

Valeria Mattaloni

## Between Emendation and Error: The Use of Sources in Medieval Latin Texts and the Philologist's Choices

In all medieval Latinity the source *par excellence* was of course the Bible: it provided the *accessus* to understanding the world, being the code through which it could be decrypted. The Bible itself also had to be decrypted, however: sermons and preachings of the Church Fathers, exegetical works (for instance *commentaria*, *tractatus*, *expositiones*, *glossae*), and new instruments such as *glossaria* or *florilegia* contributed to understanding the Holy Scripture and to preserving the *auctoritates*. Exegetical works, in turn, became fundamental references for the authors of the Latin Middle Ages. Authors usually had a copy of their source, be it the whole text or collections of *excerpta* from it; in some cases they possessed more than one copy, and in some cases they had to use a different ancestor during the compilation or the revision of their work. For an author, the use of sources was a complex operation, in terms both of the content and of the physical material (i.e. the availability of witnesses of the source and their accuracy in relation to the original text). In any case, errors were a common occurrence and a hazard of the job.

A specific methodological problem arises when a philologist edits a text that was composed using faulty authorities. If a quotation in a work contains a *lectio* that distances it from the standard text of the source, should I (as editor) amend the text or maintain the error? The answer is not always obvious and the search for a solution poses further dilemmas for the philologist, who needs to understand the nature of the errors and their genesis.

In general terms, when a philologist is establishing the text of a work whose author drew upon a particular source, he has to consider on the one hand whether a *lectio* is an error due to the transmission of the work (and therefore he has to correct the faulty text), or whether it is an error by the author, who might have either misunderstood the source he was reading or distanced himself from it intentionally (in which case the editor should preserve the variant). On the other hand, if the *lectio* depends on the source, the philologist has to consider whether the error occurred in the manuscript tradition of the source (or because of its author); moreover, he ought to consider also how the source was transmitted, and through which manuscripts it spread. In summary, then, the philologist has to reconstruct both the history of the work in question and the history of the source – which at a certain point in its transmission intersected with a new work and a new manuscript tradition – in order to understand what can be considered the original text (Chiesa 2012: 153-154).

In discussing the length of the island of Ceylon, for example, Dicuil cited Iulius Solinus, saying that the latter had expressed the measures in thousands of *stadia* (Tierney 1967: 82), and Isidorus' *Etymologiarum libri*, saying that he had indicated them in *milia passuum*; yet in fact, Wallace Martin Lindsay's edition of Isidorus has *milia stadiorum* (Lindsay 1957, XIV: 6, 12), and Olga Spevak's edition, while also still retaining the same *lectio*, indicates that Faustino Arévalo considers it appropriate to expunge *stadiorum*, in favour of a more pertinent *passuum*, implied from the preceding part of the period (Spevak 2011: 109). The editor James Tierney correctly preserves the text used by Dicuil, but a check on Isidorus' manuscripts is a *desideratum* in this case.

In his *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, the Venerable Bede quoted the *Rescriptum ad Augustinum* by Gregory the Great. The editor Michael Lapidge (2010, I: 27) maintains the grammatical distortions and errors, supposing that Bede had slavishly copied from a faulty text. In this case, the reconstruction I proposed for the complex tradition of the *Rescriptum* confirmed Lapidge's insight and the low stemmatic position of the Gregorian copy that the Venerable had read and carefully quoted (Mattaloni 2017: 415).

So should one amend the text or maintain the error? The philologist's task is immense thanks to frequent borderline situations (as for polygenetic errors, where it is difficult to answer the question of whose fault it is) and because many fundamental works still lack a modern critical edition. Clearly, therefore it is quite problematic for a scholar to rely on a misleading edition, or to study a work based on an *auctoritas* without a proper check on the source's manuscripts, at least when it comes to particular *loci critici* or controversial quotations.

The *Moralia in Iob* by Gregory the Great are a significant example: they had a wide circulation via about 1500 manuscripts (in their original form and in a great number of abbreviations). The most recent critical edition, however, by Mark Adriaen, is based upon an average of two manuscripts per book (Adriaen 1979-1985). As Lucia Castaldi clarified in the critical and philological analysis developed in her monograph dedicated to Gregory's works and the Gregorian manuscript tradition, Adriaen's selection of manuscripts was not justified by any philological criterium and the *constitutio textus* was arbitrary (Castaldi, Chiesa 2013: 53-54). It is a pity, therefore, that Gabriella Braga (1974), when analysing the abbreviation by the monk Iohannes Cluniacensis, did not indicate which *Moralia* manuscripts she had read in order to define where the author had departed from Gregory's tradition and where, conversely, there was a possible error in the manuscript transmission.

The Italian Iohannes met Oddo, abbot of Cluny, in 938 or 939, became a monk and travelled with him; he later composed the *Vita Oddonis*, soon after the death of his *magister*. Thanks to pieces of information in the prologue to his hagiography, we know he copied a lot of works and that he wrote the *Sententiae morales super Iob*, consisting of a prologue, *tituli* and *excerpta* from the *Moralia*, with each *titulus* summarizing the argument of the Gregorian quotation which followed it.

The only known manuscript is Montecassino, Archivio dell'Abbazia (Biblioteca Statale del Monumento Nazionale) 317 (s. XI in.; it will be indicated by **M**) and there is no

complete edition of the *Sententiae*: the monks of Montecassino published the prologue (BC: 101-102) and Braga (1974)<sup>1</sup> printed the critical text of the *tituli* and of five out of the 153 *sententiae* that the manuscript transmits. After each *titulus*, Braga quotes the *incipit* and *explicit* of each *sententia*, with a basic reference to the *Moralia* edition available to her (i.e. the *Patrologia Latina*)<sup>2</sup>. Furthermore, she states that she has used italics to highlight the Bible quotations and the words and phrases which were not verbatim quotations from the *Moralia* (Braga 1974: 171, fn. 87, and 181); thus we can infer that the personal interventions by Iohannes are in italics. Moreover, Braga affirms that she does not use italics on occasions where the author gave a variant differing from the *Moralia* edition but attested in some manuscripts. Consequently, we are not informed about where Iohannes' text coincides with the *lectiones* from certain *Moralia* copies, which Braga consulted but unfortunately does not mention in her analysis.

The first limitation of this partial edition is that a reader is forced to consult the text of the *Moralia* from PL. The second is that the *excerpta* from the Gregorian exegesis are not precisely identified by Braga: as discussed above, she indicated only the *incipit* and *explicit* of the portion of text, but the monk Iohannes did not quote the whole passages, and therefore the reader cannot gain an idea of what selections have been made from the source. It may have been an intentional choice on Braga's part to omit the complete reporting from the *Moralia* because of their considerable length. Ultimately, therefore, due to the unreliable editions of Gregory's work (PL and Adriaen's), a new edition of the *Sententiae super Iob* should give the *tituli* composed by Iohannes, the whole text quoted from the *Moralia*, and an apparatus with regard to **M** and the *Moralia* manuscripts, indicating which variants Iohannes had and which the *Moralia* editions and manuscripts did – or did not have.

Two *sententiae*, 59 and 60, will be analysed as an example. Braga clarified that Iohannes made no leaps backwards or forwards while copying, barring a few exceptions, but she did not mention the anomalous disposition of the *excerpta* in these *sententiae*, from *Moralia* VIII 12-17. When the selected passages are compared with their source, their sequence creates a curious puzzle: in fact, the first part of sentence 59 (59 A) is taken from the *Moralia* text that follows the *excerpta* used for the first part of sentence 60 (60 A), and the second part of 59 (59 B) follows the second part of 60 (60 B), joined almost seamlessly<sup>3</sup> (see TABLE 1).

<sup>1</sup> For a complete *status quaestionis* about Iohannes and his works, see Mattaloni 2019.

<sup>2</sup> J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, voll. 75-76, Paris 1849. I abbreviate it as PL.

<sup>3</sup> In order to compare the lengths of the two works, I hypothesized a *codex* of the *Moralia* with a similar format to **M** (as a possible source from a comparable *scriptorium* or a closer period/geographical area), considering that one column of PL roughly corresponds to one *folium* (*recto-verso*). The approximation of the length in **M** is due to the fact that the copyist (or copyists) of this manuscript was not precise and the numbering of lines per page and the spacing of its writing often differ.

TABLE I

<i>Moralia</i> VIII 12-17 (ed. PL)	<i>Sententiae</i> (ed. Braga)	<b>M</b>
Col. 841 CD-848 AB (7 ff.)	60 A	pp. 193 (l. 8)-200 (l. 12) (4 ff.)
Col. 848 CD-850 AB (2 ff.)	59 A	pp. 188 (l. 1)-191 (l. 27) (2 ff.)
Col. 850 CD-852 CD (2 ff. + 1 r)	60 B	pp. 200 (l. 12)-203 (l. 23) (2 ff.)
Col. 853 AB-853 CD (1 f.)	59 B	pp. 191 (l. 27)-193 (l. 7) (1 r)

This suspicious ordering and the peculiar length of these portions of the text in **M** suggest that a reversal might have occurred in a *fasciculum*; it is still not possible to define whether this shift arose in a *Moralia* copy or in a possible ancestor of **M**, as I have not yet found a Gregorian manuscript testifying to this shuffle<sup>4</sup>.

As regards the errors within the text, the *sententia* 59 has a peculiar homeoteleuton. Braga affirmed that the homeoteleuton explains many of the omissions in the *Sententiae* and is dependent on the manuscript tradition, indicating the corrupted *explicit* of this *excerptum* (Braga 1974: 171 and note 90) as an example. However, she did not explain which tradition was corrupted by the homeoteleuton: whether the tradition of Iohannes' work (**M** or its ancestor) or the original of the *Sententiae* (in which case our author might have made a mistake while copying from his source), or the transmission of the source (i.e. the *Moralia codex* used by our monk). This is a rather difficult question to answer and unfortunately the text proposed by Braga is misleading; nevertheless, a closer look at *Moralia* VIII 48 can clarify the situation:

*Moralia* (Adriaen 1979: 448): Saepe enim ab ipso ostensionis exordio propriam laudem quaerunt. Saepe vero in ostensione operis auctoris patefacere gloriam cupiunt...

<sup>4</sup> To list the copies that I could collate (closest to the age of Iohannes): Admont, Bibl. des Benediktinerstifts 374 (s. XI-XII); Amiens, Bibl. Centrale Louis Aragon 39 (s. XII); Bamberg, Staatsbibl., Bibl. 40 (B.II.17) (s. IX<sup>1</sup>); Barcelona, Arxiu Capítular de la Catedral, Còd. 102; Basel, Universitätsbibl. B I 12 (s. XI-XII); Bayeux, Bibl. du Chapitre 57 (6G, t. I); Bordeaux, Bibl. Municipale 24 (s. XI); Charleville-Mézières, Médiathèque Voyelles 20 (t. II) (s. XII); Città del Vaticano, BAV, Arch. Cap. S. Pietro, A.10 (s. X-XI); Città del Vaticano, BAV, Vat. lat. 576 (s. XI); Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibl., Aug. Perg. II (s. VIII-IX); München, Bayerische Staatsbibl., Clm 3842 (s. IX<sup>3/3</sup>); Paris, Bibl. nationale de France, lat. 2213 (s. XI); Sankt Gallen, Stiftsbibl. 207 (s. IX<sup>3/4</sup>); Schaffhausen, Stadtbibl., Min. 51.

**M** (f. 192, last line and a half from the bottom): Sepe enim ab ipso ostensionis operis auctoris patefacere gloriam cupiunt...

*Sententiae morales super Iob* (Braga 1974: 197-198): Sepe enim ab ipsa (v) ostensione (z) operis auctoris patefacere gloriam cupiunt...

*apparatus*: (v) Nel *ms.* ipso (z) Nel *ms.* ostensionis

Braga corrected a gap in the text of **M** because the sentence was faulty: she amended *ipso* in *ipsa*, using italics (to indicate an anomalous change, an authorial intervention by Iohannes), and she corrected *ostentionis* – part of the first colon of the *saut du même au même* – to *ostensione*, anaesthetizing the error in the manuscript and considering it a variant from the *Moralia* tradition.

However, **M** has the masculine form *ipso*, indicating that our monk had not changed his source, and so the homeoteleuton was misinterpreted and not properly indicated in Braga's short *apparatus*: the variant *ipsa* is not an innovation by the author without parallels within the *Moralia* witnesses, and the *lectio ipso* is original both in the Gregorian work and in the *Sententiae*. The *Moralia* manuscripts I have seen<sup>5</sup> do not present the same *saut du même au même*, but this error is polygenetic, and so it is possible that the *codex* of the *Moralia* read by Iohannes did contain it. Yet due to the lack of sense made by this passage, Iohannes might have noticed a gap in his copy (although he was not usually so precise in his work as to do so)<sup>6</sup>; considering that the scribe of **M** was in turn quite messy<sup>7</sup>, the most probable hypothesis is thus that the error occurred during the copying process of the ancestor to **M**.

In any case, we cannot just simply anaesthetize the error because of the faulty quotation, as Braga did. And because this is a borderline situation, where we are not sure whose fault it is (for we do not hold a corrupted copy used by Iohannes), I suggest using angle brackets to integrate the passage:

Saepe enim ab ipso ostensionis <exordio propriam laudem quaerunt. Saepe vero in ostensione> operis auctoris patefacere gloriam cupiunt.

Another example may be given regarding the Gregorian work on Job. In his study of the *Speculum Gregorii* by Adalbertus of Metz, Lorenzo Valgimogli (2006: 52-54) errone-

<sup>5</sup> See note 4.

<sup>6</sup> Evidence to support this statement may be found in the tradition of the *Vita Oddonis*, which is confused and remarkable for the great quantity of shifts in the text; these gave rise to different ordering of the episodes of the saint's life within this hagiography, probably from the very beginning of the writing process (Mattaloni 2019: 361-386).

<sup>7</sup> In **M** the copyist (or copyists) calculated the blank lines for the *rubricator* badly, made a lot of errors and *sauts*, later corrected; these elements prove its inaccuracy and suggest the presence of an ancestor (whether the archetype or a copy).

ously trusts Adriaen's edition. He believes that Adalbertus had re-established the dative *indignationi* in this *excerptum* from the *Moralia*:

*Moralia* IX 16: Mirum valde quod irae Dei nullum posse resistere dicitur, cum multos indignationis supernae animadversionis obviassse eloquia divina testantur.

*Speculum* LXXIII: Sed mirum valde quod irae dei nullum posse resistere dicitur cum multos indignationi supernae animadversionis obviassse eloquia divina testantur.

Adriaen's edition has the genitive<sup>8</sup>; Valgimogli did not check other *Moralia* manuscripts, but all the *codices* I have seen give the dative form here<sup>9</sup>; thus Adalbertus did not amend his source, but it is probably the case that he owned a correct copy not collated by Adriaen.

Furthermore, Valgimogli did not discuss other variants, considering them simply to be innovations of the author. But his study is based upon only one manuscript – Cambridge, Trinity College 141 (C) – that he chose for its age and integrity. Unfortunately, C contains errors, while other manuscripts of the *Speculum* give the correct readings of the *Moralia*<sup>10</sup>. Therefore, a complete study of the tradition of the *Speculum* (and of its source) is still required.

A correct approach to the text is proposed by Roberto Gamberini in his edition of the *Expositio Hieremiae prophetae* by Hrabanus Maurus. In the introduction the editor discusses the variant *arbitris* (Gamberini 2017: LVII and 62):

Cum enim expleuerint superni arbitris in aduersariis suis secreta iudicia, tunc et ipsi reatus sui iusta recipiant praemia.

He explains that the expression *supernus arbiter* is attested in the *Homiliae in Evangelia* by Gregory the Great (that Hrabanus quotes in the following lines), but that the form *arbitris* had been corrected to *arbitri* in the previous *Patrologia* edition (PL III, col. 1211 C) and in a branch of the manuscript tradition, as a regular substantive of the second declension. However, as Gamberini shows, Gregory used *arbiter* as a third declension noun, as his works attest and as the manuscript tradition of the *Regula pastoralis* proves in the *Codex Trecentis* (Troyes, Médiathèque Jacques-Chirac [olim Bibliothèque Municipale;

<sup>8</sup> For book IX, the editor used Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibl. Aug. II, III, IV (s. VIII ex.-IX in.) and Manchester, John Rylands Libr. 83 (year 914).

<sup>9</sup> See note 4 for the manuscripts already mentioned: Admont 374, Amiens 39, Bamberg Bibl. 40, Barcelona 102, Basel B I 12, Bayeux 57, Bordeaux 24, Sankt Gallen 207, Schaffhausen Min. 51. The dative is also in PL 75, col. 872 A.

<sup>10</sup> E.g.: *Moralia* IX 16: "Quod quia hac mente agitur, statim venia subiuncta testatur". C has *nocte* and *subiecta*, while Paris, Bibl. nationale de France, lat. 1707 (s. XII) still has *mente* and *subiuncta*. *Nocte* and *subiecta* are not attested in the quoted *Moralia* *codices* and seem to be *lectiones singulares* of C: neither Adalbertus' innovations nor errors from the source.



Médiathèque du Grand Troyes], Fonds ancien 504, at ff. 4v and 52r), which Gregory licensed (Ricci 2005; Chiesa 2013: 178). Thus what appeared to be an error in the source, to be amended, was instead ratified by the manuscript tradition and the linguistic *usus* of the *auctoritas*, and rightly maintained as original text in the edition, with the necessary indications to the reader.

In conclusion, when investigating a text, a philologist should explain if an error was committed by the author, if it was introduced in the manuscript tradition (beginning with an eventual archetype), or if it was in the source. In this last case, the editor ought to maintain the text that the author had relied on, however faulty, and use the error to look for the copy (or the manuscript branch) which transmitted it. However, some borderline situations require investigations of parallel sources, linguistic tools and, above all, manuscripts. Such analysis can lead to other acceptable solutions being found, and when this is the case, a work may become a critical instrument by which to examine manuscript traditions of other works and to reconstruct the network of relations that characterized medieval Latinity.

### Abbreviations

BC:	Monachi Ordinis S. Benedicti Abb. Montis Casini, <i>Bibliotheca Casinensis seu codicum manuscriptorum qui in tabulario Casinensi aservantur, Series per paginas singillatim enucleata, notis, characterum specimenibus ad unguem exemplatis aucta</i> , v, Montecassino 1894.
C:	Cambridge, Trinity College 141.
M:	Montecassino, Archivio dell'Abbazia (Biblioteca Statale del Monumento Nazionale) 317 (s. XI in.).
PL:	J.-P. Migne, <i>Patrologia Latina</i> , Parisiis 1844-1855.

### Literature

Adriaen 1979-1985:	M. Adriaen, <i>S. Gregorii Magni Moralia in Iob</i> , Turnhout 1979-1985 (= Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 143, 143A, 143B).
Braga 1974:	G. Braga, <i>Le Sententiae morales super Job Ioannis abbatis. Ricerche sulle epitomi altomedievali dei Moralia</i> , in: <i>Studi sul Medioevo cristiano offerti a Raffaello Morghen per il 90° anniversario dell'Istituto Storico Italiano (1883-1973)</i> , Roma 1974, pp. 153-231.
Castaldi, Chiesa 2013:	L. Castaldi, P. Chiesa (a cura di), <i>La trasmissione dei testi latini del Medioevo / Mediaeval Latin Texts and Their Transmission. Gregorius I papa</i> (= "Te.Tra.", v), Firenze 2013.

- Chiesa 2012: P. Chiesa, *Una letteratura "sbagliata". I testi mediolatini e gli errori, "Ecdotica"*, I, 2012, pp. 151-161.
- Chiesa 2013: P. Chiesa, *Regula pastoralis*, in: L. Castaldi, P. Chiesa (a cura di), *La trasmissione dei testi latini del Medioevo/Mediaeval Latin Texts and Their Transmission. Gregorius I papa* (= "Te.Tra.", v), Firenze 2013, pp. 174-190.
- Gamberini 2017: R. Gamberini, *Rabano Mauro. Expositio Hieremiae prophetae, libri XVIII-XX, Lamentationes*, Firenze 2017.
- Lapidge 2010: M. Lapidge (a cura di), *Beda. Storia degli inglesi*, trad. di P. Chiesa, Borgaro Torinese (TO) 2010<sup>3</sup>.
- Lindsay 1957: W.M. Lindsay, *Isidori Hispalensis episcopi. Etymologiarum sive Originum libri XX*, Oxford 1957<sup>2</sup>.
- Mattaloni 2017: V. Mattaloni, *Gregorius Magnus. Rescriptum beati Gregorii ad Augustinum episcopum quem Saxoniam in praedicatione direxerat (seu Libellus responsionum)*, Firenze 2017 (= Edizione Nazionale dei Testi Mediolatini d'Italia, 43).
- Mattaloni 2019: V. Mattaloni, *Iohannes Cluniacensis mon.*, in: L. Castaldi, V. Mattaloni (a cura di), *La trasmissione dei testi latini del Medioevo/Mediaeval Latin Texts and Their Transmission*, Firenze 2019 (= Te.Tra., vi), pp. 355-395.
- Ricci 2005: L.G.G. Ricci, *Codex Trecensis. La Regola pastorale di Gregorio Magno in un codice del VI-VII secolo: Troyes, Médiathèque de l'Agglomération Troyenne*, 504, Firenze 2005.
- Spevak 2011: O. Spevak (ed.), *Isidore de Séville, Étymologies. Livre XIV. De terra*, Paris 2011.
- Tierney, 1967: J.J. Tierney, *Dicuili Liber de mensura orbis terrae*, Dublin 1967.
- Valgimogli 2006: L. Valgimogli, *Lo Speculum Gregorii di Adalberto di Metz*, Firenze 2006.



*Abstract*

Valeria Mattaloni

*Between Emendation and Error: The Use of Sources in Medieval Latin Texts and the Philologist's Choices*

When a work is based on faulty sources, its edition poses complex questions for the philologist, who has to reconstruct the history of the text and of its *auctoritas*. This article gives examples from the Latin Middle Ages: specifically, with regard to the tradition of the *Moralia in Iob* by Gregory the Great. This exegetical work was used by Iohannes of Cluny for his *Sententiae morales in Iob* and by Adalbertus of Metz for his *Speculum Gregorii*, but studies dedicated to these latter works have not examined in depth their relationships with the codices of the *Moralia*, which still lack a reliable edition. An appropriate methodological approach (exemplified by Gamberini's edition of Rabanus Maurus' *Expositio* on the *Lamentationes* of Jeremiah) would integrate analysis of linguistic *usus* with analysis of the manuscript traditions of the work and of its sources, in order to clarify the interrelation between *textus* and *auctoritates*, to decide whether to amend, and to define what can be considered the original text.

*Keywords*

Medieval Literature; Medieval Latin Philology; Exegesis; Textual Criticism.