

✓
I
STUDI MEDIEVALI

SERIE TERZA

Anno XIII - Fasc. II

1972

CENTRO ITALIANO DI STUDI SULL'ALTO MEDIOEVO
SPOLETO

a083912

The Formation of Laon's Cathedral Library in the Ninth Century

The Carolingian intellectual renaissance was a renaissance of the written word. While it is sometimes difficult to defend the originality of the Carolingian achievement, there can be no doubt, I think, of the significance of the Carolingian emphasis on the written word. The sacred texts were to be corrected, copied faithfully, and complemented by texts on the liberal arts whose study would enrich the understanding of the sacred texts. In addition, the Carolingian program was suffused by the belief that learning, study, the book were useful. Study of the written word would lead to the regeneration of society (1). This optimistic belief in the ability of the word in some way to better man and society has had a long history since the Carolingian period.

In the context of the ninth century, however, the Carolingian intellectual program would have been stillborn without the transcription and collection of texts carried out by individuals and institutions. Numerous paleographical studies have isolated important eighth and ninth century scriptoria where primary responsibility for the success of the Carolingian literary and intellectual renaissance must be placed. Other recent studies have begun to focus on the individuals responsible for building library collections. Laymen as well as ecclesiastical figures carefully searched for manu-

(1) For a recent, stimulating interpretation of the Carolingian renaissance, see WALTER ULLMANN, *The Carolingian Renaissance and the Idea of Kingship*, London, 1969, especially pp. 1-20. See also PIERRE RICHÉ, *Education et culture dans l'occident barbare, VI^e-VIII^e siècles* (2^e éd.), Paris, 1967, pp. 550-552. For the Carolingian Christianization of the arts, cf. M. TH. D'ALVERNY, *La Sagesse et ses sept filles: Recherches sur les allégories de la philosophie et des arts libéraux du IX^e au XII^e siècle*, in *Mélanges Félix Gral*, 1, Paris, 1946, pp. 245-278, and G. MATHON, *Les formes et la signification de la pédagogie des arts libéraux au milieu du IX^e siècle: L'enseignement palatin de Jean Scot Erigène*, in *Arts libéraux et philosophie au moyen-âge*, Paris, 1967, pp. 47-64.

scripts which interested them ⁽²⁾. The lists in which they sometimes recorded the contents of their libraries are of inestimable value for reconstructing the cultural formation and interests of a Dhuoda, a Lupus, or a Hincmar of Reims.

The formation of institutional libraries, those of the monastery and cathedral, however, is often an anonymous affair. The contents of many important libraries have been collected in Becker's still useful compendium of medieval library catalogues ⁽³⁾. Yet, in many cases the individuals responsible for the creation of these libraries are unknown. Where medieval library catalogues have not survived, it becomes, of course, even more difficult to trace the growth of a library. In the instances where a medieval library has been scattered, as has Fleury's, for example, one must first search the major European manuscript depositories in order to reconstruct the library *before* one can begin to discern those individuals who were interested in the intellectual and cultural life of the monastery or cathedral. For the cathedral of Laon, however, the task is easier: a substantial number of Laon's ninth century manuscripts have survived and, almost as important, many of them can be studied in the same place they were used in the ninth century ⁽⁴⁾.

The school of Laon, especially during the third quarter of the ninth century, has increasingly attracted attention as an important Carolingian intellectual center ⁽⁵⁾. In the absence of de-

(2) Cf. the studies of F. M. CAREY, *The Scriptorium of Reims during the Archbishopric of Hincmar (845-882 A.D.)*, in *Classical and Mediaeval Studies in Honor of Edward Kennard Rand*, ed., L. W. JONES, New York, 1938, pp. 41-60; E. PELLEGRIN, *Les manuscrits de Loup de Ferrières*, in *Bibliothèque de l'École de Chartes*, 115 (1957), 5-31; C. CHARLIER, *Les manuscrits personnels de Florus de Lyon et son activité littéraire*, in *Mélanges E. Pothéard*, Lyon, 1945, 71-84; P. RICHÉ, *Les bibliothèques de trois aristocrates laïcs carolingiens*, in *Moyen Age*, 69 (1963), 87-104; B. BISCHOFF, *Die Hofbibliothek Karls des Grossen*, in *Karl der Grosse: Lebenswerk und Nachleben*, 11: *Das geistige Leben*, Düsseldorf, 1965, pp. 42-62; M. CAPPUYNS, *Les 'Bibli Vulfadi' et Jean Scot Erigène*, in *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 33 (1966), 137-139.

(3) G. BECKER, *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui*, Bonn, 1885.

(4) I would like to express here my deep gratitude to the Librarian at the Bibliothèque Municipale of Laon, Mme. S. Martinet, and to her staff for the kind welcome I received at the library during my research there in 1969 and 1970. I would also like to acknowledge the courtesy and help I received at the Cabinet des Manuscrits in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. Unless otherwise noted, all references to manuscripts are made to manuscripts conserved at the Bibliothèque Municipale, Laon.

(5) For the most important bibliography see n. 1 in my study *A propos de quelques manuscrits de l'école de Laon au IX^e siècle: Découvertes et problèmes*, in *Le Moyen Age*, 78 (1972), 5-39. See also Abbé BERNARD MERLETTE's paper presented at the *95e Congrès National des Sociétés Savantes (Reims, 23 March 1970): Ecoles et bibliothèques à Laon de la fin de l'Antiquité à la naissance des universités*, also to be published shortly. I have not seen Edouard Jeuneau's paper, *Les écoles de Laon, Auxerre, et Reims au IX^e et X^e siècles*, presented 21 April 1971 at the *Centro Italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*.

tailed narrative sources for the history of the school, the study of its library is crucial for understanding the activities and significance of the work of the Laon masters. The study of Laon's library reveals that this superb collection of manuscripts was put together by two generations of Laon masters and bishops.

Three important tools aid the systematic exploitation of Laon's manuscripts as a source for the history of the formation of the cathedral library. The first and most recent is Félix Ravaisson's catalogue of Laon manuscripts published in 1849 ⁽⁶⁾. This catalogue was the first departmental catalogue of manuscript holdings published in France. This was a mixed honor though for the manuscripts of Laon. In 1849, Ravaisson was working in the dark as far as the study of medieval literature and paleography in France was concerned. French medieval studies were just beginning to recover from the dissolution of the religious orders during the Revolution. When Ravaisson began to work on the Laon manuscripts, both the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* and Abbé Migne's republication of medieval sources, the *Patrologia latina*, were in their infancy. Ravaisson's catalogue, then, is essentially worthless and offers little help to the researcher. His analyses of the manuscripts are often vague or erroneous. His dating is equally unreliable. He has omitted some manuscripts and misjudged the provenance of others.

Two other manuscript catalogues are more valuable than Ravaisson's. They are also both about a century older and record the contents of the library as it existed before the French Revolution. These catalogues record approximately fifty-four manuscripts which somehow had disappeared by Ravaisson's time. Dom Bernard de Montfaucon published his census of Laon manuscripts in his two volume *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum manuscriptorum nova* ⁽⁷⁾. His list preserves 364 titles. One hundred nineteen of these bear the short description, «est summae antiquitatis», or «est antiquissimae», or simply, «antiquiss.» Judging from the existing manuscripts «very old» connoted a manuscript of the tenth century or older to Montfaucon.

Dom Bugniâtre's list of Laon manuscripts is similar to Mont-

(6) *Manuscrits de la bibliothèque de Laon*, in *Catalogue générale des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques des départements*, 1, Paris, 1849, pp. 41-255.

(7) *Catalogus mss ecclesiae cathed. Laudunensis*, in *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum manuscriptorum nova*, 11, Paris, 1739, pp. 1292-1299.

faucon's. Bugniâtre, a Maurist engaged in the monumental, uncompleted history of the ecclesiastical provinces of France, compiled his catalogue shortly before the French Revolution. It is preserved in the unique manuscript copy of his *Histoire de Laon* (8). Bugniâtre's descriptions of the manuscripts are much fuller than Montfaucon's. Also, unlike Montfaucon, he noted each *ex-dono* found in the Laon manuscripts. These precious bits of information make even the «lost» manuscripts of Laon valuable sources.

Some of the cathedral's manuscripts left Laon before these three catalogues were compiled. Of these, several can be traced back to Laon by an *ex-libris* or another clue such as the script of a Laon master. The catalogues of Bugniâtre and Montfaucon, however, preserve substantially the contents of the library at Laon as it existed in the ninth and tenth centuries (9). With these basic tools and the surviving manuscripts, the first study of the formation of Laon's ninth century library can be attempted.

The only literary evidence for the formation of the cathedral's library are the few notices of Hincmar of Reims' (845-882) gifts to the bishops of Laon (10) and a request by Hincmar of Laon (858-876) for books from Bishop Witgarius (858-887) of Augsburg (11).

(8) Chapter 6, «Les bibliothèques, les manufactures et les maisons royales du laonnais», *Paris, B. N., Collection de Picardie*, t. 267, ff. 97v-113v. This catalogue, which is as important for the twelfth century library at Laon as it is for the ninth century library, deserves to be published in a critical edition.

(9) It is, of course, entirely possible that a ninth or tenth century manuscript might have come to the cathedral library in the eleventh, twelfth, or later centuries and thus be irrelevant for the study of the ninth century library. Judging from the surviving ninth and tenth century manuscripts, this possibility seems remote. Most of Laon's manuscripts bear unmistakable signs that they were in use at Laon during the period considered in this study.

(10) In a letter to Bishop Pardulus of Laon (848-856): «Item pro ecclesia Morini vacante pastore, ut unde cum loquatur, qualiter ipsa electio rite peragatur, et pro libris sancti Ambrosii de fide sibi mittendis». FLODOARD, *Historia Remensis Ecclesiae*, in M.G.H. Scr., X111, 518.

In a letter to Hincmar of Laon (858-876): «Sententiam beati Leonis ad Leonem Augustum deproptam parvipendere nullo modo debes, quam in synodo apud Sussionis audisti; et in illo libro quem tibi dedi ipse legere potes». *P.L.*, 126, 544.

In another letter to Hincmar of Laon: «Et quia districtione retributionis non considerant de domnis suis miseri exultant, et caetera quae in regula pastoralis beati Gregorii ex ordine potes relegere, quam tibi una cum libro sacrarum canonum in manu ante altare sanctae Mariae in die ordinationis tuae misi, obstans quae ignorare non potes et oblivisci non debes». *ibid.*, 558.

In his tract, *Opusculum LV Capitularum*, *ibid.*, 316: «Et ut certius credas [i.e. Hincmar of Laon] quae de hoc etiam verbo dicemus, revolve libros veterum et illum nihilominus codicem quondam meum, a sobrino tuo Anselmo receptum, et tibi a me praestitum sed postea sicut nec quosdam alias tibi a me commendatas obtentum . . . ».

(11) Mentioned in a letter from Hincmar of Reims to Hincmar of Laon: *P.L.*, 126, 280: «Frater Clarentius communis compresbyter noster ad me veniens ex tua parte mihi dixit quia fratre Hadulfo compresbytero nostro missaticum tuum ad Witgarium episcopum de civitate Augustiburc pro libro Paterii et aliis quae tibi placuerunt commiseris . . . ».

The manuscripts themselves are more helpful. According to Dom Bugniâtre, nineteen Laon manuscripts were given to the cathedral by Bishop Dido (ca. 882-893). A twentieth manuscript with Dido's *ex-dono* left Laon before Bugniâtre compiled his catalogue (12). Bugniâtre attributed twenty-two manuscripts to the generosity of a Bernard and Adelelm. Two additional manuscripts bear their *ex-dono* (13). Finally, Bugniâtre recorded that Bishop Rodulf of Laon gave four manuscripts to the cathedral library. The preservation of this information is a stroke of great fortune. Of the approximately 125 manuscripts which were at Laon in the ninth and tenth centuries, forty-eight, or about forty per cent, can be traced to a donor. More importantly, the size of their donations, whose magnitude has never been suspected, reveal Dido, Bernard, and Adelelm, as cultural patrons of the first order. Their donations compare favorably with that of Archbishop Hincmar of Reims who gave at least twenty-one manuscripts to the churches of Reims (14). Their personal libraries must have been as large as that of Archbishop Wulfad of Bourges (ca. 866-876) who had thirty-one titles in his collection (15).

Of the twenty books which Dido gave to Laon, nine survive (16). His library contains few surprises. It was weighted in favor of patristic authors. Three of his codices, all apparently lost, contained Augustine's sermons on the Psalms and other minor works (Bugniâtre, cod. 79, 80, 91) (17). Dido also had a collection of Augustine's letters (Bugniâtre, cod. 93). Dido's manuscript 97 contains

(12) *Paris, B.N., lat. 5095* (Anasthasius Bibliothecarius, *Collectanea ad Joannem Diaconem: Hincmarus Laudunensis, Collectio altera ex epistolis Romanorum pontificum: Hincmarus Laudunensis et Hincmarus Remensis, Epistolae*).

(13) *Paris, B.N., lat. 5643* (*Passiones sancti Issac, Maximiani, Fronti, Philippi, Marcull, Mariae*); and, *Paris, B.N., lat. 5670* (Paulus Diaconus, *Vita sancti Gregorii*).

(14) See the study by CAREY cited above, n. 2. Carey attributes twenty-two manuscripts to the archbishop. However, one of these, *Reims. Bibl. mun.*, 118, bears the presentation notice of Deacon Hincmar. I think this must be the archbishop's nephew who was a deacon at Reims before he became bishop of Laon.

(15) Cf. the article by Dom CAPPUYNS also cited in n. 2 above.

(16) His *ex-dono* is almost invariable: «Hunc librum dedit dominus dido episcopus deo et sanctae mariae. Si quis abstulerit iram dei et sanctae mariae incurrat» (ms. 24, f. Av; ms. 97, unnumbered fragment attached to f. 1; ms. 342, f. 1r). Manuscript 122 bis, f. 1v and ms. 428, second unnumbered flyleaf, substitute *libellum* for *librum*. Manuscript 6, inside front cover, ms. 135, f. 85r, ms. 199, f. Av, and *Paris, B.N., lat. 5095*, f. 1r have «. . . iram dei et eius dominae genitricis offensam incurrat».

(17) References to lost manuscripts are made to Bugniâtre's fuller descriptions. A concordance of Montfaucon's, Bugniâtre's, and Ravaisson's numbers for the Laon manuscripts is provided in Appendix B of my unpublished dissertation, «The School of Laon from 850 to 930: Its Manuscripts and Masters» (Michigan State University, 1971).

Augustine's *De consensu evangelistarum*. Another extant manuscript, 135, is a collection of eight Augustinian sermons with a pseudo-Augustinian homily and another homily wrongly attributed to Fulgentius of Ruspe. Dido also possessed Eugippius' handy precis of the African Father's voluminous work, the *Excerpta ex operibus S. Augustini* (Bugniâtre, cod. 101). Other fathers were not so amply represented. Dido gave a copy of Jerome's commentary on Daniel, Jonas, Nahum, Micheas, and Habacuc (Bugniâtre, cod. 66) to Notre Dame of Laon. His donation of Jerome's *Liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominum* (manuscript 24) is still conserved at Laon. His only manuscript of Ambrose's work, a collection of his treatises, has been lost (Bugniâtre, cod. 57). The bishop of Laon also read John Chrysostom. Dido's copy of Chrysostom's thirty-four sermons on the epistles to the Hebrews has not been conserved (Bugniâtre, cod. 61).

Among medieval authors, Dido's collection was spread rather thinly. In addition to Bede's commentary on Proverbs and on the book of Tobit (Bugniâtre, cod. 123), he owned Ps. Alcuin's little treatise, *De processione sancti spiritus* (manuscript 122bis), and commentaries by Rhabanus Maurus on Genesis (Bugniâtre, cod. 133) and Exodus (manuscript 6). Dido also possessed a beautiful copy of Anastasius the Librarian's *Collectanea ad Iohannem Diaconem*. The same manuscript (Paris, B. N. lat. 5095) contains Hincmar of Laon's *Collectio altera ex epistolis Romanorum Pontificum* and a collection of the correspondence between Hincmar of Reims and Hincmar of Laon. Dido's library was completed by two volumes of conciliar canons⁽¹⁸⁾, the *Liber Pontificalis* (manuscript 342), and Vegetius' *Epitoma rei militaris* (manuscript 428).

Dido's manuscripts add a few details to his obscure life. Dido was evidently a wealthy man⁽¹⁹⁾. With one important exception, his books do not seem to have been used in the school. They are well preserved and are bare of all notes which would indicate heavy use. In fact, in Dido's nine surviving manuscripts there is no evidence of his own handwriting. The only manuscript which

(18) Dido's ms. 199 is a copy of the *Concilium Lateranense Romanum* of 649. A second collection of canons, unfortunately lost (Bugniâtre, cod. 36), also contained a chronicle from the creation of the world to the twenty-fifth year of Charlemagne's reign as well as excerpts from Augustine, Jerome, Anastasius, and Gregory of Tours.

(19) Another indication of Dido's largess is contained in a poem, probably by Heiric of Auxerre, which commemorates Dido's presentation of a bell to his cathedral, cf. R. QUADRI, *I Collectanea di Eirico di Auxerre*, Fribourg, 1966, p. 157.

can be connected with the school at Laon is Dido's copy of Jerome's *Liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominum*, manuscript 24. On a flyleaf, folio 11, there are two important notes in Irish script⁽²⁰⁾. On the verso of the same leaf, Martin Scotus (819-875) copied the table of contents for the manuscript⁽²¹⁾. Obviously Martin owned this handy guide to Hebrew etymologies before it came into Dido's possession. This manuscript is the only connection between Dido and Laon before his consecration as bishop of Laon in 882/883. It allows us to suspect that Dido was familiar with one of the Laon masters sometime in the early 870's (Martin Scotus died in 875) and perhaps was a student at Laon.

Bishop Rodulf's contribution to the cathedral library was less spectacular than Dido's. Of the four manuscripts Bugniâtre attributed to Rodulf, two have survived. Rodulf's copies of Jerome's commentary on Ezechiel (Bugniâtre, cod. 65) and Cassiodorus' commentary on the Psalms (Bugniâtre, cod. 103) have both been lost. Bugniâtre also ascribed a copy of Augustine's *De trinitate* to the generosity of Rodulf. This must be manuscript 130 whose contents fit Bugniâtre's description. The front flyleaf has been cut in half vertically. On the verso of the remaining portion is the note [R]odulfus episcopus. There would have been sufficient space on the entire folio to read «Hunc librum dedit Rodulfus episcopus», or some variation. According to Bugniâtre, Rodulf also gave a copy of Florus of Lyons' *Expositio in epistolas beati Pauli, ex operibus sancti Augustini collecta* to Notre Dame of Laon. Manuscript 105 exactly fits Bugniâtre's description. However, it contains no *ex-dono*. The *ex-dono* may have disappeared when the flyleaves were removed from the manuscript after Bugniâtre saw it.

There are two problems in assessing the significance of Rodulf's contribution to the formation of the library at Laon. First, there were two Bishop Rodulfs at Laon during the tenth century. Rodulf I presided over the see from 894 to 921⁽²²⁾. Rodulf II was

(20) See below.

(21) Martin's script has long been known from the notes he made in ms. 444, Laon's famous Greek-Latin glossary. His script is also found in many other Laon mss. including ms. 24, cf. n. 46 and n. 50 below.

(22) Cf. Flodoard, *Historia Remensis Ecclesiarum*, in M.G.H., Scr., X11, 571, and *Recueil des actes de Charles III le Simple, roi de France, 893-923*, edd. F. LOT, P. LAUER, I, Paris, 1940, pp. 16-17; 112. Rodulf was a close friend of Archbishop Fulko of Reims and a loyal ally of Charles.

bishop of Laon from 936 to 948⁽²³⁾. There is no sure way to tell which of these is the Bishop Rodulf of the manuscripts. The same must be said for a short note which appears in a medical manuscript at Laon: «Rodulfus episcopus vivat in aeternum»⁽²⁴⁾. For the present, I am inclined to identify Rodulf I as the benefactor of the cathedral library. The two manuscripts which survive and are attributed to him are from the ninth century. Presumably, Rodulf II would have had greater opportunity to present tenth century manuscripts to the library.

Secondly, it is surprising that no one has seriously connected the Rodulfs of Laon with two important classical manuscripts now conserved at Leiden⁽²⁵⁾. Both *Leiden, Voss. lat. F. 84*, which contains the philosophical works of Cicero, and *Leiden, Voss. lat. Q. 20*, Curtius' *History of Alexander the Great* with an excerpt from Orosius' *History*, bear a mutilated *ex-dono* which refers to a Bishop Rodulf. In the Cicero codex all that is visible at the top of folio 1r is, «Hunc librum dedit Rodulfus episcopus...». The name of the recipient of the manuscript has been blotted out. A Rodulf's *ex-dono* is found several times in the Leiden Curtius. Unfortunately, it has been zealously covered with dark brown ink so that only a portion of it is legible. Historians who have tried to decipher the *ex-dono* in this manuscript have been misled by the facsimile of folio 68v presented by Chatelain in his *Paléographie des classiques latins*⁽²⁶⁾. The *ex-dono* is not confined to the verso of this folio but continues onto the corresponding opposite recto leaf. In other words, Traube knew only half of the *ex-dono* when he reconstructed it as: HUNC LIBRŪ RODULPHUS EP̄S DE [DIT]

(23) For this politically active prelate, cf. Flodoard, *ibid.*, 581, 588, 590; *Annales*, ed. P. LAUER, Paris, 1905, pp. 71, 73, 110, 115, 118, 120-121; and D. MISONNE, *La chartre de Raoul de Laon relative à l'établissement de moines scots à Saint-Michel-en-Thiérache* (3 fév. 945), in *Revue bénédictine*, 74 (1964), 298-307.

(24) Manuscript 420, f. 99v. This copy of Marcellus' *De medicamentis* is from the first quarter of the ninth century, cf. E. WICKERSHEIMER, *Les manuscrits de médecine du haut moyen âge dans les bibliothèques de France*, Paris, 1966, pp. 35-36. It was at Laon at least from about the middle of the century as the presence of Martin Scotus' (819-875) script indicates. Thus, the epitaph could refer to either Rodulf.

(25) For these mss., cf. E. K. RAND, *Studies in the Script of Tours, I: A Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours, I: Text*, Cambridge, Mass., 1929, pp. 134-135, and B. BISCHOFF, *Hadard und die Klassikerhandschriften aus Corbie*, in *Mittelalterliche Studien: Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte* 1, Stuttgart, 1966, p. 53, n. 14.

(26) Vol. II, Paris, 1894, p. 26 (pl. CLXXXVIII). All discussions of the *ex-dono* of this manuscript spell the donor's name *Rodulphus*. However, when I examined the ms. in May, 1970, I saw *Rodulfus*, the same form used by the bishop of Laon and found in the *ex-dono* of the Leiden Cicero. My reading has been graciously corroborated by J. van Groningen, Western Manuscripts, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden (letter, 1 March 1971).

DE [O] [ET BEATO EIUS MARTI]NO⁽²⁷⁾. The -NO which Traube observed is not the end of the *ex-dono* but a syllable of a word in the middle of the *ex-dono*. The terminal word, clearly visible on the recto of folios 4r, 45, 53, and 57 is ECCLESIAE. This strongly suggests that the recipient of the manuscript was not a monastery, as Rand thought⁽²⁸⁾, but a cathedral, most probably the enigmatic Rodulf's own.

An ultra-violet light does not help to decipher the *ex-dono*. Although the formula HUNC LIBRUM RODULFUS EPISCOPUS DEO DEDIT ET SANCTAE MARIAE LAUDUNO [OF, LAUDUNENSIS] ECCLESIAE could fit the space occupied by the *ex-dono*, there are no grounds to warrant such a reconstruction. Perhaps someday a chemical means will be employed to bring out the original notice.

Another avenue of approach might yield a provisional solution to the problem of Rodulf's identity. How many Bishop Rodulfs were there during the ninth and tenth centuries? The earlier of the two Leiden manuscripts is from Tours and dates from the abbacy of Fridugisus (820-834), according to Rand. The second is from 850 at the earliest⁽²⁹⁾. However, the *ex-dono* in both is from the end of the ninth or the beginning of the tenth centuries⁽³⁰⁾. In addition to the two Rodulfs of Laon, the only other Rodulf is the archbishop of Bourges from 845-866⁽³¹⁾. Only a handful of bishops bore the name during the second half of the tenth century⁽³²⁾. None of these, to my knowledge, has been associated with a gift of books to his cathedral as has the Rodulf of Laon whose donation is recorded in Bugniâtre's catalogue.

Even if some doubt remains on the attribution of the Leiden manuscripts to Rodulf, both Dido's and Rodulf's contributions to the cathedral library were impressive. From the point of view of the school at Laon, however, the importance of the gift of Bernard and Adelelm surpasses that of Dido and Rodulf. Among

(27) Cf. *Paläographische Anzeigen*, 111, in *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen*, hrsgb. F. BOLL, 111, Munich, 1965, p. 233.

(28) Cf. n. 25 above.

(29) Cf. BISCHOFF, *ibid.*, 53.

(30) *Ibid.*, n. 14.

(31) Cf. *Gallia Christiana*, 11, Paris, 1720, pp. 24-27.

(32) Cf. P. B. GAMS, *Series Episcoporum Ecclesiae Catholicae*, Graz, 1957. A search of the lists for France, Belgium, Holland, and Lorraine yields Rodulfs at the following bishoprics during the second half of the century: Avranches (990-1006); Chalons-sur-Saône (977-986); Chartres (1004-1009); Noyon (950-952); St. Malo (1008-1022).

the twenty-four manuscripts which bear their presentation notice are found the most important books used in the school ⁽³³⁾.

Bernard and Adelelm were first identified by Félix Ravaisson ⁽³⁴⁾. He found their names in the testament Charles the Bald prepared before his Italian voyage of 877. In the twelfth paragraph of the testament, Counts Bernard and Adelelm, along with two other counts and various prelates, were delegated to distribute Charles' books to St. Denis, Notre Dame at Compiègne, and Charles' son, Louis ⁽³⁵⁾. Counts Bernard and Adelelm were also among those designated as Louis' guardians during his father's absence. Ravaisson conjectured from this testament and the six *ex-donos* in Laon's manuscripts that he knew that Louis, less interested in books than his father, gave his portion to Bernard and Adelelm who, in turn, gave them to the cathedral at Laon. Ravaisson's hypothesis was strengthened by the fact that Adelelm was a close vassal of Charles. In addition, Adelelm was rector, by royal will, of the monastery of St. Peter and St. Bavo in Gent and also count of Laon ⁽³⁶⁾.

Ravaisson's ingenious and happy solution to the puzzle of Laon's benefactors held sway for more than a century despite the publication of the *Annales Laudunenses et S. Vincentii Mettensis Breves* in 1888 by O. Holder-Egger ⁽³⁷⁾. The annals present two

(33) Their *ex-dono* is also practically invariable: *Istum librum dederunt bernardus et adelelmus deo et sanctae mariae laudunensis ecclesiae. Si quis abstulerit offensioem dei et sanctae mariae incurrat* (ms. 26, inside front cover; ms. 38, f. 1v; ms. 136, f. 1r; ms. 298, f. 1v; ms. 444, f. 1v; ms. 468, f. 11r).

Manuscripts 50 (f. 1v), 122 (f. 77r), 273 (f. 1r), have *Hunc* for *Istum*. Manuscripts 464 (f. 1r) and *Paris, B.N., lat. 5670* (f. 1r) have *Istum libellum* for *Istum librum*. Manuscript 265 (f. 1v) has *Hunc libellum*.

Bugniâtre describes cod. 144 as an anonymous commentary on St. John and attributes it to Bernard and Adelelm. Manuscript 80 (formerly numbered 144) is an anonymous commentary on John (cf. below, n. 43). This ms. dates from the middle of the ninth century and bears the script of Martin Scotus.

Bugniâtre also describes cod. 362 as a ms. of Fortunatus' poems. In the margin of his catalogue, opposite his description of this codex, he noted simply *•Aadatelemi•*. There is no mention of Adelelm in ms. 469 (Fortunatus, *Carmina; Vita sancti Martini*) but this could be due to the loss of the flyleaf of the manuscript.

Paris, B.N., lat. 5643, f. 51v is attributed to Adelelm alone, cf. n. 13 above.

(34) Cf. pp. 43-45 of his catalogue cited above, n. 6.

(35) Cf. *Conventus Carisiacensis (877)*, in M.G.H. *Leges*, I, 539.

(36) Cf. *Recueil des actes de Charles 11 le Chauve, roi de France*, ed. G. TESSIER, et al. II, Paris, 1952, pp. 115-117; 158-161.

(37) Cf. L. DELISLE, *Le cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, II, Paris, 1874, p. 375; E. MILLER, *Glossaire grec-latin de la bibliothèque de Laon*, in *Notices et extraits* 29, 2^e pte (1880), 5-6; W. WATTENBACH, *Das Schriftwesen im Mittelalter*, 3te Aufl., Leipzig, 1896, p. 592, n. 3; E. LESNE, *Les livres •scriptoria•, et bibliothèques du commencement du VIII^e à la fin du XI^e siècle*, Lille, 1938, p. 263, n. 8; A. BOUTEMY, *Notes de voyages sur quelques*

cathedral canons, Bernard and Adelelm, whose claim to the books which bear their names is manifestly more obvious and more in accord with the nature of the books than that of the counts Bernard and Adelelm. Bernard, the cathedral canon, was a *scolasticus* at Laon. He later became dean of the cathedral chapter. Adelelm, who became priest in 892, succeeded Bernard as dean and became bishop of Laon in 921. Thus, both had a long association with the cathedral. Both also taught in the school. As the following discussion will prove, most of the books Bernard and Adelelm gave either came from the school or belonged to an earlier Laon master. They can hardly be described as the *«libri nostri qui in thesauro nostro sunt»* which Charles the Bald confided to Counts Bernard and Adelelm and others. Charles' will undoubtedly referred to the luxurious illuminated Gospel books prepared for him rather than to a collection of teachers' manuals. In addition, although Bernard and Adelelm jointly donated twenty-three manuscripts, there was at least one donated by Adelelm alone after he became bishop ⁽³⁸⁾.

In addition to manuscripts of Jerome's ⁽³⁹⁾, Augustine's ⁽⁴⁰⁾, Ambrose's ⁽⁴¹⁾, and Gregory the Great's works ⁽⁴²⁾, Bernard and Adelelm also owned a copy of Origen's homilies on Numbers (manuscript 298), Cassiodorus' commentary on the Psalms (manuscript 26), Prosper of Aquitaine's *De vocatione omnium gentium* with five letters of Pope Leo I (manuscript 122), as well as a copy of Hesychius' commentary on Leviticus (Bugniâtre, cod. 106), and Fortunatus' *Carmina* and *Vita sancti Martini* (manuscript 469). Bernard and Adelelm also owned Rhabanus Maurus' commentary on Exodus (Bugniâtre, cod. 135), a complex collection of extracts from early medieval authors (manuscript 265), an anonymous

manuscrits de l'ancien archidiocèse de Reims, in *Scriptorium*, 2 (1948), 124; S. MARTINET, *Laon, in Catholicisme: hier, aujourd'hui, demain*, ed. G. JACQUEMET, VI, Paris, 1967, p. 1821.

EDOUARD FLEURY, in his *Les manuscrits à miniatures de la bibliothèque de Laon...* (2^e éd.), Paris, 1863, pp. 23-25, challenged Ravaisson's identification. He suggested that Bernard and Adelelm might be cathedral canons but offered no proof. O. HOLDER-EGGER, in *M.G.H. Ser.*, XV, 1295, n. 1, guessed correctly that the Bernard and Adelelm of the *Annales Laudunenses* were also the donors of the manuscripts.

(38) This is the *Paris, B.N., lat. 5643* already mentioned in n. 33 above.

(39) Bugniâtre, cod., 62, 63, 64: commentary on Isaias; cod. 69: commentary on Joel, Habacuc, Zacharias, and Malachy; ms. 38: commentary on Joel, Jonas, Nahum, Micheas, and Habacuc.

(40) Manuscript 136: various Augustinian and pseudo-Augustinian sermons.

(41) Bugniâtre, cod., 54: commentary on the epistles of St. Paul.

(42) Bugniâtre, cod. 107: books 17-22 from the *Moralia in Iob*. In the margin of his catalogue, Bugniâtre attributed this ms. to Adelelm alone.

commentary on St. John (manuscript 80) ⁽⁴³⁾, and two collections of saints' *Lives* ⁽⁴⁴⁾.

All these texts, of course, could be used in a school. What is remarkable about Bernard's and Adelelm's collection is the presence of several manuals specifically designed for teaching. Wicbod's *Quaestiones in Octateuchum ex dictis sanctorum Patri Augustini, Gregorii, Hieronimi, Ambrosii, Hilarii, Eucherii, et Iu-nilli* (manuscript 273) is, as its title suggests, a compilation of extracts from the fathers and other early medieval authors. Wicbod's text has never been fully published for the precise reason that he was merely content to pass on the thoughts of his authorities in a convenient format ⁽⁴⁵⁾. There is nothing original about Wicbod's work except his system of selection and arrangement of his materials. In addition to its popular dossier format, Wicbod built his work around a dialogue between a master and a student. In this one codex, then, the masters of Laon possessed a handy and far-ranging repertoire of information on the first eight books of the Old Testament. A similar manual employing the dialogue format was Aldhelm's treatise on versification, the *Retractio reciprocae interrogationis et responsionis de pedum regulis* (manuscript 464). Designed to teach the rules of meter, the dialogue is built around a hundred riddles drawn from pagan and Christian poets and exotic word-lists which exemplify various meters.

In manuscript 468, Bernard and Adelelm had a *Handbuch* for the study of Virgil and of the Christian author Sedulius. This important manuscript provided the student with an introduction to Virgil's life and works as well as a glossary of the more difficult vocabulary in both Sedulius' and Virgil's work. Another important teaching aid is manuscript 444, a Greek-Latin glossary to which Martin Scotus added a Greek and Latin grammar. This

(43) Folio 1r: • In nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti. In principio erat verbum qua similitudine intelligitur verbum substantiale verbum et in ipsos homine quod manet intus. Quod vere spiritualiter dicitur quod intelligitur de sono non ipse sonus nam cum cogitas dei substantiam hoc est verbum de deo in corde tuo •.

According to the file of *incipits* at the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes (Paris), this commentary is also found in *Val. Patat. lat.*, 176, ff. 87-161, a ms. of the tenth century according to the I.R.H.T.'s file.

(44) See above, n. 13.

(45) Wicbod has been identified with the abbot of St. Maximin in Trier by W. LEVISON, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century*, Oxford, 1946, p. 128, n. 9. Martène and Durand published the first book of the *Quaestiones* from a manuscript they found at St. Maximin, cf. *P.L.*, 96, 1105-1168.

manuscript formed the core of instruction in Greek at Laon during the third quarter of the ninth century.

Two more aspects of Bernard's and Adelelm's library need to be stressed in order to appreciate fully the significance of their donation. Of the fifteen extant manuscripts they donated to the cathedral, ten came to Bernard and Adelelm from Martin Scotus as the presence of his script in their margins or on their flyleaves attests ⁽⁴⁶⁾. This means that most of the books which Bernard and Adelelm gave to the cathedral were not new to the school of Laon. Rather, they had been at Laon since approximately the middle of the ninth century. Secondly, of the surviving manuscripts of Bernard and Adelelm, at least four show signs of an Irish background. Manuscript 26 (Cassiodorus, *In Psalmos*) is copied in Irish pointed minuscule and bears marginal notes in Old Irish ⁽⁴⁷⁾. Manuscript 50 (Lathcen, *Ecloga in Moralia Gregorii in Iob*) was copied by a continental scribe directly from an Irish exemplar ⁽⁴⁸⁾. The Greek-Latin glossary, manuscript 444, bears some words in Old Irish, an important clue to its background. The text of manuscript 468, the guide to the works of Virgil and Sedulius, although written by a continental hand bears some anomalies that can most easily be explained by the use of an Irish archetype for the material in the manuscript ⁽⁴⁹⁾.

Bernard and Adelelm's collection of manuscripts mirrors the character of the library at Laon in the ninth century. It was a library formed by Martin Scotus. Not surprisingly, this library which was used by John Scotus, Martin, and other members of the Irish group at Laon contained manuscripts with an Irish origin or provenance.

Martin never left an *ex-dono* or *ex-libris* in his books. We may assume, I think, that Bernard and Adelelm inherited their books from the master who died in 875 just as they inherited his position as teacher. Some of Martin's books, or at least the books which he used, were not passed on to Bernard and Adelelm. Martin's handwriting is found in at least fourteen other Laon

(46) These are mss. 38, 50, 80, 265, 273, 298, 444, 464, 468 and 469.

(47) K. MEYER has translated these interesting scribal notes into German, cf. *Neu aufgefundene altirische Glossen*, in *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, 8 (1912), 175-176.

(48) Cf. E. A. LOWE, *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, VI, Oxford, 1953, 18-19 (n. 763).

(49) For ms. 444, cf. J. VENDRYES, *Les mots vieil-irlandais du manuscrit de Laon*, in *Revue celtique*, 25 (1904), 377-381 among many studies of this important codex. For ms. 468, cf. below and, more fully, my study in *Le Moyen Age*, cited in n. 5 above.

manuscripts in addition to the ten just mentioned in Bernard and Adelelm's collection ⁽⁵⁰⁾. Some of these Martin probably found at Laon. He also added his own to those he found. On the flyleaf of manuscript 38 (folio 1r), Martin recorded the contents of this manuscript:

Hic continentur iohel (liber i), ionas (liber i),
micheas (libri ii), naum (liber i), abacuc
(libri ii). Libri vii.

Above this list, at a slightly later date, he noted, « Iohel et abacuc habeo in altero libro ». And immediately below his table of contents he indicated, « Expositionem super sophoniam et ageum non habeo » ⁽⁵¹⁾. Here was a scholar eager to have all of Jerome's commentaries. Another precious note reveals the source of at least one book Martin owned. In his copy of Wicbod's *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, Martin added a marginal note to the discussion about the sons of Cham which occurs in Wicbod's section on Genesis:

Cham invasit per vim fortem fratris sui sem, id est, terram repromissionis, et ideo reddidit eam deus semini sem. Videlicet abraham et semini eius. Sic enim inveni in libro quem dedit mihi fulbertus ⁽⁵²⁾.

The book Martin referred to has not yet been identified. There is a strong possibility, however, that his friend Fulbert was attached to Charles the Bald's court ⁽⁵³⁾.

(50) These are mss. 24, 37, 67, 86, 92, 299, 319, 336, 420, 424, 447, and three others not at Laon: Berlin, *Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Philipps*, 1830 (*Annales Laudunenses et S. Vincentii Metensis Breves*); Paris, B.N., lat. 2024; Paris, B.N., lat. 12964 (Iohannes Scotus, *De Divisione Naturae*, libri I-V). For knowledge of the last two mss. which exhibit Martin's script, I am indebted to Abbé Bernard Merlette.

(51) Bernard and Adelelm owned a ms., now lost, which contained Jerome's comments on Joel, Habacuc, Zacharias, and Malachy (Bugniâtre, cod. 69). It is very possible that this is the ms. to which Martin referred. There is no evidence that the library at Laon ever possessed Jerome's commentaries on Sophonias and Aggeus.

(52) Manuscript 273, f. 67r.

(53) There is no record of a Fulbertus at Laon during the ninth century but there was one at the palace who was a deacon and a chanter there. In addition, this Fulbertus possessed property « in pago Laudunensi ». In 855, according to a charter granted by Charles the Bald, Fulbertus exchanged this property for five manse and their serfs at Confavreux-en Orceois on the Ourcq river. Nine years later, in another charter, Charles confirmed Fulbertus' donation of this property to the monastery of Saint-Crépin-le-Grand. In the second

We can safely ascribe most of the Irish manuscripts, or manuscripts with an Irish background, to Martin. Of the four just mentioned, only one (manuscript 26) does not bear his script. There were at least three more Irish books at Laon during the ninth century. Unfortunately, they exist today only as fragments used as flyleaves in other manuscripts ⁽⁵⁴⁾.

Bishops Dido and Rodulf, Bernard and Adelelm, and Martin Scotus, were not the only ones who helped form the library at Laon. Bishop Hincmar of Laon sent one of his canons to Bishop Witgarius of Augsburg to borrow a copy of Paterius' abridgement of Gregory the Great's work ⁽⁵⁵⁾. An anonymous note in a Laon manuscript further illustrates the efforts that the Laon masters undertook to fill *lacunae* in their library. On a flyleaf of manuscript 24 (folio 1r) (Jerome, *Interpretationes hebraicorum nominum*), which Bishop Dido presented to the cathedral but which was already at Laon during Martin Scotus' time, an Irish hand has copied the following note:

Domine winiberte commodate nobis felicem capellam
parvo tempore et si vultis illum emendabo in illis
partibus quas dum simul eramus praetermissimus.
Utinam in uno loco essemus etiam parvo tempore!
Sidera si sparsim speciali lumine fulget
O quam collectim $\Phi\omega\varsigma$ animosa foret!

The identity of the Irish author of this letter and its import for the history of the school of Laon is explored elsewhere ⁽⁵⁶⁾. Winibert, there is good reason to believe, was the abbot of Schüttern, near Strasbourg, during the second quarter of the century. Whether he eventually provided his Irish co-worker with a copy

charter, Fulbertus is no longer described as a chanter in the palace. This would seem to indicate that he left the palace and the area of Laon when he gave up his lands there. In that case, he probably knew Martin during the early 850's although it is quite probable that they maintained contact during the 860's. Cf. *Recueil des actes de Charles II le Chauve, roi de France*, I, 453-455 (no. 172: 11 July 855): « . . . quidam diaconus, sacri palatii nostri cantor, Fulbertus nomine . . . »; *ibid.*, 2, 109-111 (no. 271: 26 July 864): « . . . dilectus nobis diaconus noster Fulbertus nomine . . . ».

(54) Manuscript 55 contains two flyleaves, ff. A and B, from two different sources, in Irish script. Manuscript 122bis has two leaves, ff. 25-26, from a commentary on St. Paul in Irish script, cf. B. Bischoff, *Wendepunkte in der Geschichte der lateinischen Exegese im Frühmittelalter*, in *Mittelalterliche Studien*, I, 292, n. 123.

(55) Cf. above, n. 11.

(56) I tentatively suggest that John Scotus may be the author of this letter in my *A propos de quelques manuscrits de l'école de Laon au IXème siècle*, cited above, n. 5.

of Martianus Capella's *De Nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* is unknown. Nevertheless, we can now single out another individual at Laon who like Martin, Hincmar, Dido, Rodulf, Bernard, and Adelelm actively sought and attempted to bring to Laon manuscripts which were important to their work. In no other center can so many individuals with an interest in building a library be found during as short a time span as the period considered here. This intense activity made the library at Laon extremely rich for a cathedral library. It also bears witness to the vitality of intellectual life at Laon especially during the period of Martin Scotus and Hincmar, the third quarter of the ninth century.

Thus far, we have considered only half the question of the library's formation. We have tried to single out those individuals who contributed to the growth of the library at Laon. We have found that these individuals, who can be identified by the presentation notices and other marks they left in their manuscripts, were the bishops and masters of the city. There is yet another factor which ought to be considered — the possibility that an active scriptorium existed at Laon which furnished the school with texts. This aspect of the library's formation deserves special treatment. It demands, first of all, a detailed paleographic analysis of Laon's manuscripts. The prospects of success for such an inquiry, which can not be undertaken here, are discouraging⁽⁵⁷⁾. Yet, we can provide some evidence to indicate that Laon did indeed have an active, if modest, scriptorium during the third quarter of the ninth century and that the chief products of this scriptorium were texts used in Laon's school.

The evidence which has thus far been brought forward for the existence of a scriptorium at Laon concerns the late eighth and early ninth centuries and the early tenth century. If Laon was not the principal home of the famous «Laon az-type script», it appears nevertheless that Laon was an important center for the production of manuscripts in this script⁽⁵⁸⁾. There is also a

(57) • Ich möchte nur hinzufügen, dass es einfachere und klarere Situationen paläographischer Überlieferung gibt als in Laon (z.B. in Corbie oder in Reims) ». B. Bischoff, letter, 24 June 1970.

(58) Cf. W. M. LINDSAY's *The Laon AZ-type*, in *Revue des bibliothèques*, 24 (1914), 15-27 and E. A. LOWE's remarks, *C.L.A.*, 6, xviii. Abbé Merlette's discovery of Martin Scotus' script in *Paris, B.N., lat. 2024* (cf. n. 50 above), a collection of extracts from various authors which contains a leaf in az-type script (cf. *CLA*, 5, 7 no. 539), permits the attribution of one more az-type specimen to Laon.

reference to an early ninth century scriptorium at Laon during the pontificate of Bishop Wenilo (799-814)⁽⁵⁹⁾. Finally, at least one manuscript was partially copied at Laon during the first quarter of the tenth century⁽⁶⁰⁾. No evidence, however, has yet been presented for the work of copyists at Laon during the third quarter of the ninth century, the period coincidental with the work of the most important Laon masters. Many of Laon's manuscripts can be attributed to other centers. St. Amand, Reims, and Corbie were the chief sources of Laon's manuscripts⁽⁶¹⁾. On the other hand, several important Laon manuscripts bear unmistakable signs that they were copied at Laon and thus that there was a local interest not only to collect manuscripts from other scriptoria but also to copy them at Laon for use in the school and for the library.

It is somewhat paradoxical that the only literary reference to scribal activity at Laon in the ninth century comes from the pontificate of the much maligned Hincmar of Laon. Hincmar most certainly had a scriptorium at his disposal for the preparation of the tracts he addressed to the archbishop of Reims⁽⁶²⁾. At one point in his controversy with his uncle, he mentioned the names of two of his deacons, Teutlandus and Hartgarius, who served him as copyists⁽⁶³⁾. Scholars have tried to identify the Hartgarius who corrected manuscript II, Origen's homilies on Leviticus, without knowledge of this passage⁽⁶⁴⁾. The Hartgarius who worked as a scribe for Hincmar, however, is obviously

(59) Cf. P. LEHMANN, *Erzbischof Hildebold und die Dombibliothek von Köln*, in *Erforschung des Mittelalters*, II, Stuttgart, 1959, pp. 139-144.

(60) See my article, *Le Formulaire de Laon (Paris, B.N. lat., 11379): Source pour l'histoire de l'école de Laon au commencement du dixième siècle*, to appear in *Scriptorium*.

(61) For this information, I gratefully acknowledge Professor Bischoff's kind permission to consult the brief notices he made on the Laon manuscripts.

(62) However, he presented Charles the Bald with a treatise which he copied himself: «... dedit mihi libellum manu sua scriptum...»: *Concilium Duzlacense I (871)*, in *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, ed. J. D. MANSI, 16, 580.

(63) *Epistola ad Hincmarum Remensis*, in *P.L.*, 124, 1039: «Nam ab eo [i.e. Archbishop Harduicus of Besancon (859-872)] illam accepi, et relegens transcribi jussi, et transcripta est per manus duorum ecclesiae mihi commissae diaconorum, quorum unus est Teutlandus, alter vocatur Hartgarius...».

(64) Ravaissou conjectured in his catalogue of Laon mss., p. 60, that Hartgarius was Archbishop Halitgarius of Cambrai (817-831). Msgr. LESNE, p. 252, did not repeat this gratuitous identification but suggested that Hartgarius belonged to a scriptorium other than Laon's. TRAUBE (M.G.H., *Poetae latini*, III, 751) identified Hartgarius with Bishop Hartgarius of Liège (840-854). I do not think that it is necessary to go that far afield.

the Hartgarius who corrected the Laon manuscript and left the following note on folio 195r:

Quisquis ad aeternae festinas gaudia vitae
 Hos flores typicos devota mente require
 Noxia quo valeas contempti linquere saeculi
 Et tandem capias celestis premia regni
 Hartgarii memor esto precor qui noxia cuncta
 Que potuit rasit nec non condigna remisit.

This identification accords well with Bernhard Bischoff's remarks concerning the manuscript. He dates it to the second half of the ninth century. Furthermore, while it is not a Reims manuscript it bears paleographical characteristics of the scriptoria of Reims — exactly what would be expected in light of the proximity and ties between Laon and Reims. I conclude that Hartgarius of Laon corrected this manuscript and that the manuscript itself was produced at Laon during the 870's or 880's.

Another manuscript which I would not hesitate to ascribe to Laon's copyists is the famous Greek-Latin glossary, manuscript 444. This manuscript has an Irish background and was probably copied during the 860's (65). It is divided into two distinct parts. Folios 5 to 275 contain the glossary itself. The remainder of the manuscript, from folio 276 to folio 318, contains a Greek and Latin grammar. Two subscriptions in the latter part attribute the grammatical glosses to the hand of Martin Scotus (66). The subscriptions themselves seem to be a servile imitation of Martin's hand and may belong to a student. But there is no doubt that most of the grammatical portion of the manuscript, as the subscriptions suggest, was personally copied by Martin whose hand is easily recognized in notes and passages copied in numerous other manuscripts. The importance of the presence of Martin's hand in manuscript 444 is that it gives a key to the production of the entire manuscript. As it exists now, the manuscript has the appearance of being completed in two stages. The glossary section ends on folio 275v with a dedicatory poem to Hincmar which indicates that this leaf was the last in a codex which originally only contained the glossary (67). Martin later joined folios 276 to 318 to the glos-

(65) See above, n. 49.

(66) Folios 296v and 297v. For the subscriptions, cf. MGH, *Poetae*, III, 696-697, 821, for Traube's transcription and a plate exhibiting Martin's script.

(67) Cf. *ibid.*, 686.

sary section. Although Greek-Latin glossaries were not as rare as one might expect in the ninth century (68), I think that it is safe to assume that the three hands responsible for the glossary section of the manuscript belong to Laon scribes (69). First, there is the question of the archetype behind manuscript 444. It unquestionably either belonged to or was copied by Irishmen (70). Secondly, the glossary section was produced for a Hincmar. Hincmar of Reims was familiar with Greek-Latin glossaries. However, I think that manuscript 444 was dedicated to his nephew, Hincmar of Laon. The younger Hincmar, according to his uncle, knew both Greek and Irish and loved to garnish his literary productions with Greek words indiscriminately and improperly used (71). This sounds like a trait of someone whose knowledge of a language is superficial and dependent primarily on a dictionary. Thirdly, there is the fact that manuscript 444 is at Laon. It belonged to Martin and then passed to Bernard and Adelelm. All of Hincmar of Reims' manuscripts stayed at Reims until the modern era (72).

I reconstruct the production of manuscript 444 as follows. Martin Scotus had the glossary section copied by local scribes for Hincmar of Laon, his pupil and patron. When Hincmar was disgraced, imprisoned, and eventually blinded, Martin reclaimed the manuscript. He then added, in his own hand, the grammatical portions of the present manuscript to the glossary portion.

Martin was also intimately involved with the production of a second manuscript as important as the Greek-Latin glossary and grammar to the school at Laon. Manuscript 468 has already been mentioned as a *Handbuch* for the study of Virgil. The sixty-one folios of this manuscript have been copied by one hand. It is a clear, continental hand which, however, exhibits a tendency to

(68) Hincmar of Reims was well acquainted with them: « Nos etiam moderni glossarios Graecos, quos suatim Lexicos vocari audivimus... » *Opusculum LV Capitularum*, 449.

(69) Professor Bischoff (cf. n. 61 above) has noted simply that the hands responsible for the glossary exhibit Reims traits.

(70) Cf. VENDRYES' article cited above, n. 49. This does not mean that the exemplar of the manuscript necessarily « derived from Ireland » as J. F. KENNEY, *The Sources for the Early History of Ireland (Ecclesiastical): An Introduction and a Guide*, New York, 1966, p. 590, thought. In fact, the exemplar of ms. 444 was definitely based on a continental manuscript, London, *British Museum, Harley*, 5792 (cf. CLA, 2, 25 no. 203).

(71) « ... cum suppetere sufficenter verba Latina, quae in his locis ponere poteris, ubi Graeca, et obstrusa, et interdum Scottica et alia barbara, ut tibi visum fuit nothata atque corrupta posuisti!... » *Opusculum LV Capitularum*, 448.

(72) One of Hincmar's twenty-one mss. is at Cambridge. Another is at Paris. The remainder are still conserved at Reims, cf. CAREY, 49-56.

slant to the right and some Irish traits (73). Throughout the manuscript, another hand has assisted that of the principal copyist. This second hand is Martin Scotus'. It is important to note that Martin did not *correct* the manuscript. The main copyist left blank spaces in the text which Martin filled with the proper word or phrase. This method of work indicates that there was close cooperation between the scribe and Martin Scotus. The scribe copied from a text which presented some difficulty to him. To judge from the characteristic nature of Martin's additions to the text, the copyist worked with an Irish exemplar and had difficulty with Irish abbreviations and symbols (74). Martin, working with the copyist, filled in the words and phrases which were unclear to the scribe.

Hartgarius and the scribes who worked on manuscripts 444 and 468 for Martin Scotus were, of course, kept busy with other manuscripts. A detailed analysis of manuscripts II, 444, and 468 might provide sufficient paleographic clues to isolate other products of Laon's scriptorium among the Laon manuscripts generally ascribed to northeastern France.

Laon's scriptorium is but one aspect of the school which needs further study. The Laon masters' texts and notes must be published for the true significance of the school to be appreciated (75). Martin Scotus' career and work especially need to be illuminated: he, more than John Scotus, was at the center of the school at Laon (76).

(73) There is a tendency to 'let off' end strokes with a flourish in the cross-bar of the *t*, the abbreviation bar, the tongue of the *e*, and in the *-ur* abbreviation. Professor Bischoff has observed that these traits extend to the 'whole Laon circle', cf. I. P. SHELDON-WILLIAMS, *Iohannis Scotti Eriugena Perisphyson (De Divisione Naturae), Liber Primus* Dublin, 1968, p. 12.

(74) See my study of this ms. cited above, n. 5.

(75) A more complete edition of John Scotus' commentary on Martianus Capella is an especial desideratum. Abbé Merlette intends to publish the notes in ms. 468, a *Handbuch* for the study of Virgil and one of Laon's most important teaching manuals. Manuscript 444, the famous Greek-Latin glossary, deserves a fuller and more modern critical edition than Miller was able to furnish in *Notices et Extraits* in 1880. I hope to be able to study John Scotus' and Haimo of Auxerre's Biblical glosses.

(76) The commentary attributed to Martin by J. G. PRÉAUX, *Le commentaire de Martin de Laon sur l'oeuvre de Martianus Capella*, in *Latomus*, 12, 1953, 437-459, needs further work. Also, while Martin might be responsible for the Greek notes attributed to him by M. L. W. LAISTNER (*Notes on Greek from the Lectures of a Ninth Century Monastery Teacher*, in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 7, 1923, 421-456), I am not convinced by Laistner's evidence, i. e., that *Vat. Reg. lat.* 215 is from Laon. Cf. further, LAISTNER, *Candalabrum Theodosianum*, in *The Classical Quarterly*, 16 (1922), 107, and H. J. THOMPSON, *Anaphus*, in *The Classical Review*, 34 (1920), 32-33.

What we have been able to discover about the formation of Laon's library, however, proves that Laon's masters and bishops fully participated in the spirit of the Carolingian renaissance. Their efforts to create the elements of a teaching library bear witness to their belief in the propaedeutic value of the word. Martin Scotus expressed this sentiment in the closing lines of his *De octo vitis*:

Deicit ast alios kenodoxia corde superbo;
Hos restaurat ovans divini lectio verbi (77).

JOHN J. CONTRENI

(77) Manuscript 444, f. 2r. Ed. L. TRAUBE, in *MGH, P.L.*, 3, 692-693. While not signed by Martin, this poem was copied by him into the Greek-Latin glossary.