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Among the manuscripts listed by E.A. Lowe in his great Codices Latini Antiquiores (CLA) as belonging to the monastery of Echternach was a fragmentary volume, of which two folios survive in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS. lat. 10399, (Suppl. lat. 1894) fols 35+36. This manuscript is a miscellany of various bits and pieces recovered from the bindings of other codices, brought together to form what a note on the flyleaf describes as Fragmenta variorum codicum ad theologiam et ad jus spectantium. The two leaves that concern us are badly worn in places and have lost parts of their texts as a result of the activities of the binder's knife. Enough survives, however, to enable a partial reconstruction of their former contents, together with a discussion of their possible provenance. Because the fragments contain a number of Old Irish glosses not previously noticed they have an importance belied by their present sorry state.

The principal reason for Lowe's ascription of our fragments to Echternach is the fact that they were recovered from the binding of a later codex from that monastery. He described the script (CLA V 585) as being a „mixed Anglo-Saxon majuscule and minuscule, saec. VIII . . . written presumably in England, or possibly at Echternach, where the fragments were later used for binding purposes“. Here, however, the Bibliotheksheimat may have influenced Lowe’s judgement of the Schriftheimat, for Professor Bernhard Bischoff has written more recently that „Die Bestimmung von CLA V 585 als „angelsächsisch” war unvorsichtig wegen des eigenartigen Schriftcharakters. . . Es läßt sich nichts gegen irische Entstehung vorbringen, im Gegenteil (z. B. spelling).“ Lowe in his plate reproduced a part of the Paris fragments containing an Old Irish gloss – but without any comment. This single Old Irish gloss, however, was enough to awaken the suspicion that perhaps the manuscript was written by an Irishman rather than by an Englishman. Further firsthand examination of the two Paris leaves has revealed the presence of five (possibly six) other Old Irish glosses (one of them a double-gloss). This being the case, it is time to look again at the manuscript and its contents in order to see how this new evidence can be brought to bear on the problem of establishing its provenance and authorship. Our findings will have obvious implications for the continuing debate about the earliest Echternach scriptorium and its personnel.

Lowe stated that the Paris fragments contain the text of Pseudo-Anatolius De Pascha. This was a work well-known to the Irish, and is cited as an authority by Columbanus in his letters to Rome AD

---

1 CLA V 585. Lowe was, I think, mistaken in his belief that the single folio of Easter tables bound up with Paris, Bibl. Nat., MS. lat. 9527, as f 201, was part of the same manuscript. The dimensions of that single folio must have been quite different from those of the other two folios, and besides, the script is, in my view, by a different hand. See figs. 13-16.

2 They are not mentioned by Lowe, who in fact passed over one of them without comment, although he reproduced it in his CLA plate.

3 In a letter to the writer dated 22 January 1982.


5 For the text, see Bruno KRUSCH (ed), Studien zur christlich-mittelalterlichen Chronologie [1]. Der 84jährige Ostercyclus und seine Quellen (Leipzig 1880) 311-327. For commentary, see C. W. JONES (ed), Bedae opera de temporibus. Medieval Academy of American Publications 41 (Cambridge, Mass. 1943) 82-87, and Maura WALSH & Dáibhí Ó CRÓINÍN (eds &
600 and to the Gallican bishops AD 603. Pseudo-Anatolius is also cited by the southern Irish cleric Cummian in his letter on the Easter controversy addressed to abbot Ségéne of Iona, c. AD 632. In addition, the work is quoted (often at length) in every early Irish computistical collection known to me. The great Bruno Krusch demonstrated over a century ago that the work is probably an Irish forgery of the sixth century, whose manuscript transmission is almost exclusively Irish or derived from Irish exemplars. Hence the nature of the text itself provides additional grounds for suspecting an Irish involvement in the production of the Paris manuscript.

In fact, however, the Paris leaves, fragmentary though they are, contain not just one text (as Lowe’s description would suggest) but six, all of which I have been able to identify. Three of them are works usually regarded as Irish computistical forgeries (Pseudo-Athanasius, Pseudo-Anatolius, and Pseudo-Theophilus), while the three others are excerpts from Augustine, De Genesi ad litteram II 14, Gaudentius, De paschae observatione, and an excerpt from the Book of Numbers, also concerned with Easter. Hence the contents of the original manuscript, insofar as they can be reconstructed, seem to have dealt exclusively with the Paschal question.

The presence in the Paris fragments of a solitary Old Irish gloss – as was thought up to now – need have implied no more than that some Irishman at Echternach had glossed the text while reading through it. Now, however, with the realisation that there were many more glosses in Old Irish, at least six of which are still to be seen on the surviving folios, and that the contents of the manuscript were heavily biased in favour of Irish texts, there are surely much stronger grounds for believing that the manuscript itself was penned by an Irishman. All the glosses are apparently written by the prima manus and the orthography of the Old Irish ones suggests a very early date for the text. There is one small indication that the Old Irish glosses were copied from an earlier exemplar (one seems to be misplaced), and this would suggest on even older date for the archetype.

The present shorn and damaged state of the Paris fragments makes an accurate reconstruction of the original manuscript impossible, but the surviving evidence does suggest that the original measurements may have been c. 330 × c. 230 mm; the text was apparently written in two columns throughout. The quality of the texts is relatively good; what surprises is the unusual attributions of some: the Gaudentius excerpts are ascribed to Origen (Originis) while the tract known as Pseudo-Athanasius is here ascribed (uniquely) to Sulpicius Severus (ut alii dicunt). The first few lines of Pseudo-Anatolius are lost, so we cannot say whether it was correctly identified or not, but the Augustine excerpts certainly were (Augustinus hucusque).

The known contents of the fragments allow some guesswork about the original extent of the manuscript. The two surviving folios have been inverted in the binding, so that f 35v should precede f 35r, and f 36v should precede f 36r. Following this revised order, the first text encountered is the end of Pseudo-Theophilus, De Pascha. The bulk of this text is now missing, however, but estimates based on the measurements (c. 330 × 230 mm) suggest that a full folio would have been required to accommodate the rest of the tract. Hence the present f 35 must have been preceded by at least one other folio.

Following the end of Pseudo-Theophilus on the present f 35v are the excerpt from Nm 9.1-11 and Gaudentius (‘Originis’) Tractatus 1 in Exodum (De Paschae observatione), which fill col. a of that

---


7 See WALSH & Ö CRÓININ, Cummian’s Letter, 84-86.


9 It is perhaps more than a coincidence that Aldhelm, in his letter to the British king Gerontius, has a confused reference to Sulpicius as author of the British/Irish 84-year tables; see Rudolf EHWALD (ed), Aldhelmi opera. MGR AA 15 (Berlin 1919) 480-486. For discussion of the work, see C.W. JONES, Bedae opera, 51-52, and Claude BARLOW (ed), Martini Ep. Bracarensis operaomnia (New Haven 1950) 259-263.
Early Echtternach manuscript fragments

page; col. b sees the opening of Pseudo-Anatolius, De Pascha, §1. Pseudo-Anatolius then continues on f 35r a-b with §§1-3. The text then breaks off and is renewed on f 36v a with §§12-13, ending with the last section, §14, on f 36v b. This implies the loss of almost nine full sections of the printed edition, or approximately 200 lines of text. Reckoning on the basis of c. 35 lines per column, this implies the loss of at least six columns or one full plus one half-folio.

The present f 36r begins with Augustine, DGAL, which is then followed by Pseudo-Athanasius/ Pseudo-Martinus of Braga, De ratione paschali. If this text were transcribed in full into the original manuscript, we could reckon on the loss of four full columns, or one folio.

The upshot of these calculations is the probability that the surviving two folios were once accompanied by at least four others.

Although the bulk of Pseudo-Anatolius De Pascha has been lost in P enough of the text survives to enable a comparison with other manuscripts. The readings in P at several points agree with those in the so-called Sirmond codex of Bede's computus(S), which I have elsewhere demonstrated is derived from an Irish exemplar dated AD 658. The relevant textual readings are as follows (reference is to Krusch's edition, cited by paragraph plus page and line-number):

§1 (317.36): et (ter) om. SP
§1 (318.1): delucidii K stillicidii SP
§1 (318.1): eloquiae K eloquentiae S aeloquentiae P
§1 (318.1-2): sapientiae K scientiaeque S scientiae P
§2 (319.6): luna soli K luna om. SP
§13 (326.11): excedisset K excedens S excidens P
§13 (326.21): Ab viii. kl. ap. K Et ab viii.kl.ap. SP
§13 (326.24): sole discindente K d. s. S discendente s. P
§13 (326.26): simili numero dierum K dierum om. SP

The texts in S and P are not identical, however. P sometimes has unique readings:

§1 (317.2): contexerunt, for construxerunt K
§1 (317.4): conprobandam, for probandam K
§1 (317.12): ieurum, for Hieronymum K
§2 (318.21): ex planiada, for ex Spaniada K
§2 (318.24): praeponenti, for proponenti K
§13 (326.3): Caeterum + est, for Caeterum K
§13 (326.4): discensumque om.
§13 (326.4): qui + in aequinoctio
§13 (326.9): ex xii partibus, for ex xii partiunculis
§13 (326.13): vii diebus commedes, for s. d. comedetis K

In drafting his statements about the earliest Echternach manuscripts Lowe, as it seems to me, sometimes failed to appreciate the significance of some of the evidence. This case has already been made regarding the famous calendar known to have been in Willibrord's possession, and in particular the single-leaf Easter table which was bound in with the Calendar from an early date. There seems now to be a general consensus emerging that this table must have been written c.c. AD 684, in which case it represents the earliest example of an Echternach hand, but one which must have received its training in the Irish monastery of Rath Melsigi. The close relationship between the script of the Easter table and the hand that wrote the main entries in the Calendar, and also the Augsburg (olim Maihingen/Harburg) Gospels, has likewise led to the realisation that the first generation of Echternach scribes must have acquired their familiarity with this hand either in Ireland itself or from masters trained in Ireland.

12 See Bernhard BISCHOFF, Paläographie des römischen Altertums und des lateinischen Mittelalters, 2nd ed (Berlin 1986) 126 n 75.
That Rath Melsigi may have been the home of a thriving scriptorium, with Irish and Anglo-Saxon masters and pupils, is certainly not beyond the bounds of possibility. It is certainly significant that among the first generation of Echternach scribes are the names of at least two Irishmen, Laurentius and Virgilius, whose names are preserved in Echternach charters from the years AD 704 to AD 721/22. To the weight of that evidence can now be added the newly-discovered Old Irish glosses in the Paris fragments. Bilingual glossing (Latin and Old Irish) is, of course, a distinctive feature of Irish manuscripts from the earliest period, and the glosses on Pseudo-Anatolius follow, therefore, in a long line of such practices developed in the Irish schools. We cannot say from the fragmentary evidence of the Paris leaves, however, whether text and glosses were written in Ireland or at Echternach. What we can say, on foot of the new evidence, is that the Irish input into Echternach manuscript production remained strong even after the transfer from Rath Melsigi. The orthography of the Old Irish glosses suggests an Irish presence at the very beginning, since spellings like árem. córido and tólæ represent a stage of the language c. AD 700 (i.e. roughly contemporary with the oldest stratum of the Würzburg glosses on St Paul), while the technique of writing Old Irish words with horizontal dashes over most syllables likewise represents an early stage in the glossing practices of Irish scribes. 

All in all, therefore, the new Paris discoveries add more evidence for the argument that the earliest Echternach manuscripts and their scribes represent a thorough integration of Irish and Anglo-Saxon techniques and interests. In their choice of texts, in their bilingual glossing of those texts, and in their script, the Paris fragments provide important corroborative evidence that the genesis of Hiberno-Saxon cultural relations is to be sought not just in Northumbria but in Ireland as well.

TEXTS

The texts that follow are reproduced as they appear in the Paris fragments. I have printed between square brackets those letters and words that are no longer visible, but which can be safely restored since the texts have been identified. Manuscript abbreviations and contractions have been silently expanded, and minimal capitalisation has been introduced, to facilitate the reader. Punctuation is that of the manuscript, except where retention of it might confuse. The spelling of the fragments has been retained without change; where the text is lost I have assumed a certain consistency on the part of the scribe and used his spelling in preference to that of the editions.

Letters and words added between two diagonal slashes (//) indicate words or letters added by the scribe above the line. Words added between arrow brackets (<> ) were omitted by the scribe, and I have restored them where necessary. The Latin and Old Irish glosses, with their lemmata, are printed following the six texts. Roman numerals are printed with a stop on either side, for clarity. A vertical line is used to mark line-ends.

PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS. lat. 10399, ff 35-36

I


[Pseudo-Theophilus, De ordinatione feriarum paschalium MPL 90, 607-610: 609-610]

For a full description of the Echternach documents, see Camille WAMPACH, Geschichte der Grundherrschaft Echternach im Frühmittelalter. 2 vols. Publications de la section historique de l'Institut Grand-Ducal de Luxembourg 63 (Luxembourg 1929-1930).

II

[In nomine Domini] [Dei summi.] [Loquutus est Dominus ad Moyses in deserto Sinai. anno secundo postquam egressi sunt de terra Aegipti mense I primo diecens: Faciant filii Israel fasse in tempore suo [.xiii. die mensis huius ad uesperam] iam uixta omnes remorquolias et justificationes eius. Et precipit Moyses filis Israel ut facerent fasse. Qui [facerunt tempore suo .xiii. die] [mensis ad uesperam in monte Sinai iuxta omnia quae mandauerat Dominus Moysi fecerunt fili Israel. Ecce autem quidam inmundi super animam [hominis qui non poterant facere phasse in die illa] [ad Moysen et Aaron.] qui dixerunt eis: [inmundi sumus] [super animam hominis.] [Quare fraudumur ut non ualeamus oblationem in tempore suo offerre inter filios] [Israel. Quibus respondit] Moyses: State ut consulam quid precipiat Dominus de uobis. [Loquutus estque Dominus ad Moysen dilicens: Loquere filis Israel: homo qui fuerit inmundus sui anima siue in via procul in gente ustra, faciat phasse Domino mense secundo, .xiiii. die mensis ad uesperam.]

[Numbers 9.1-11]

III

Originis dicit: [In exodo libro pariter nunc audimus] obseruatio paschae describitur et se septem diebus eiusdem sollemnitatem azemam comedenda mandatur. [Precipit tamen deus et hoc ut si quis primo mense vel in anima linmundus hominis id est mortui] [tollutus. Vel extra electum sacrificis. hircol solimae locum in lonquinquo itenere constitutus. pascha non potuerit celebrare.].: Et ideo nec ante .xiii. lunam. nec ultra [uicesimam primam celebrare possumus. Quia .uii. sunt dies azemorum] [in quibus qua hominem fecerat pro eodem pasus. et die dominica quae dicitur in scrip turis prima sabbati in qua sumpserat mundum unde postea hominem propter quem fecerat mundum. Haec breuiter dixerim de ratione paschali.]


IV
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D[ae]s. x[u]el. x[ui]usque ad .x[u]n[am] fuerat inuenta pro reverentia dominicae resurrectionis

I

diae I[die se]cundae lunae eodem mensae I[natae ad uesperum Pascha celebratur.]

consummuntur .xii. I[horae et a[assin id est] prima pars. et ex ea I[inchoatur] particula prima ex

est per .iiii. in una die ab .uuiii. KI. Ian. in .uuiii. KI. ApI. hora diminuitur. I IN qua

quos expossuimus I[sollemnitatem] dominicae resurrectio[nem concludam., Caeterum

.I[uii. die]bus I[partem. sol obteniens] luna uero e[contrario autum]lpnalis. Et ideo ...

mensis primi sit statute I[sollemnitas] Ipost uesperam. quando luna sol[ii] obposita e religione

immolabatur. I[Siautem e]xcidens numerum .xu. et .xui. lluna fuisse inuenta: in uespera eius

custodire ut pluribus et diversis opin<ionibus] lacten[tibus prae]termis intra terminos

ac noctium conficit ut hoc sinuare con[arer hoc] modo inl[choatur a]c
deprahenditur sicut e[tiam oculis probare]

36v a . . . [nouissima pars vincitur .xiiii. die mensis primi qui non die lunae cursibus con[putatu]r Pascha ha I[moimetor. Quoqu id]lem ut domini [iussio]ne san[litum est et]
sa[plienti non est] dubium. Et i[deo hoc solum satis est omnibus] I[sanctis et cathol]cicis uiris


tuae] I[epistola]e s[ubieceras ut solis ascensum] qui in aequinoctio in diminutio[nem dierium]

est per .iii. in una die ab I[.uiii. KI. Ian. in] .uiii. KI. Apl. hora diminuitur. I IN qua

consummuntur .xii. I[i[horae et a]ssin id est prima pars. et ex ea I[inchoatur] particula prima ex

.xii. partibus I[In qua die] ad uesperum si luna .xiii. ae I[aduenisessel]gnus apud ludeos

die] I[.xiii. die se]cundae lunae eodem mensae I[natae ad] usp[erum Pasch[a c]elebre[ratur.] I[
..u. die]bus con<m>ete] [az]ema usque I[in diem .xxi. in usp[erum. Nobis ergo similiter si
eueniatur ut .uiii. KI. Apl. et dies dominica et luna .xiii. inueniatur Pascha celeb[Randam est.

Sed si.xu. uel .xxui. usque ad .xx. lunam fuerat inuenta pro reverentia dominicae resurrectionis]
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V


VI


35r b 20 utique uernalis aequinoctii partem sol obteniens, gl.

35r a 21 problesmatibus (with ref. mark connecting this to 'pylagus'), gl. tolue: 'flood'; vn. of *to-uss-lin or *to-fo-lin. DIL T 238. Note retention of –ae in the second, unstruck syllable (later tóla).

36r a 21 problesmatibus (with ref. mark connecting this to 'pylagus'), gl.

36r a 32 usque ante non multum tempus, gl.

VI 13 occur. Lowe described the bow of q as 'disproportionately large' and noted the stubbed, short descender of that letter.

Whole the orthography is good.

Spelling: Insular spellings are common:

Punctuation: the medial point is used for pauses; stops are indicated by the use of three dots (.) . Omissions are marked by 

A peculiar reading; most MSS have either locutus est or locutus est.

NOTES ON THE TEXTS

I 2 Quando ergo fit inura: the scribe first wrote Quando ergo inira, then added above the words sit inter, as a correction.

II 4 Et precipit: Not attested in Henri QUENTIN et al. (eds), Biblia Sacra iuxta latinam vulgatam versionem 3. Numeri-Deuteronomium (Rome 1936). Most MSS have praecipitque, though G* omits the -que.

II 7 phasse: pascha is the preferred reading in the Rome edition, though numerous MSS in fact have phasse or a variant.

II 9 fraudamur: fraudamur is the preferred reading in the Rome edition; MS O has our reading.

II 9 in tempore suo offere: The Vulgate text is offerre oblationem Domino in t.s.; our reading is not attested.

II 11 Loquus estque: a peculiar reading; most MSS have either locutusque est or locutus est.

III 1 Originis: an interesting ascription; the same spelling is found in MSS of Pseudo-Anatolius (KRUSCH, Studien 1, 317).

III 3 in anima inmundus hominis: the CSEL ed. reads: immundus in anima hominis.

IV 68 .ui. diebus con<m>: the editions have nothing added between the lines, with the word ratione above the second Paschae, perhaps with the intention of incorporating the word in the title. The ascription of this work to Sulpicius Severus is, to my knowledge, unique.

I 2 de ratione: above -ne is written -ni, perhaps as a correction.

VI 3 relinquerunt. Tani: the editions have nothing added between relinquerunt and quasi.

VI 12 quia et usus: the editions read: quia et ipsa liberabitur a servitute interitus cum libertate filiorum Dei (= Rm 8: 20-21).

VI 13 cum omni libertate: omni not in the editions.

VI 14 ut corpora iam: not in the editions, perhaps a gloss.

PALEOGRAPHICAL DESCRIPTION

The two surviving folios measure 330x230 mm, but these have been trimmed by the binder. The writing area is c. 315 mm long, and the estimated breadth is c. 250 mm. Allowing for an average of c. 35 lines per page, with loss of 2-3 lines at the top of the page and 5-6 at the foot of the page, the original dimensions were probably in the region of c. 360 x c. 260 mm. The writing is in two columns, enclosed by single bounding lines.

Punctuation: the medial point is used for pauses; stops are indicated by the use of three dots (.). Omissions are marked by signes de renvoi. Monosyllables and long -is in final syllables are accented. There is an extensive repertoire of construe-marks (though their use is not always clear). Abbreviations: besides the usual forms br., q = bus, que, dr, dát = dicitur, dicunt, etc., some less regular forms occur: e.g. temp = tempus. Insular abbreviations are frequent: ɔ = con/con (comedenda); ɔ = eius; + = est; id = id est; q: = quae; ʃ = uel. Not noted by Lowe is the distinctively Irish f = secundum.

Spelling: Insular spellings are common: pýlagus (pelagus), problesma, lonquinquo, chemis (hiemis), sollempnias, but on the whole the orthography is good.

Script: described by Lowe as a 'majuscule verging on minuscule', who noted also that the script changes into a crowded minuscule for the Gaudentius text on f 35v a. Uncial d is the rule; half-uncial n r and r are regular, though the uncial forms do occur. Lowe described the bow of q as 'disproportionately large' and noted the stubbed, short descender of that letter. Ligatures are common: ti, hi, mi, ni, fi, gn; nt, with subscript t occurs once (36r a). The ink is now brown, and according to Lowe thevellum was 'prepared in the Insular manner'.
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13. – Paris, B.N. lat. 10399, f. 35.
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14. – Paris, B.N. lat. 10399, f. 35v
16. – Paris, B.N. lat. 10399, f. 36v