NOTE

Three Carolingian Texts Attributed to Laon: Reconsiderations

In the course of research on the ninth-century cathedral school at Laon, I was led inevitably to examine the authenticity of three texts which had been attributed to the school. Two of the texts, a collection of Greek notes known as the *Scholia Graecarum glossarum* and a commentary on the *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*, had been attributed to the most important Laon master, Martin Hibernensis (819-875), sometimes also known as Martin of Laon, Martin the Irishman, or Martin Scottus. The third text is an interesting letter from a student, known only by his initial, A, to his master, similarly identified only by his initial, E. The *Scholia* and the letter, I soon decided, could not be assigned to Laon. I later came to the conclusion that the arguments for attributing the Martianus Capella commentary to Martin Hibernensis do not deserve the confidence that has been accorded to them (1).

Negative criticism of one’s predecessors is never very pleasant to write—especially when a new attribution cannot be offered to replace an older one that has been cast into doubt. But such criticism does serve a useful scholarly purpose. It awakens new

---

1. The commentary and the *Scholia Graecarum glossarum* as authentic works of Martin in my 1971 dissertation for Michigan State University, a revised version of which is to be published soon by the Arthur Guenther under the title *The School of Laon from 850 to 939: Its Manuscripts and Masters*. The letter from A to E was examined in Appendix D of the dissertation. My new stand on the commentary and the *Scholia* have been outlined briefly in the *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum* 111, ed. F. Eusebio Canz, Washington, D.C., 1976, pp. 451-52, and in a paper presented at the first Saint Louis Conference on Manuscript Studies (see *Monumenta* 51, 1975, p. 76).
interest in texts and stimulates the investigations and reassessments that are such a vital part of scholarship. It is in that spirit that I offer a reconsideration of the texts in question.

THE LETTER FROM A TO E

The letter from A to his master, E, contains numerous details and allusions that should have facilitated the identification of A and E, yet their full names continue to elude scholars (?) The search for their identities is of more than antiquarian interest since the letter contains the key to many of the interrelationships among the schools of the ninth century.

A was acquainted with the work of John Scottus; he knew Manno of Laon personally and mentioned a meeting with him at the palace at Compiègne; he wrote that he confided some of his works to a « dearly beloved » Tentbertus; other works he sent to a Bishop L whom I am inclined to believe must be Linddo of Autun (866-874); he also knew Bishop Isaac of Langres (856-880); he asked the recipient of his letter to remember two youths from Saint Amand; he resented the fact that a recent bishop had been installed in his see by the king rather than by the people; another friend was a « venerable » dean, Fulcoldo; he also referred to a Burgardus, provost of the monastery of Saint Mary; A asked E to undertake the education of two religious of this monastery: the daughter of Count Baldwin of Flanders and Judith (daughter of the Charles the Bald) and the other, a relative of his (« mea consobrina ») (?). Interspersed among these names are requests for information on various scholarly topics in which A exhibited his acquaintance with the works of Martianus Capella, Fulgentius, Virgil, Aulus Gellius, Terence, Jerome, Philo Judaeus, and Donatus. A second, less detailed letter from an H to the « famous and celebrated » master A follows the letter from A to E (?). Presumably,

the recipient of the second letter is the A who wrote the first letter.

The letter from A to E has been studied several times. Ernst Dümmler discussed it at some length and assigned it to the early 870s (?). Any daughter of Baldwin and Judith, who were married in 862, must have been at least ten years old when her education with a famous master was contemplated. Dümmler assumed that Charles the Bald was the king who interfered with an episcopal election and thus set the termen ante quem for the letter at 877, the date of Charles’s death. The letter, however, does not refer to the king by name. In any case, it must have been written before 880, the year Isaac of Langres died.

Max Manlius repeated the details furnished by Dümmler (?). M.L.W. Laistner was the first to detect the author’s knowledge of Fulgentius in the letter (?). He made no attempt to identify the author of the letter. André Van de Vyver provided the most important discussion of the letter in a two-page footnote in an article on Hubald of Saint Amand (?). He dated the letter to 870, the year that Charles the Bald installed the archbishop of Cologne contrary to the wishes of the clergy and people of that city. He also argued that the letter was not written at Laon, but sent there. Master E was asked to supervise the education of the two religious who belonged, in Van de Vyver’s view, to Saint Mary’s at Laon (Notre-Dame-la-Profonde). Finally, Van de Vyver identified E as Heirc of Auxerre who, according to Van de Vyver’s interpretation of Laon, Bibl. mun., 197, was teaching at Laon around 870 (?). The second letter, from H to A, was written by Heirc who used H instead of E to signify his name. According to Van de Vyver, it was Heirc, E in one letter, H in the other, who collected and preserved the letters rather than A, the author of the first and recipient of the second.

(2) The letter, too long to be reproduced here, was published by Ernst Dümmler, in MGH, Ep., VI, pp. 182-96.

(3) For Manno, Linddo, and Isaac, see my forthcoming monograph cited in n. 1 above. I have not been able to discover anything about Tentbertus or Burgardus. For the many-nineteenth-century Fulcoldo, see Gerhard Schmieder, Erbliebiges Fulco von Reims (885-909) und das Frankreich, Munich, 1973, pp. 2-6. A Fulcoldo, « ex consobrina sancti Juliani clericus », is mentioned in Heirc of Auxerre’s Missale sancti Germani, PL 124, col. 1265d.

(4) MGH, Ep., VI, pp. 186-87.


(6) Geschicht des lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters, 1, Munich, 1971, pp. 325, 498, n. 5.


(9) For this manuscript and Heirc’s connection with H, see Günter Billamovich, Dall’antica Bavenna alle biblioteche umanistiche, in Università cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Annuario, 1955-56, pp. 89-96.
Riccardo Quadri, in his exhaustive study of Heiric's life, was not convinced by Van de Vyver. He rightly dismissed Van de Vyver’s dependence on Laon, Bibl. mun., 107 and warned that it would be hazardous to attribute the letters to Heiric on the basis of similar initials alone (10). Recently, Bernard Merlette once again provisionally identified E with Heiric (11).

An examination of the manuscript which contains the letters is most rewarding and may shed new light on the identity of the individuals mentioned in them. Leiden, Voss. lat. oct. 88 is a scholastic miscellany written probably early in the tenth century. It is a composite manuscript, both parts of which were owned by Pierre Daniel, the lawyer from Orléans (12). Folios 69r-111v belong to a manuscript of the fourteenth century and can be ignored here.

The letter from A to E was impeccably transcribed by Dümmler except in one place where he made a crucial error. On folio 24r, in reference to the two nuns, Dümmler reads "Quod superest: in monte sanctae Mariae sunt duae sanctionumiae." His footnote explained: "I.e. Landunensi, qui mons Landuni vocatur, cf. Flodoard Ann. a. 551." Everyone who has discussed the letter has followed Dümmler and assumed that it concerned Laon. The manuscript, however, reads [folio 24r, l. 15] "in mons sanctae Mariæ." The abbreviated word is "monasterio," not "monie." Monst occurs seven lines later in the manuscript and is correctly transcribed as "monasterii" by the editor.

This emendation throws new light on the problem. The daughter of Baldwin and the "cousin-brother" of A could have belonged to any number of monasteries dedicated to Mary. It is not at all certain that they were members of the community at Laon.

The script and some of the contents of the Leiden manuscript indicate that it originated in the region embracing Tours, Orléans, Fleury, and Auxerre (13). The fact that Pierre Daniel


(12) Folio 2r: Ex libri Petri Danielli Aurellii, 1560; fol. 11v: Ex libri Petri Danielli, Aurellii, 1564.


(14) Marginal versi in hands of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries between fol. 47v-50r refer to Chartres, Orléans, Paris, and Bern (See Dümmler, Briefe und Verze, p. 340).

THREE CAROLINGIAN TEXTS ATTRIBUTED TO LAON

owned it in the sixteenth century also points specifically to Fleury or Auxerre. The first gathering of the manuscript is missing. An unidentified commentary occupies folios 21r-10v (14). Folios 11r-18r contain more than 275 Greek and Latin etymologies from classical authors. At least thirty-seven of these entries came from the same source as the Scholia Graecarum glossarum edited by M. L. Baillier (15).

Folios 18r-25v contain a poem attributed to Gottschalk of Orbais and the two letters published by Dümmler (16). Folios 26r-39v contain a De directa attributed to the manuscript to Augustine (17). Folios 40r-41v bear an unidentified glossary of twenty-six Greek rhetorical and grammatical terms. The same glossary is also found in two tenth-century manuscripts now at Bern: Burgerbibliothek 172 and 184 (18). The former belonged to Pierre Daniel and came from Fleury. The script of the glosses in this manuscript is quite close to, but not identical to, that of the Leiden codex. Bern, Burgerbibliothek 184 belonged to Jacob Bengal who inherited some of Daniel's manuscripts (19). Thus, the glossary in the Leiden manuscript would seem to have originated in the Fleury-Auxerre region.

Folios 42r-42v contain an excerpt from an unidentified commentary (20). Folios 43v-48r bear glosses on Greek grammar (21).

(15) Fols 4v is signed with a "n". Fols 14v is signed "n". The remaining gatherings are unsigned. A gathering is missing between fol. 79r-80v, see below n. 24.

(16) The name of the author seems to be in the Categories. The text on p. 17, n. 1, is "Huoc autem profecto scis conferri hominum scripturam et institutum." Both is cited on this leaf. The commentary ends with "Scil circit religiae veteris." (17) See Nota in Greek from the Lectures of a Ninth Century Monastic Teacher, in Bulletin of the Johns Hopkins University Library, VII (1923), pp. 241-50. Laibacher thought that there were only two on or 30 "Scholia" entries in the Leiden manuscript (ibid., p. 242). However, he was following George Goetz's edition of three notes; see Corpus graecarum etiusam. 7 vols., Leipzig, 1884-1923, V, p. 631-40.

(18) For the poem, see MOH, Ep., vi. p. 195, 1, 15.

(19) See Augustine, De Doctrina Fide, II. DierFL, RODKOV, De Gallia et Romania from the Text of Jan Provonicus, Synthes Historical Library, vol. 16, Dordrecht and Boston, 1755, pp. 9, 77.


The glossary was published from the two Bern manuscripts by Hagen, Sktihed Beskrivning af Virkelig Danske Sprogskrift, in Studier til det almindelige Philologi, Supplementum, 4 (1867) pp. 593-87.

(21) E. V. Raby, Studies in the Script of Tours, l. 2: A Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours, l. Text, Cambridge, 1929, p. 205, examined and rejected this manuscript as a Tours product. It does exhibit some characteristics of the Tours style.

(22) The commentary begins: "Indici et aliqua indicii ambiguum quicquid enquirentur, quod, sed, quid, quales, quossumus.

(23) Folio 4v is blank. The glosses begin: "DE NOMINE." Oxalis nomina græca in capite seu (27) Hesperia herba in aedes hanc cum et aspiratone aliquo aequaliter opus laticnis ut phaeus, ephebus, ephelus."
The remainder of the manuscript contains Prosper’s *Epigrammata ex sententiis sancti Augustini* (folios 48r-79v) and centos from the *Aenéid* (folios 80r-94v) (24).

The identification of the anonymous commentaries and glosses should help to localize further the author (or authors) of the letters included among them. As far as I can see, all this material was compiled at Fleury or somewhere nearby and not at Laon.

**The *Scholica Graecarum glossarum***

M.L.W. Laistner in 1923 published the *Scholica*, 349 Latin definitions of Latinized Greek words arranged in alphabetical order, under the name of Martin Hiberniensis, an attribution that has been followed since (25). Laistner’s edition of the *Scholica* was based on two manuscripts, Vatican, Reg. lat. 215, copied in 876 or 877, and London, British Library, Royal 15 A XVI, a codex of the tenth century. Three additional manuscripts of the *Scholica* have come to light since 1923; Ripoll 74, copied between 935 and 977; Paris, B.N., lat. 4883A, an eleventh-century manuscript probably copied from the Vatican codex at Saint Martial in Limoges; and, Oxford, Barlow 35, from the early eleventh century. The new manuscripts all entitle the notes, *Scholica Graecarum glossarum*. There are only inconsequential differences among these five witnesses to the *Scholica*. As already noted Leiden, Voss. lat. oct. 88 contains thirty-seven of the *Scholica* entries but without any title and in unalphabetized order (26).

In addition to the discovery of new manuscripts, it has also been determined that Remigius of Auxerre had access to the *Scholica* and used them in his Martianus Capella commentary. Abbo of Saint Germain-des-Prés in the late ninth century drew upon the *Scholica* for the difficult and rare vocabulary he inserted into his *Bella Parisiaca urbis*, especially in the third book which accompanies it. That the *Scholica* continued to be copied after the time of Remigius and Abbo suggests that they enjoyed a more than modest fortune among medieval teachers and writers.

Laistner attributed the *Scholica* to Martin because he believed that one of the two manuscripts he knew came from Laon (27). The source of his information was a *guess* made by H. J. Thompson; *Analphus* looks like the creation of some grammarising teacher... Who this was may we guess with some probability. I learn from Professor Lindsay that Cod. Vat. Reg. 215 was written in 876 at Laon, where Greek was taught by Martin the Irishman; and though Martin died in 875 it is likely enough that the *scholica graecarum glossarum* represent some of his teaching (28). Nowhere in his article of 1923 or his six subsequent discussions of the *Scholica* did Laistner present further evidence that the text was indeed *lecture notes* copied down and preserved by a pupil of Martin (29).

Vatican, Reg. lat. 215, contains a note of provenance although, unfortunately, it is quite cryptic (30). At the top of folio 1r stands the truncated ex-libris, *Hic liber est scie Mar*. The name of the establishment to which the manuscript belonged is incomplete because the corner of the leaf which bears the ex-libris has been torn away. F. Arcavo, an eighteenth-century Spanish scholar, suggested that the ex-libris should be completed as *S. Marii Forcalqueriensis* (31). Bethmann, in 1874, suggested that the name in question was *S. Marie* (32). In 1895, Bruno Gütebock noticed that a series of Old Testament glosses found elsewhere in the Va-rice and used them in his Martianus Capella commentary. Abbo of Saint Germain-des-Prés in the late ninth century drew upon the *Scholica* for the difficult and rare vocabulary he inserted into his *Bella Parisiaca urbis*, especially in the third book which accompanies it. That the *Scholica* continued to be copied after the time of Remigius and Abbo suggests that they enjoyed a more than modest fortune among medieval teachers and writers.

Laistner attributed the *Scholica* to Martin because he believed that one of the two manuscripts he knew came from Laon (27). The source of his information was a *guess* made by H. J. Thompson; *Analphus* looks like the creation of some grammarising teacher... Who this was may we guess with some probability. I learn from Professor Lindsay that Cod. Vat. Reg. 215 was written in 876 at Laon, where Greek was taught by Martin the Irishman; and though Martin died in 875 it is likely enough that the *scholica graecarum glossarum* represent some of his teaching (28). Nowhere in his article of 1923 or his six subsequent discussions of the *Scholica* did Laistner present further evidence that the text was indeed *lecture notes* copied down and preserved by a pupil of Martin (29).

Vatican, Reg. lat. 215, contains a note of provenance although, unfortunately, it is quite cryptic (30). At the top of folio 1r stands the truncated ex-libris, *Hic liber est scie Mar*. The name of the establishment to which the manuscript belonged is incomplete because the corner of the leaf which bears the ex-libris has been torn away. F. Arcavo, an eighteenth-century Spanish scholar, suggested that the ex-libris should be completed as *S. Marii Forcalqueriensis* (31). Bethmann, in 1874, suggested that the name in question was *S. Marie* (32). In 1895, Bruno Gütebock noticed that a series of Old Testament glosses found elsewhere in the Va-
tican manuscript contained several Old Irish words. In addition, many of these glosses were preceded by the letters IO or IOH and AI or HAI which Gueterbock interpreted as abbreviations for John Scotus and Haimo, one of the masters of Heiric of Auxerre. Armed with this evidence, with Bethmann's reconstruction of the ex-libris, and with the evidence of his friend, Ludwig Traube, Gueterbock concluded that the manuscript most probably came from Laon whose cathedral was dedicated to Mary (33). In 1913, Manitius went one step further and claimed that the manuscript was copied at Laon (34). In the meantime, however, Traube, who had initially followed Bethmann and suggested the Laon attribution to Gueterbock, examined the manuscript in 1902 and attributed it to Tours on paleographic grounds. He suggested that the ex-libris should read "Hic liber est sancti Martini Turonensis" which, in light of the definite feminine ending of sanctae, hardly has merit (35).

In 1913, H. M. Bannister challenged Traube's view and was the first to insist on the distinction between the origin and provenance of the manuscript. The truncated ex-libris, Bannister wisely decided, was much too vague to serve as an indication of provenance. As for its origin, the manuscript reminded him of many copied at Fleury (36). When E. K. Rand later made his study of Tours manuscripts, he wrote that the paleographic argument of his master, Traube, which attributed the manuscript to Tours was insufficient. Nevertheless, he accepted Vatican, Reg. lat., 215 into his catalogue with the simple note, "A book of Tours according to Traube's later view" (37).

This conclusion, built on such slender grounds, has been accepted by the editor of the catalogue of the Regina manuscripts (38). To my knowledge, no one has reconciled the different attributions of Traube, Manitius, and Bannister or definitely settled the question. I do not believe that the origin or the provenance of the manuscript can be traced to Laon. Paleographically, the manuscript does not resemble the handful of late ninth- and early tenth-century manuscripts produced in Laon's modest scriptorium. Furthermore, the ex-libris of the Vatican manuscript does not resemble any of the notices of ownership, from many different periods, that are found in the Laon manuscripts (39).

Two additional considerations reinforce the case for reopening the question of the source of the Scholica Graecarum glossarum. First, there is no evidence of which I know in Martin's manuscripts of the teaching which the Scholica are supposed to represent. Secondly, one of the three manuscripts of the Scholica which has come to light since 1923, the tenth-century Ripoll 74, seems to have been copied from a Visigothic archetype to judge from orthographic variations and problems of word separation (40). The existence of such an archetype places the home of the Scholica far from Laon.

If Martin was not the source of the Scholica, who then was? I doubt that the source will ever be identified. I do believe, however, that the Scholica are earlier than the last quarter of the ninth century. The earliest surviving manuscript of the Greek notes, the Vatican codex, is not the earliest representative of the Scholica. For the gloss on ana bolarium, this codex warns against the erroneous readings of other, presumably earlier, manuscripts (41). Interestingly, when Abbé de Saint German-des-Prés consulted the Scholica, he used a text which carried the faulty spelling of ana bolarium, which would indicate that the textual tradition to which he had access was not that of the Vatican manuscript or of any of the others which have survived. Spelling
errors in both Abbo’s excerpts from the Scholica and in the Ripoll manuscript of the Scholica likewise indicate an earlier date for their compilation. Both Abbo and Ripoll 74 use a for a, a mistake occasioned most probably by the open minuscule a in the early copies of the text (42).

The fact that Ripoll 74 shows signs of an earlier Visigothic archetype warrants considering Spain as the ultimate home of the notes. The fact also that most of the Scholica and, indeed, most of the «Miscellaneous Notes» which Laistner published with them are excerpts from Isidore of Seville strengthens this hypothesis.

How Abbo came to know the Scholica cannot be told with any precision although the relationships between his monastery and Ripoll offer an obvious possibility (43). Remigius of Auxerre’s use of the Scholica is, however, susceptible of closer analysis – the school of Auxerre seems to have been a major center for the diffusion of the Scholica.

Vatican, Reg. lat. 215, as already noted, was copied in 876 or 877. Although its origin and provenance are unknown, its contents bear witness to the influence of John Scottus, Haimo of Auxerre, and Gottschalk of Orbais. Of the last, there is a fragment from his grammatical anthology (44). A series of biblical glosses collected from the teaching of John Scottus and Haimo of Auxerre are also found in the codex (45). In addition, among the «Miscellaneous Notes» which Laistner published with the Scholica, there is an explication of a Greek line from a poem of John Scottus. The poem was composed in 862 (46). Whoever compiled the Scholica and the other glosses between this date and 876/877 most likely was connected with the masters whose works are included in the manuscript.

Remigius of Auxerre was familiar with the Scholica, the biblical glosses, and glosses on the prologues of Jerome which the manuscript also contains. The obvious intermediary between Remigius and John Scottus and Haimo of Auxerre is Remigius’s own master, Héric of Auxerre. One of Héric’s talents was the compilation of pedagogical texts reminiscent of the Scholica Graecarum glossarum. His Collectanea and Scholica questionum, based on the teaching of Lupus of Ferrières and Haimo of Auxerre, is one of these texts. In this connection, it should be remembered that thirty-seven of the Scholica entries appear in Leiden, Voss. lat. oct. 88. In this manuscript, which seems to come from the region of Fleuray and Auxerre, the Scholica entries appear in unalphabetized order reflecting perhaps their application to a text (47).

With the Laon origin and provenance of the Vatican manuscript, Laistner’s sole reason for attributing the Scholica to Martin, now extremely doubtful, the Laon master’s claim to the notes must now be judged as unfounded. I once thought that Laistner came indirectly to the same conclusion. After he first published the Scholica he later discovered that many of the notes came from a commentary on Martianus Capella. His comparison of the Scholica led him to believe that the ninth century produced a fourth commentary on the De nuptiis in addition to those of John Scottus, Duncacht of Reims, and Remigius of Auxerre. This fourth commentary, Laistner suggested, might have been that of Martin. In 1953, Jean G. Préaux did, in fact, attribute a Martianus Capella commentary to Martin, the very same commentary that had earlier been attributed to Duncacht (48). However, of this putative Duncacht commentary, Laistner wrote, «clearly the source of the Scholica graecarum is not the commentary of Duncad» (49). The comparison which I have made between the Scholica items and the commentaries of «Martin-Duncacht», of John Scottus, and of Remigius of Auxerre, support this conclusion. Martin-Duncacht and John seem to be ignorant of the Scholica, whereas, as Laistner saw, Remigius of Auxerre consulted them frequently in his own commentary. The finding that the commentary attributed to Martin and the Scholica do not coincide would be an absolute proof that Martin’s lectures did not generate the Scholica. Préd-

---

(42) See Helix Parisianae urbis, III, 88 (MGH, P.L., IV-I, p. 120); and, Laistner, Abbo of St-Germain-des-Prés, pp. 28-30.
(44) See Wilmart, Codex, p. 510.
(47) See above, n. 17.
(49) Martianus Capella and his Ninth Century Commentators, p. 137.
aux's arguments, however, for attributing the Martianus Capella commentary to Martin are also suspect and thus the commentary cannot be used as additional evidence that Martin had nothing to do with the Scholia.

THE DUNCAHT-MARTIN Commentary ON MARTIANUS CAPELLA

The Martianus Capella commentary formerly attributed to Duncanh of Reims and later attributed to Martin Hibernensis reflects perfectly the christianization of the arts that took place during the Carolingian renaissance (50). Influenced by the Neoplatonic theory of recollection, the commentator argued that the arts are innate in man and that, therefore, the process of education is a process of recollection. In a more profound sense, in recollecting the student not only acquired intellectual skills but he also progress ed toward man's privileged status before the Fall, for the arts have not been invented by man but are a constituent part of his nature. The commentator implied that the cultivation of the arts is not merely a propaedeutic but rather a progress towards man's lost state of perfection (51).

Who this commentator is I cannot say, but after first accepting the identification of Martin Hibernensis as the author of the Duncanh commentary, I have reluctantly come to believe that the author of this commentary on the De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii has yet to be identified.

Martin certainly would seem to have some connection with the commentary. It is possible that he is its author. It is also equally possible that he knew and cited the work of someone else, or that both the author (hereafter, Anonymous) and Martin drew upon common sources.

In his article of 1953, Préaux first brought forth a series of logical and historical deductions which pointed to Martin as a likely candidate for the authorship of the commentary. These deductions, by Préaux's own admission, are extremely weak and

I will not discuss them here (52). Instead, I want to focus attention on a stronger argument for Martin's relationship with the Anonymous commentary—a comparison between certain notes in the Anonymous commentary and a note in Laon, Bibl. mun. 444, ff. 299r-v, Martin's Greek-Latin glossary and grammar. Arguments based on resemblances between the commentary and the Scholia Graecorum glossarum, obviously, cannot be used to strengthen Martin's candidacy for the commentary.

Martin's note in the Laon manuscript needs to be reproduced: (53)

VERSUS DE VIII MUSIS

Clio gesta canens transactis

tempora relicit.

5 Dulciqusa calamos Euterpe

flatibus urges.

Comica lascivo gaudet sermone

Thalia.

Melpomene tragoediam

mesta bota.

10 Therapaicore affectus cythis

movet, imperat, auget.

Plectra gerens Erato saltat pede

carnime, vultum.

Signat cancta manu loquiturque

Polinia gestu,

Uraniaque poli scrutatur undique musas.

Carmina Calipe libris eroica

mandat.

20 Mentis Apollinace vis habet movet

undique Musas.

In medio resedens complectitur

omnia Phoebos.

Clio interpretatur bona fama, id est cogitatio quaerendae scientiae.

(50) See Cora E. Luce (ed.), Duncaht, Glossae in Martianum and Praeaux, Le commen
ta
taire de Martin de Lano.

(51) See the comment on 1V, 347 of the De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii (ed. A. Diew;

rev. J. O. Preaux, Stuttgart, 1960), p. 160, as reported in Duncaht Glossae in Martianum,
ed. Luce, p. 22-23; and, Paris, B. N., lat. 8769, f. 38r.

(52) See Le commentaire de Martin de Lano, pp. 141-43.

(53) Laon, Bibl. mun. 444, f. 299r-v. See also R. Müller, Glossaire grec-latin, de la Bib-
25 Ergo propter bonam famam quaeritur scientia.

Enterpium interpretatur bene delectans. Prius enim est scientiam quaere et postea delectari in ipsa.

Melpomene interpretatur meditacionem faciens permanere. Primum est enim velle, secundum desiderare quod velit, tertium instare 30 meditando ad id quod delectaris.

Thalia interpretatur capacitatis et dicitur quasi Thibonlia, id est ponens germinia. Ergo post meditandi instationem percipitur fructus, id est germin.

Polimnia dicitur quasi polimmenen, id est multam memoriam faciens 35 qua post capacitatem est memoria necessaria.

Erato interpretatur invenisim similium qua post scientiam et memoriam instum est ut aliquid simile et de suo inventat.

Terpsicore interpretatur delectans instructionem. Ergo post inventionem oportet te iam discernere ac indicare quod inventur.

40 Urania interpretatur caelestis. Post enim diuidacionem eligis quid dicias, quid dispues, eligere utile caducumque dispueserit, caeleste ingenium est [f. 299v].

Caliope interpretatur sonoritas vel bona vox, vel vox deae clamantis. Ergo post electionem dicendi, oportet ut bene et pulchre profaratur 45 illud quod eligitur.

Est enim ordo; primum est velle doctrinam; secundum delectari quod velit; tertium instare ad id quod delectatus es; quartum capere ad quod insites, quinto memorari quod capas; sextum invenire tu simile ad quod memineris; septimum indicare quod inventes; octavum 50 est eligere de quo indicas; nonum bene proferre quod elegeris.

Mus dictur quasi moysa, id est aquatica. Nulla enim sonora vox potest esse sine aquis. A quo etiam nomine Moses dicitur, id est aquaticus, eo quod in aquis sit inventus. Vel secundum ethimologia grecam Musa dicta est APOTOYMOYCOIN, id est a quareendo, quia, ut antiqui 55 voluerunt, vis carminum et modulatio vocum per eam inquirebatur.

Nunc antem non solum dicitur illud instrumentum musa, sed omnis sonora vox musa dicitur. Martians: Musae namque dictae sunt ut feracent, filiae Iononis et Iovis, quia omnis vox ex aere et aereth efectur et formatur secundum philosophicam rationem. Deus enim aetheris 60 Iovis et dea aeris Ioana dicitur. Quorum nominam hae sunt: Urania qua interpretatur caelestis, ipsa est firmamentum; Polimnia multa memoria, id est Saturnus; Enterpium bene delectans, id est Iovis; Erato inveniens similium, id est Mars. Melpomene meditacionem faciens permanere, id est Virgus. Caliope interpretatur sonoritas, id est Mercurius; Clio interpretatur fama, id est Luna; Thalia interpretatur capacitatis, ipsa est Terra.

Before this note can be analyzed, it must be pointed out that Martin was responsible for copying it. Most of the material in the grammatical portion of the manuscript (ff. 276-319), in fact, was copied by his hand. Here, Martin gathered together a whole series of didactic texts which he carefully listed in the table of contents of his manuscript (f. 2v), e.g.: "D Item greca Prisciani de octo partibus et constructione. Item greca de membris hominum. Item de inventione litterarum... Item greca diversa collecta. Item interpretationes novem musarum. Item alia greca. Item greca ad versus. Item greca de versibus Johannis Scotti. Item versus grecisci. Item grecisca nomina. Item versus de viii musis. Item declinationes grecorum. Item glossarium grecum. Item de nomine Ihesu."  

Martin, thus, certainly was acquainted with the note on the Muses. The important question, however, is whether he simply collected the glosses from other sources or whether the note derived from his own work. Many of the pieces in the grammatical portion of his manuscript were collected from other sources. In only one instance is any of this material credited directly to Martin (54). All the rest, I would suggest, was collected from his reading.

As a teacher, Martin impresses me more as a compiler than as an original thinker. His introductory handbook to Latin literature, Laon, Bibl. mun. 468, amply proves this (56). This manuscript introduced the student to the reading of Virgil and Sapidus. It is filled with lists and definitions designed to help the student in his reading. All this material can be traced back to Isidore of Seville and to Fulgentius who are cited verbatim. The note on the Muses reproduced above seems also to represent such a pastiche—a pastiche which included a fragment from a Martianus Capella commentary (II. 57-66).

The note on the Muses can be divided into three parts. Part I consists of Ausonio's Idyll XX copied in the left column of folio 299r with Martin's parallel notes in the right column (II. 1-23). Part II (II. 24-50) presents another interpretation of the Muses in which they are arranged in a definite order symbolizing the
progress toward wisdom. Part III (ll. 51-66) completes the note with a series of explanations of the word musa.

Part I is influenced by Ausonius's poem. Part II derives almost directly from Fulgentius the Mythographer whom Martin cited earlier in Laon, Bibl. mun. 444 under the rubric, Interpretationes VIII Musarum et quorundam grecorum nominum (f. 293v) (56). Many of the definitions in Part II, as Préaux discovered, are also found in the Anonymous Martianus Capella commentary (57). The notes in both Laon, Bibl. mun. 444 and 468 prove that Martin knew his Fulgentius well, but he was certainly not the only ninth-century master to draw upon that author.

That the use of Fulgentius by Martin and Anonymous might only be coincidental is suggested by Anonymous's gloss on Apolline (58). Here, Anonymous arranged the Musae in a progression that only superficially resembles Martin's arrangement in ll. 24-50 of his note. The only point of contact between Martin's arrangement and that of Anonymous consist in what both owe to Fulgentius. It is difficult to understand how the same master would arrive at two different schemes in the ascent to learning in which the positions assigned to the Musae are so different (59).

The strongest argument for Martin's knowledge of Anonymous's commentary occurs in Part III (ll. 51-66) of his note. Here he seems to cite Martianus Capella but in fact, as Préaux showed, the phrase Μυσα πανακά... secundum philosophicum rationem... is almost exactly reproduced in the commentary of Anonymous (60). Is this congruence enough to identify Martin with Anonymous? I would hesitate to go that far. In the context of Part III, the definition of the Musae derived from Martianus is but one of three definitions offered in that part of the note. (A Musa dictur quasi...)

[Footnotes]


(57) Le commentaire de Martin de Laon, pp. 402-403: "paralipetem dans son esprit..."

(58) Ibid. This gloss does not appear in the edition of Lotz.

(59) Anonymous

Inixa vero leges allegoricae Apollinis Musarum usus est ordine: Urasia iugum primo

Clio... Euterpe... Megaira... Thalassa

Polimnia... Erato... Terpsichore... Urania... Calypso... Est enim ordem... bine positum Euterpe... unde Erato... idem

subsequitur Megaira, iuxta Terpsichore... Calypso... unde Clio... sub qua Talia quis

si in ultimo hoc positum... For the text in Anonymous, see ibid., pp. 492-53.

(60) Ibid., pp. 447-48. It should be noted that the order of the names of the Musae in this section of Martin's note (ll. 60-66) follows the order of Anonymous.

Vel secundum ethimologiam... Martianus...). Martin patched together an explanation from three different sources, one of which was a Martianus Capella commentary. He may not even have thought that he was quoting a commentary since he seems to have ascribed Anonymous's comment to Martianus himself (A Martianus...).

Two supplementary considerations should be noted. Not one of the manuscripts of the Anonymous commentary, as reported in Claudio Leonardi's census of De nuptiis manuscripts, has been traced either by origin or provenance to Laon (61). While this is an argument ex silentio against attributing a commentary to Martin, I think that it is worth remembering, especially in light of the fact that Laon's modest scriptorium specialized in didactic texts such as Laon, Bibl. mun. 444 and 468.

Secondly, we must admit that we do not know all the ninth-century masters who commented on the De nuptiis. John Scottus and Remigius of Auxerre certainly did. An additional commentary that Remigius drew upon survives as the Anonymous commentary. Remigius points to Heiric of Auxerre but Heiric, born in 840, may have been too young to have produced a commentary that Martin would have known before 875. Perhaps, however, Heiric taught from a commentary composed by Lupus of Ferrières, Haimo of Auxerre, or even Muridius whose career at Auxerre is just coming to light (62). A certain Winibertus, collaborator of John Scottus on the establishment of a faithful text of the De nuptiis, should also be remembered as should the author of a poem which shows a deep acquaintance with Martianus Capella (63). The candidacy of Duncan of Reims also should not be ignored (64).

Three Carolingian Texts attributed to Laon

[End of Footnotes]

John J. Contreni