

VIRGINIA BROWN, *Pastorale, mysticum, peccatorium : a Beneventan manuscript from Telese and the Normans in southern Italy*, in «Scrittura e civiltà» (ISSN: 0392-1697), 7 (1983), pp. 113-140.

Url: <https://heyjoe.fbk.eu/index.php/scrciv>

Questo articolo è stato digitalizzato dal progetto [HeyJoe](#) - *History, Religion and Philosophy Journals Online Access* della Biblioteca Fondazione Bruno Kessler, Il portale HeyJoe, in collaborazione con enti di ricerca, società di studi e case editrici, rende disponibili le versioni elettroniche di riviste storiografiche, filosofiche e di scienze religiose di cui non esiste altro formato digitale.

This article has been digitised within the Bruno Kessler Foundation Library project [HeyJoe](#) - *History, Religion and Philosophy Journals Online Access* platform. Through cooperation with research institutions, learned societies and publishing companies, the *HeyJoe* platform aims to provide easy access to important humanities journals for which no electronic version was previously available.

La digitalizzazione della rivista «Scrittura e civiltà», a cura dalla Biblioteca FBK, è stata possibile grazie alla collaborazione con Aldo Ausilio editore, erede dei diritti della Bottega d'Erasmus

Nota copyright

Tutto il materiale contenuto nel sito [HeyJoe](#), compreso il presente PDF, è rilasciato sotto licenza [Creative Commons](#) Attribuzione–Non commerciale–Non opere derivate 4.0 Internazionale. Pertanto è possibile liberamente scaricare, stampare, fotocopiare e distribuire questo articolo e gli altri presenti nel sito, purché si attribuisca in maniera corretta la paternità dell’opera, non la si utilizzi per fini commerciali e non la si trasformi o modifichi.

Copyright notice

All materials on the [HeyJoe](#) website, including the present PDF file, are made available under a [Creative Commons](#) Attribution–NonCommercial–NoDerivatives 4.0 International License. You are free to download, print, copy, and share this file and any other on this website, as long as you give appropriate credit. You may not use this material for commercial purposes. If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you may not distribute the modified material.



La digitalizzazione della rivista «Scrittura e civiltà», a cura dalla Biblioteca FBK, è stata possibile grazie alla collaborazione con Aldo Ausilio editore, erede dei diritti della Bottega d’Erasmus

VIRGINIA BROWN

PASTORALE, MYSTICUM, PECCATORIUM:
A BENEVENTAN MANUSCRIPT FROM TELESE AND THE
NORMANS IN SOUTHERN ITALY *

Rimini, Bibl. Civica Gambalunga SC-MS. 74 is a triple rarity. A seemingly entire codex in Beneventan script, it was not known to E. A. Lowe¹; it contains a lengthy colophon that not only places and dates the manuscript but also reveals the existence of a new scriptorium, namely, the Benedictine monastery of San Salvatore, Telesse, where the manuscript was copied in the twelfth century; and it contains works that, for the most part, appear not to have circulated at all in those regions of southern Italy and Dalmatia where the Beneventan hand was used. For any one of these reasons the manuscript might be said to deserve special study, and in this article I propose to describe this codex, to examine its contents, and to explore the clues it offers to the political and cultural conditions of the period in which it was written². This investigation will raise, admittedly, perhaps more questions than it can answer.

* A General Research Grant from the Humanities and Social Sciences Committee of the Research Board of the University of Toronto enabled me to study *in situ* the manuscript, which is now at Rimini, and I am happy to acknowledge this assistance. I should like to thank dott. Piero Meldini, Director of the Biblioteca Civica Gambalunga, for his courtesy in putting the manuscript at my disposal and for permission to publish the reproductions that accompany this study, and my colleague Professor A. G. Rigg for valuable suggestions.

1. The manuscript was not included in the 'Hand List of Beneventan MSS.' in *The Beneventan Script. A History of the South Italian Minuscule* (Oxford, 1914), pp. 334-70 [cited hereafter as *The Beneventan Script*] or in 'A New List of Beneventan Manuscripts' in *Collectanea Vaticana in honorem Anselmi M. Card. Albareda a Bibliotheca Apostolica edita* (Studi e Testi 220; Vatican City, 1962), pp. 211-44.

2. I 'discovered' Rimini SC-MS. 74 in March 1976 and examined it briefly at that time. A short notice was given in my 'A Second New List of Beneventan Man-

DESCRIPTION OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Physical layout

Parchment, i + 90 ff., 203 × 158 (c. 155 × 95) mm., 25 long lines. Gatherings: 1² (parchment leaf pasted to inside front cover and f. i), 2⁹, 3⁸-12⁸, 13² (f. 90 and parchment leaf pasted to inside back cover). Catchwords are written horizontally and placed below the text towards the bottom center of the folio in a rectangle that has been retraced in red ink: ff. 9v, 17v, 25v, 33v, 41v (traces only), 49v, 57v, 65v, 73v (traces only), 81v. The color of the ink varies between brown and black. Ruling is in lead on the flesh side: double bounding line comprise both inner and outer vertical margins; the first three lines from the top and last three lines from the bottom are extended all the way across the folio. On every folio prickings are visible in the inner margin.

Contents

- f. 1r-v: Medical remedy (in Latin); 'Quattuor modis potest deus facere hominem' (both in non-Beneventan writing of a *manus recens* [s. XV?])
- ff. 2r-48v: Honorius of Autun, *Elucidarium* (with marginalia in Beneventan by the scribe and in non-Beneventan [s. XV])
- ff. 48v-72r: Hugh of St. Victor, *De tribus diebus*
- ff. 72r-89r: 'florilegium peccatorium'
- f. 89r-v: colophon.

Date and origin

According to the colophon (analyzed and printed below on pp. 118 ff.), the manuscript was copied by a scribe named John

uscripts (I)', *Mediaeval Studies* 40 (1978) 268, together with an indication that a separate study of the manuscript would be forthcoming. The present article constitutes this promised study (also noted in *The Beneventan Script*², vol. I [Rome, 1980], p. 347). For other descriptions of the manuscript see D. Frioli in *Catalogo di manoscritti filosofici nelle biblioteche italiane*, vol. 1: Firenze, Pisa, Poppi, Rimini, Trieste (Florence, 1980), pp. 135-36 (where it is dated to 's. xiii') and in *Studi medievali*, 3rd Ser., 21.1 (1980) 440-41, 444-47 (where it is cited as 'new' and dated to 's. xii'), with 2 plates (ff. 24v, 37v).

during the reign of King Roger for Abbot Stephen of Telese and presented to a certain Ebulus. An Abbot Stephen of the monastery of San Salvatore, Telese is named in charters of the 1140s and, in view of the special relationship between Roger II of Sicily and Abbot Alexander of this same monastery in the 1130s, we may reasonably identify the Abbot Stephen of the colophon with the Abbot Stephen of the charters. The *terminus ante quem* for the writing of the codex is 1154, the date of Roger's death.

Script

In keeping with the evidence of the colophon, the letters conform to the canon established by Lowe for manuscripts of the second half of the eleventh/first half of the twelfth centuries³. Although the script varies considerably in size (for example, ff. 72v and following are copied in a noticeably smaller format), it appears that a single scribe is responsible for the entire codex. The slightly rounded appearance of the hand is characteristic of the 'region outside Naples': the letters are less angular and more 'spread out' than their Cassinese counterparts, and the lozenges are less clearly defined; there is also a fair amount of space between each word, which tends to give a 'softer' appearance⁴. It may be noted that the 'broken' form of *c* occurs rarely, final *s* goes only slightly below the line, and the short form of final *r* is definitely preferred.

Abbreviations are also of the kind usual for Beneventan manuscripts of this date with the exception of *omnis*, *anima*, and *animus*. In such cases, the older forms are preferred, namely, *oms*, *ome*, *omem*, *omia*, *omibus*, *ama*, *ame*, *amam*, *ami*, *amo*, although the newer system for *omnis* is sometimes used⁵. The scribe seems to know only the later system for various forms of *homo* (i. e., *hoiem*,

3. *The Beneventan Script*², vol. I, pp. 124 ff., 314 ff.

4. For facsimiles of other manuscripts written 'at or near Naples' cf. E. A. Lowe, *Scriptura Beneventana*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1929), pls. 31 (Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale Vindob. lat. 5, s. x in.), 45 (Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale Vindob. lat. 6, s. x), 47 (Prague, Státní knihovna ČSR VII A 16/9, s. x²), 48 (Montecassino 123 [Josephus], s. x²), 49 (Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vat. lat. 3317, s. x), 93 (Rome, Biblioteca Corsiniana Cors. 777 [41 G 12], A. D. 1226-52). Lowe's descriptions mention many of the same features exhibited by the Rimini codex, the difference in date notwithstanding.

5. I have noted *oium* (f. 6v, end of line) and *oibus* (f. 18v, end of line).

hoie, *hoies*, *hoibus*). Instead of being placed suprascript and slightly after the preceding letter, the 3-shaped *m* sign is put after the letter and on a level with it; often the curves of the 3 merge into a rather thick straight line.

Regarding symbols of punctuation, the simple period serves as both medial and final stop. The point with an oblique line above also functions as the medial stop. Interrogative sentences display at the end either a check over a point or the usual interrogative sign resting obliquely over the point. The 2-shaped inflection sign over the introductory word of interrogation does not seem to occur. There is frequent use of the hyphen to mark the division of words at the ends of lines, another indication for a twelfth-century date.

Illumination

On f. 2r (see plate I) the *Q* of *Quaeritur* is supported by a reclining angel with arms upraised whose left wing serves as the tail of the *Q*. The letter itself is formed by two lines in brown ink, inside which are placed, at regular intervals, green and red stepped pyramids; the general effect is that of a mandorla. Inside the *Q* Christ sits on a throne against a background of greyish-blue. His hair and beard are reddish-brown, and his halo red and simulated gold. He wears an inner garment of light brown and outer garments of blue and red. The right foot, which is bare, shows beneath the garments. His right arm is raised, with the hand upright to bless in the Greek manner, and in his left hand he seems to hold a book with a blue cover⁶. The angel also has reddish-brown hair, and his wings are red

6. Here there is a crease in the manuscript and so it is difficult to state with absolute certainty that the enthroned Christ is actually holding a book, but this appears to be what was intended. The enthroned Christ with a book or roll is a well-known model found frequently, for example, in the Beneventan Exultet Rolls studied by M. Avery, *The Exultet Rolls of South Italy*, vol. 2: *Plates* (Princeton-London-The Hague, 1936) and G. Cavallo, *Rotoli di Exultet dell'Italia meridionale. Exultet 1, 2, Benedizionale dell'Archivio della cattedrale di Bari. Exultet 1, 2, 3 dell'Archivio capitolare di Troia* (Bari, 1973). In a number of the following instances the figure of Christ is also situated in a mandorla that is supported by angels: Bari Exultet 1, s. xi¹ (ante a. 1067) (Avery pl. VII.6, Cavallo pl. 5 [color] and *Benedictio ignis et fontis*, s. xi¹ (ante a. 1067) (Avery pl. XIV.4, Cavallo pl. 15 [color]) and Exultet 2, s. xi ex. (Avery pl. XXI.9, Cavallo pl. 24 [color]); Gaeta Exultet 1, s. xi (Avery pl. XXXI.4); London, British Lib. Add. MS. 30337, s. xi ex. (Avery pl. XLIII.1); Manchester, John Rylands University Lib. 2, s. xi in. (Avery pl. LII.2);

with touches of yellow and greyish-blue. His inner garment is pinkish-red with a green sleeve and a green vertical stripe at the bottom; the outer garment is reddish-yellow.

There are three smaller illuminated initials. On f. 37v the *A* of *Antichristus* is bluish-grey with streaks of red; inside the letter a grotesque naked figure is caught in an interlace of red edged in white on a green background. On f. 49r the *I* of *Invisibilia* is written in brown ink, and inside the letter are green stepped pyramids outlined in red and placed against a background of lighter green. A pinkish-red flower sprouts from the top of the *I*; the letter terminates in a red and brown flourish, and bluish-grey and red flourishes decorate either side. Inside the red *D* of *De* on f. 72r (see plate II) is a floral-geometric pattern of pinkish-red, blue, green on a yellow background; the vertical stroke of the letter contains a green zig-zag line.

The remaining illumination consists of small red initials with brown flourishes (ff. 4r, 8r, 10v, 12r, 16r, 18v, 22r, etc.), and, on f. 27r, the *Q* of *Quid* is painted red with white interstices and infilled with green tracery.

Provenance

After the manuscript left Telese, we know only that it eventually made its way into the collection of Cardinal Giuseppe Garampi (1725-92), a protector of the Biblioteca Gambalunga who bequeathed a large part of his various collections, which included manuscripts, to this library; cf. the ex libris pasted to the inside front cover: 'Ex bibliotheca Josephi Garampii. DP. B. 52'⁷. The other shelf marks entered on the inside front cover are, in chronological order: 'D.

Rome, Bibl. Casanatense 724, *Benedictio fontis*, s. x/xi, ut uid. (Avery pl. CX.1) and *Exultet*, s. xii (Avery pl. CXXV.13); Troia *Exultet* 3, s. xii (Avery pl. CLXXIII.8, Cavallo pl. 45 [color]); Velletri, Museo Capitolare S. N., s. xi ex. (Avery pl. CLXXXVI.1).

7. For Garampi and the Biblioteca Gambalunga, cf. C. Tonini, *La coltura letteraria e scientifica in Rimini dal secolo XIV ai primordi del XIX*, vol. 2 (Rimini, 1884), pp. 460-88. The manuscript is not listed in M. De Romanis, *Bibliothecae Josephi Garampii cardinalis catalogus materiarum ordine digestus et notis bibliographicis instructus*, 5 vols. (Rome, 1796), who was concerned only with the printed books that came to Garampi's heirs.

II. 35',⁸ '33' (pasted in), '4. A. III. 8', and 'SC-MS. 74' (in current use).

EDITION AND ANALYSIS OF THE COLOPHON

Colophons are not often found in Beneventan manuscripts. From the more than 600 items that make up the 'Hand List of Beneventan MSS.' on pp. 334-70 of the first edition of *The Beneventan Script*, Lowe drew only thirty instances⁹. The colophon in the Rimini manuscript (see plates III and IV) is the only one to emerge from the approximately 600 new items that have been discovered since 1914, and this in itself would be of interest even if the colophon were not as long and as historically interesting as it is. Consisting of forty-six hexameters, of which forty-four are Leonine and constitute a dedicatory poem¹⁰, our colophon is the second longest

8. This is the shelf mark given in G. Mazzatinti, *Inventari dei manoscritti delle biblioteche d'Italia*, vol. 2 (Forlì, 1892), p. 146, no. 34.

9. The Beneventan colophons have been carefully studied and reedited by F. Newton, 'Beneventan Scribes and Subscriptions, with a List of Those Known at the Present Time', *The Bookmark. Friends of the University of North Carolina Library* 43 (1973) 1-35. In reducing the total to twenty-nine, Newton adds to the list some colophons overlooked by Lowe that are found in manuscripts cited in the first edition of *The Beneventan Script* and rejects others known to Lowe on the grounds that they do not give the scribe's name and hence are not genuine colophons.

10. There is at present no way to determine whether or not the scribe was the *author* as well as the copyist of the poem. Newton has examined the question of the scribe as scholar in 'Beneventan Scribes' and in 'Some Monte Cassino Scribes in the Eleventh Century', *Medieval and Renaissance Studies. Proceedings of the Southeastern Institute of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, vol. 7 (Chapel Hill, 1978), pp. 3-19, and he concludes: 'Those whose chief task was to be calligraphy doubtless did not continue the study of Latin past a certain point... The exact level of accomplishment is revealed on those occasions when they write these messages — these «subscriptions» or «colophons» of their own composition. On such occasions, they can rely on formulae: «Three fingers write, but the whole body labors,» or the simile about the mariner, or an entreaty for the prayers of the reader. These elements, often in verse, they found in earlier mss. and simply appropriated for themselves. When, however, they tried to add elements of their own invention, the grammatical endings are faulty, the sense often becomes obscure, and the metre limps or is completely abandoned. The *scholar* who writes or corrects a ms. is easily distinguishable from the common scribe' ('Beneventan Scribes', p. 11). If criteria of grammar, sense, and metre are applied here, the scribe, in order to be the author, must also have been a scholar, for the poem is remarkably, though not entirely, free of such blemishes (cf. n. 12 below and the notes to the poem itself for some critical and textual remarks). I have preferred to leave moot the question of authorship since the Rimini manu-

colophon that has yet been found in a Beneventan manuscript. Only that of Cava 24 (A. D. 1268-95), also in Leonine hexameters and comprising forty-seven lines, is longer ¹¹.

To summarize now the contents of the colophon in the Rimini codex:

- ll. 1-2 the usual plea of the scribe for spiritual well-being
- ll. 3-5 the presentation of the book by Abbot Stephen to Ebulus
- ll. 6-23 Abbot Stephen's *apologia* for the book
- ll. 24-46 Abbot Stephen's direct address to Ebulus: (1) he is to be mindful of his saviour (ll. 24-26); (2) the monks of the monastery will pray for Ebulus' promotion by the king (ll. 26-29); (3) Ebulus is asked to provide help and protection and to put down robbers (ll. 30-36); (4) through prayer Moses was able to slow the course of time and so accomplished more than did Joshua through fighting (ll. 37-41); (5) the abbot describes the glorious heavenly reward awaiting Ebulus (ll. 42-46).

I give below an edition of the colophon, with notes on scribal corrections and sources. Editorial additions and letters which have had to be supplied because of damage to the parchment are enclosed in angled brackets; deletions are put in square brackets. The punctuation is my own and replaces the scribe's point surmounted by an oblique line after the caesura (which occurs in the majority of cases after the thesis of the third foot) and point at the end of the line; I have interpreted the lack of scribal punctuation at the end of ll. 6-7 as deliberate and significant for the understanding of the lines. Orthography conforms to that of the manuscript ¹².

script is the only product now known of the scriptorium at San Salvatore, and we have no further information about the intellectual life of the monastery.

11. Newton, 'Beneventan Scribes', p. 19, no. 9, who suggests, on the basis of content, that the author and the scribe are not the same. Other examples of Leonine hexameters in Beneventan subscriptions are the two verses of Lawrence of Amalfi (Montecassino 28) and four verses of Leo (Montecassino 99), both of whom combined the roles of author and scribe; cf. Newton, *ibid.*, pp. 24-25, no. 18 and pp. 25-26, no. 19.

12. For the first line and a half of the colophon see Mazzatinti, *Inventari*, p. 146, no. 34 and the Bénédictins du Bouveret, *Colophons de manuscrits occidentaux des origines au XVI^e siècle*, vol. 3 (Fribourg, 1973), p. 122, no. 8394. These first two lines do not appear to be a common formula used by scribes; I did not find any other occurrences in the five volumes compiled by the Bénédictins du Bouveret and published to date. The entire colophon has been edited and briefly discussed by D.

Permaneat felix semper persona Iohannis
qui me descripsit; letetur, sit sine dampnis ^a.

- Nomine pro Christi dat munus Stephanus ^b isti,
est quia diuinus liber hic, abbas^c Telesinus;
5 Ebulus accepit. Sic abbas dicere cepit:
'Ebule, sume bonum tibi quod modo prebeo: donum
celibis ecce uie. Liber hic est dialogie ^d
celestis regis, retinet moderamina legis.
Laude sub immensa viget ^e illic celica mensa
10 in qua letatur conuiuia, satis recreatur.
Delicie plures ibi sunt quas sumere cures;
est dapibus plenus celestibus atque serenus.
Nectar enim stillat sicientes et refocillat;
qui sitit accedat nec eum sitis aspera ledat.
15 Est liber expletus, polico de fonte repletus,
dogmate prelucens, celestia pabula ducens.
Lectio sanctorum liber est, et sermo duorum
hic recreat mentes, saciat nimis esurientes
fercula sacrarum quia sunt ibi deliciarum.
20 Actibus in claris ibi questio discipularis
uerbaque doctoris satagebant omnibus oris.
Est procul explosum, fuerat quicquid scopulosum;
quo⟨d⟩ ^f tenebris rectum fuit, est ad lumina uectum.
- Ebule, uir Christi, semper sine fraude fuisti;
25 sis saluatoris uestri memor omnibus horis
qui te formauit, qui te quoque magnificauit.
Carmine certa cano sub regno Rogeriano:

Frioli, 'Una poesia da S. Salvatore di Telese al tempo di Ruggero II', *Studi medievali*, 3rd Ser., 21.2 (1980) 855-59. My edition differs from hers in not a few places concerning matters of transcription, interpretation, punctuation, and emendation. Some instances are: (1) her punctuation of ll. 2-3 is not possible because of an indication by the scribe himself as to how the lines should be understood (cf. my note a to l. 2); (2) once the distinction between the colophon, strictly speaking, and the dedicatory poem has been made, the sense of ll. 3-5 becomes clear, and I have construed 'Ebulus accepit' (l. 5) as an independent clause; (3) Frioli's emendation to 'vera' in l. 20 is wrong because the word will not scan, while 'ibi' can be read in the manuscript and satisfies the metrical requirements; (4) in l. 30 'uiam' can be read and there is no need to 'add' it, but it is, however, necessary to supply 'et' for reasons of metre (cf. my note h); (5) in l. 46 it is not necessary to supply the *e*, which is clearly visible, of 'profe⟨rat⟩' ('prof⟨erat⟩' according to Frioli).

- ut te maiorem faciat cum fratribus orem
 menteque deuota rogat ^a istud concio tota.
- 30 Per uiam adiutor sis semper <et>^h undique tutor;
 gaudia tutele des auxiliumque fidele.
 Conprime raptores et eorum pelle furores:
 diligit obscurum tempus manus inproba furum,
 set laqueo pones, tibi rege iubente, latrones;
- 35 ex hoc mercator gaudet nimis atque uiator.
 Sepius oramus, dominum pro te rogitamus,
 uir Iosue fortis Iudee duxque cohortis
 cum Gabaonitis pugnans ad bella peritis.
 Qui bene pugnabat, Moyses, dominumque rogabat,
- 40 orans uincebat magis hoc qui bella mouebat:
 cursus stellarum piger est tun(c)ⁱ luciferarum ^j.
 A domino certa capies super et[ri]hera sarta,
 sumes namque bonam Christo tibi dante coronam,
 post infinitam capies sine tempore uitam
- 45 quam dare dignetur qui cuncta creasse uidetur.
 Profe(rat)^k omnis " Amen " qui scit proferre loquamen '.

^a There is a wavy red line in the manuscript after l. 2 (cf. pl. III); clearly this separates that section of the colophon pertaining only to the scribe from the following dedicatory poem. The division is further marked by the fact that, unlike ll. 1-2 (with intended final rhyme only), ll. 3-46 are in *Leonine* hexameters (with both medial and final rhyme). There is also a paragraph mark added by the scribe in the inner margin at ll. 3 and 24, and they may be construed as indications of division. I have indicated these distinctions among the parts of the colophon by spacing after ll. 2 and 23. ^b Contrary to classical quantity, the first syllable of *Stephanus* is long. ^c *abbas* corrected from *abas*. ^d I have not found other instances of *dialogie*, but an emendation to the attested 'dialogice' would destroy the rhyme in *-ie*. Presumably *dialogie* was formed on the model of Greek abstract nouns, with a long penultimate. Here the long first syllable and long penultimate contravene the classical quantity. ^e *viget* corrected from *vigiet*. ^f There is a small hole in the parchment where the *d* was once written. ^g The reading is uncertain, and there are signs of correction; *rotat* seems to be what is actually read now, but *rogat* is not far removed palaeographically and makes better sense. ^h In the erasure faint traces remain of what was seemingly the *et* ligature; in any case, this or a similar word is needed for purposes of scansion. ⁱ After *tun* the parchment is rubbed, and I have conjectured *c* on the

basis of the amount of space between this word and the following *luciferarum*.^j Josue 10:13. The Old Testament events alluded to in ll. 37-41 are loosely recounted, perhaps because the author of the poem relied on a not too accurate memory. The Gabaonites had become Josue's allies through a trick (Josue 9), and Josue fought the five kings who laid siege to their city (Josue 10:1 ff.). Moreover, it was Josue himself who prayed that time would stand still while this battle was being waged (Josue 10:12). Moses' intervention in one of Josue's battles occurred in the latter's fight with the Amalecites when the Israelites were still in the desert; so long as Moses held up his hands, Josue's forces were victorious (Exodus 17:11). I have construed ll. 37-38 to be vocative in apposition with *te* (= Ebulus) in l. 36; this is in accord with the interpretation of the historical events given on pp. 127-28 below which I believe to have prompted the dedicatory poem to Ebulus. In ll. 39-40 *Moyses* is the subject of *uincebat* and the antecedent of *qui* in l. 39; I have set off this name by commas because of its occurrence immediately after the caesura and its rather odd position owing to metrical requirements in the middle of the line. Frioli, 'Poesia', p. 856 begins a new sentence with *Vir Josue fortis* in l. 37 and places a colon after *rogabat* in l. 39; it is unclear from this punctuation whether *Josue* and *Moyses* are in apposition or contrast to each other, and hence the respective subjects of the verbs in l. 40 are left in doubt.^k There is a small hole in the parchment after *profe* and, given the amount of space, *profe <rat >* seems preferable to *profe <rt >*.

The colophon is quite specific as to the identity of the giver and receiver of the book, namely, Abbot Stephen of Telese (a small town northeast of Naples and near Benevento) and Ebulus respectively. In l. 27 *regno Rogeriano* must refer to Roger II of Sicily, the Norman king who waged fierce military campaigns in Campania during the first half of the twelfth century and came twice to the monastery of San Salvatore in Telese while Alexander was abbot. At the urging of Matilda, the king's sister and wife of Count Rainulf III of Alife, this same Alexander wrote a eulogistic history *de rebus gestis Rogerii* in which he recorded Roger's visits to the monastery. Thus there was a special relationship between the king and San Salvatore which it will be helpful to recall as background to an exploration of the circumstances prompting the gift of the manuscript¹³.

13. The next two paragraphs paraphrase and summarize the events recounted by Alexander of Telese, *De rebus gestis Rogerii Siciliae regis libri IV* 2. 65 (Roger's

Roger II came first to Telesse in July 1134. Seemingly he was near the end of his struggle in the principality of Capua with Rainulf and the other rebel leaders: Nocera had yielded, Rainulf had sought mercy, Hugh of Bojano had asked for pardon, and Raimpotus of Benevento had fled to Sergio of Naples. All in all, it was a favorable time for a visit which seemed to have been prompted as much by curiosity as by a desire to obtain the monks' prayers on his behalf. The monks received him in a manner that accorded well with his rank, coming to greet him on the way with hymns and songs of praise¹⁴. When prayer had been offered in the church, Roger entered the chapter room and, after kissing each of the monks, was received humbly and devoutly into their fraternity at the hands of Abbot Alexander. The king's response was to promise 'goods' (*bona*)¹⁵ to the monastery. He then bade the monks farewell and returned happily to his army. So well under control was the situation, apparently, that Roger remained in the area for three days before proceeding to Capua.

His second visit to San Salvatore took place in September 1135, also under auspicious circumstances. Benevento had received Roger as king, and his third son Anfusus was now prince of Capua. While on the way to inspect the defenses of Guardia and Dragone together with Anfusus and others of his retinue, Roger decided to make a detour to San Salvatore and offer prayers there (presumably in thanksgiving). Once again he was met by Alexander and the monks with songs of praise to God and conducted to the church where he prayed. In the chapter room he gave a brief address and greeted in a very friendly manner (*familiariter*) the abbot and the monks. Then, in the presence of the king, Anfusus was received into their fraternity at the hands of Abbot Alexander. When Roger had eaten and

first visit), 3. 28-29 (Roger's second visit), and 3. 35 (Prior Stephen's trip to Salerno) in G. Del Re, ed., *Cronisti e scrittori sincroni della dominazione normanna nel regno di Puglia e Sicilia*, vol. I (Naples, 1845), pp. 126-27, 142-43, 145.

14. Alexander records the monks' welcome of Roger 'cum hymnis et laudibus' and, on his second visit, 'deo laudes concinendo'. In a rather free and perhaps unwarranted interpretation, S. Montana has taken the 'laudes' sung by the monks to be 'laudes regiae'; cf. his 'Musica, spettacoli e potere politico nel Mezzogiorno normanno', *Quaderni medievali* 6 (1978) 10-13.

15. It is evident from the promises made by Roger during his second visit that the *bona* included property (the mountain above the monastery) and chattels (silver for the altar vessels).

was returning to his room, Alexander took the opportunity to ask him for the mountain above the monastery which had been lost to them for many years. The king promised that the mountain would be restored and that silver would be given for a chalice and two censers as compensation for the sacred vessels taken from the altar by Rainulf, but that the request should be made when Roger was at Salerno. In due course Alexander sent the prior Stephen and another monk to Salerno to remind the king of his promises. Roger gave them the money gladly, and ordered Jocelin, termed *vicedominus* by Alexander, to put the monastery once more in possession of the mountain. This action brought great joy to the abbot and the monks, and prayers were offered daily at morning Mass for Roger and his children.

There are no more references to San Salvatore before Alexander's history ends abruptly in the autumn of 1135. Few though the passages are that connect the king with this monastery, they provide, in fact, three important pieces of information: (a) both the king and his son Anfusius were received into the fraternity of the monks and had, therefore, a special relationship with the monastery, which it was to the monastery's advantage to maintain, particularly in times of trouble; (b) there was a Prior Stephen during Alexander's abbacy; (c) an official of the king was entrusted with the task of making over to the monastery the desired property. Let us see now what significance they have for our colophon.

To begin with Prior Stephen. For the most part, admittedly, the history of the monastery of San Salvatore, Teleso is obscure. The date of its foundation is uncertain, and the names of the few medieval abbots known are Leopold (1075), his successor John (at least by 1098), Alexander himself (d. 1136?), Stephen (November 1144), and John (1298)¹⁶. Evidence for Abbot Stephen is provided by a

16. For the history of San Salvatore cf. F. Pacelli, *Dissertazione critico-storica ovvero Memoria storica della città di Teleso* (Cerreto Sannita, 1775), G. Jannelli, *Relazione intorno all'antico monastero benedettino di S. Salvatore Telesino letta nella tornata del 4 dicembre 1878 alla commissione conservatrice de' monumenti ed oggetti di antichità e belle arti della provincia di Terra di Lavoro* (Caserta, 1879) (the abbots are listed on pp. 5-9), A. M. Iannacchino, *Storia di Teleso. Sua diocesi e pastori* (Benevento, 1900), and D. Marrocco, *L'abbazia di S. Salvatore di Teleso* (Quaderni di cultura del museo alifano 4; Piedimonte d'Alife, 1951) (largely based on Jannelli). Frioli, 'Poesia', 857 states that Alexander died 'verso il 1140-42', but does not cite a

charter issued at Capua, for which he was one of the signatories¹⁷. In light of the date of this charter, it seems possible to identify this Abbot Stephen with the Abbot Stephen of the colophon and donor of the manuscript, and we may suggest that he may have also been the Prior Stephen who was dispatched to Salerno by Alexander.

Ebulus, the recipient of the codex, apparently served Roger in some way (cf. above, l. 34 *tibi rege iubente*). One of the distinguishing features of Roger's reign was the establishment of an efficient administrative system and the appointment of officials with specific duties¹⁸. When Anfusius was invested as prince of Capua, all the magnates of the principality swore allegiance to him in a great assembly; two justiciars were appointed on this occasion (the archbishop-elect of Capua and Hamo of Arienzo), and there is mention of the chamberlain Jocelin. To judge from the documents that have survived, Ebulus can hardly be any one other than Ebulus of Magliano Vetere (Salerno) who was the king's chamberlain in the Terra di Lavoro from 1140 to 1156-60¹⁹. There is abundant evidence of his

source for her information; this date is also given by Marrocco, p. 11 (note, however, that Jannelli, who was Marrocco's source, suggests that Alexander died at the beginning of 1136 [p. 9] since his history ended so abruptly in the autumn of 1135). The entry for 'Alessandro di Telesè' in the *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* notes merely that 'Alessandro era già morto nel 1144'. For the most recent statement on the date of Alexander's death see G. A. Loud, *Church and Society in the Norman Principality of Capua, 1058-1197* (Oxford D. Phil. thesis, 1978), pp. 244-5: 'His work was commissioned as a piece of royalist propaganda, and that it was not widely distributed was because its author died before it could be completed, probably in 1136'.

17. For the charter see M. Inguanez, *Diplomi inediti dei principi normanni di Capua, conti di Aversa* (Miscellanea cassinese 3; Montecassino, 1926), pp. 35-38 (where it is dated to 1143 in accord with E. Caspar, *Roger II. (1101-1154) und die Gründung der normannisch-sicilischen Monarchie* [Innsbruck, 1904], pp. 550-51, no. 158) and A. Gallo, *Codice diplomatico normanno di Aversa*, vol. I (Naples, 1927), pp. 88-90 (who dates it to 1144). The mention in the charter of Prince William, Roger's youngest son, indicates that 1144 is the correct date, for Anfusius, the earlier prince of Capua, was killed on 10 October 1144. See F. Ughelli, *Italia sacra*, vol. VI (Venice, 1720), p. 97 for a charter issued at Salerno and dated November 1144 in which Abbot Stephen of Telesè is one of the signatories.

18. On this subject see the magisterial study by E. Jamison: 'The Norman Administration of Apulia and Capua more especially under Roger II. and William I. 1127-1166', *Papers of the British School at Rome* 6 (1913) 211-481. In my discussion of the role and duties of the chamberlain as reflected in the dedicatory poem, I have followed Jamison in matters of content as well as language.

19. Ebulus of Magliano Vetere is the only official among the justiciars and chamberlains cited by Jamison for Apulia and Capua to bear the name 'Ebulus' and

activity from the time that he first appears in 1140²⁰. Chronologically speaking, then, Ebulus' dates accord with those for Abbot Stephen and Roger II.

The inscription of the book to Ebulus rather than to the king directly is all the more curious in light of the monastery's friendly relationship with Roger himself. Practical motives must have dictated the choice of the dedicatee just as they did in the turbulent 1130s when the monks, led by their abbot, received Roger with every sign of respect and honor they could muster. At that time Roger was the authority to be dealt with; to judge from the colophon, the situation had changed by the next decade and Ebulus now represented that authority. In 1140 a Great Court was held at Ariano, and it is likely that the main issue was the administrative organization of Apulia and Capua. As *camerarius*, Ebulus was a financial officer with both administrative and judicial duties²¹. He could make over to recipients the concessions they had obtained from the king, and he could assign and verify grants of demesne land and grants of privilege and immunity to private persons; he also had the duty of protecting churches which the king brought under his special care. Thus Ebulus was a man of considerable importance whose activities would almost certainly touch upon the monastery's concern at some time or other.

It is possible to see in the colophon a reflection of some aspects of his various duties. At ll. 30-31, for instance, there is expressed the wish or hope that Ebulus will be a source of help and protection in this life (*per uiam*); this may be a reference to his obligation to protect certain churches, and made all the more applicable to San Salvatore, perhaps, by a seeming play on words in l. 25 ('*Sis saluatoris uestri memor omnibus horis*'). The chamberlains were royal

to hold the office before the king's death in 1154. In September 1174 'Ebulus filius marini neapolitanus' was a justiciar for the Duchy of Amalfi (Jamison, *ibid.*, p. 369), but this is too late, of course, for the 'Ebulus' of our dedicatory poem and, in any case, Telese was not located in this district.

20. Jamison, *ibid.* gives six occurrences of Ebulus' name in various documents ('Calendar of Documents', nos. 9, 29, 30, 35, 36, 40). Frioli, 'Poesia', 858 also identifies the 'Ebulus' of the dedicatory poem with Ebulus the royal chamberlain, although in a tentative manner ('Meno sicuramente risolta l'identità di Ebulo') and on the basis of only one document (Jamison, no. 9; T. Leccisotti, ed., *Abbazia di Montecassino. I registi dell'archivio*, vol. 7 [Rome, 1972], p. 241, no. 1379).

21. Jamison, *ibid.*, pp. 398-401.

servants dependent on and answerable to the king. This much appears to be implied by ll. 29-30 where the author of the colophon and the entire congregation pray that the king will show his favor to Ebulus. The chamberlains were also in constant contact with the king, who sometimes gave them orders directly. One example of this was the king's mandate to Jocelin regarding the transfer of the mountain to San Salvatore, and there are two cases documented in which Roger personally gave Ebulus instructions²². Thus, in l. 34, *tibi rege iubente* could very well be an illustration of the relationship between the king and his officer. What Ebulus is actually ordered to do in l. 34, that is, to put down robbers, is somewhat puzzling, for the judicial side of his office was limited to the cognizance of civil cases except, in special circumstances, for those dealing with feudal matters. Criminal cases were usually handled by the justiciars who were the officers responsible 'pro conseruanda pace'. Since, however, the exhortation that Ebulus deal with thieves and robbers (ll. 32-34) immediately follows the plea for help and protection (ll. 30-31), it may be partly a request for action against those who would take away what belonged to the monastery and partly a request to preserve order in general (cf. l. 35: 'ex hoc mercator gaudet nimis atque uiator') — and not to be interpreted in a strict judicial sense.

One of Ebulus' administrative duties concerned the military service owed the king by his subjects. For example, the chamberlain had to ascertain the amount and quality that could be reasonably expected. A reference, then, to Josue and his army would not be out of place, but it is the invocation of Ebulus rather than King Roger himself as another Josue which is surprising, and this, together with the mention of Josue's allies the Gabaonites, may be a clue to a more precise dating of the colophon.

Indeed, it is curious that the allusion to military matters is there at all, for the period 1140-54 was generally a time of peace for Roger's holdings on the Italian mainland; there was some fighting along the papal frontiers in 1143, 1144, and 1149, but these disturbances would hardly have troubled San Salvatore. The real threat to peace

22. At Atina in 1140 when Roger ordered Ebulus to hold an inquest regarding the royal rights and boundaries of the city, and at Sessa (date unspecified) where Roger directed Ebulus to assign a certain watercourse to the citizens for their use; cf. Jamison, *ibid.*, pp. 412-14, 431-32, nos. 9, 35, 36.

came in 1149 when an alliance was formed after the Second Crusade between Conrad III of Germany and the Byzantine emperor Manuel Comnenus who also agreed to undertake a joint attack upon Roger. Among Roger's defense measures was the levy of a *magna expeditio* which was being mobilized by the early summer of 1150 under the direction of the chamberlains and occasionally by the king himself. Ebulus' name figures often in the register of this defense force²³. He was a lesser military tenant, and this is consonant with the fact that the chamberlains were usually of less exalted rank²⁴.

The levy lasted from 1150 to 1168 and was conducted far and wide over Apulia and the principality of Capua. Its scope was of a magnitude that may well have prompted the monastery of San Salvatore to take its own precautionary measure in the form of a manuscript with a dedication to Ebulus that implied a reminder of the close ties which existed between the king and the monks and included a plea for continued assistance from the king's representative who was playing such a major role²⁵. If this hypothesis is correct, the colophon would have been composed and copied between 1150 and 1154. Ebulus is addressed as one who has always been without deceit (l. 24). The use of the perfect tense (*fuisti*) suggests that there has been sufficient time to observe his character, and therefore a time later rather than earlier during his tenure of the chamberlainship would be appropriate.

It should be emphasized that the date 1150-54 just proposed for the colophon is conjectural at best because at present we do not know the *termini* of Stephen's abbacy. What is certain is that the colophon originated between 1144 (the first mention of an Abbot Stephen of Telese) and 1154 (the date of Roger's death).

23. E. Jamison, ed., *Catalogus baronum* (Fonti per la storia d'Italia 101; Rome, 1972), p. xvi and nos. 456, 578, 910-52 passim.

24. Jamison, 'Norman Administration', 384.

25. It is instructive to recall Alexander's final sentence as he concludes his account of the king's dealings with San Salvatore: 'Quoniam itaque bona [the mountain above the monastery and the silver for the altar vessels] semper sunt recolenda, idcirco hanc ipsam Regis beneficentiam conscribi dignum duximus, ut aut ipse Rex reminiscens ad melius peragendum provocetur, aut *alius ejus exemplo, ad simile quid exercendum excitetur*' [my italics] (*De rebus gestis Rogerii* 3. 35 [p. 145]).

COLOPHON AND CONTENTS OF THE MANUSCRIPT

It is surprising to find copied in Beneventan any of the three works contained in our manuscript. At present the Rimini codex is only the second Beneventan witness known of the *Elucidarium*, a treatise composed by Honorius of Autun c. 1100 in England and disseminated throughout most of medieval Europe²⁶. For the *De tribus diebus* (c. 1127?)²⁷ of Hugh of St. Victor and the 'florilegium peccatorium', there appear to be no other Beneventan copies. All three, then, stand out as 'alien' to the Beneventan zone, to be regarded indeed as 'imports'²⁸. The colophon alludes to them in both general and specific terms: the three works are dogmatical in character (l. 16 'dogmate prelucens'); the *Elucidarium* is written in the form of a dialogue between disciple and teacher (l. 17 'sermo duorum' and ll. 20-21 'questio discipularis uerbaque doctoris').

26. New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library Marston 112 (s. XII) is the other Beneventan copy of the *Elucidarium*. Y. Lefèvre, *L'Elucidarium et les lucidaires* (Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 180; Paris, 1954) has discussed the enormous popularity and influence of the work and examined the textual relationships of the manuscripts now in French libraries, dividing them into three classes (pp. 61 ff.). Both Beneventan witnesses exhibit the reading 'Libertas eligendi bonum vel malum' at 2. 7 and so do not contain the 'texte primitif'. Our Rimini codex shares distinctive readings with Lefèvre's family B at l. 185 (f. 16v), 2. 44 (f. 25v), 2. 64 (f. 27v), 2. 76a (f. 29v), and 3. 106 (f. 45r); the New Haven text seems to belong to family A, for it contains, as do the other members of this group, 2. 33a-m (ff. 33v-36v) and it places 2. 28a after 2. 31 (ff. 32v-33r), while it does not display any of the characteristic B readings. I should like to thank the staff of the Beinecke Library for their kind assistance when I consulted the manuscript in March 1981.

27. Cf. B. Stock, 'Hugh of St. Victor, Bernard Silvester and MS Trinity College, Cambridge, 0.7.7', *Mediaeval Studies* 34 (1972) 159: 'Hugh's *Didascalicon* was completed around 1127. In the absence of contrary evidence it may be assumed that the *De Tribus Diebus* dates from the same period.'

28. How did these texts arrive in southern Italy, and particularly at San Salvatore rather than a larger centre such as Montecassino? If more were known about the monastery at Telesse, it would be easier to answer this question; see below, pp. 138-39 for a suggestion regarding a possible channel through which the three works reached San Salvatore. At the same time we may wonder at the paucity of Beneventan manuscripts of the *Elucidarium* since the work was copied so frequently elsewhere (cf. Lefèvre, *L'Elucidarium*, pp. 47-49 and the handlist of twelfth-century manuscripts in V. I. J. Flint, 'The Place and Purpose of the Works of Honorius Au-

Why were these particular works chosen for inclusion in a manuscript dedicated to the royal chamberlain? This is the mystery. The sole information we have about Ebulus comes from documents, and hence we see him only as an official who performs his duty. We know nothing about his personal life and private pursuits, nothing which sets him apart as an individual and might account for the appearance of works by Honorius, Hugh, and an anonymous compiler in the same book. Such a selection is all the more curious because of the differences among the works themselves. The *Elucidarium* fulfilled a 'pastoral' purpose, that is, it could be used to teach Christian doctrine and very often appears in manuscripts together with other texts of a similar nature, the whole serving as a 'manuel de formation' for ecclesiastics or 'manuel de référence' for clerics in the exercise of their ministry²⁹. It is very rare to find a copy of the *Elucidarium* intended for a private person³⁰. The manuscript history of the *De tribus diebus* has yet to be examined thoroughly, but it would seem too that this treatise was popular in monastic circles, a not unexpected result in light of its mystical character and subject matter (the attainment of knowledge of the Trinity through sensible things)³¹. A florilegium which consists of extracts mostly from the Fathers that have to do with sin and related matters also seems an odd choice for a royal official.

gustodunensis', *Revue bénédictine* 87 [1977] 120-22). The different strains of text in the Rimini and New Haven codices seem to underscore further the fact that there was no 'common' exemplar of the *Elucidarium* which circulated freely in the Beneventan zone.

29. Lefèvre, *L'Elucidarium*, pp. 57-60.

30. Laon, Bibliothèque Municipale 146 (a. 1473), copied at Laon by 'un sieur de Flavignies', is a manual of private devotions and is the only instance known to Lefèvre (*ibid.*, p. 58) of the appearance of the *Elucidarium* in a non-ecclesiastical manual. He observes: 'Quoi qu'il en soit, il apparaît nettement que les laïques n'ont eu de contacts directs avec l'*Elucidarium* que rarement et à une époque tout à fait tardive.'

31. For a list of manuscripts of the *De tribus diebus* see R. Goy, *Die Überlieferung der Werke Hugos von St. Viktor. Ein Beitrag zur Kommunikationsgeschichte des Mittelalters* (Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 14; Stuttgart, 1976), pp. 98-114. Many of the 114 manuscripts in his list (which, however, does not include the Rimini codex) have a monastic provenance. The title given for the work in our manuscript (f. 48v) is simply 'Hugonis sancti Victoris tractatus' and does not accord with any of the nine possibilities collected by Goy. Similarly, the incipit ('Invisibilia dei a creatura mundi') is slightly different from the one which he cites ('Invisibilia enim ipsius a creatura mundi') for manuscripts.

I am not sure that it is possible to explain, to any degree of real satisfaction, precisely why these works were chosen. The solution may be simply that the works were not chosen at all with Ebulus in view: the manuscript may have already been copied when the monastery decided to present Ebulus with a gift, and it was easier to give him something already prepared, such as the manuscript, with the addition of the dedicatory poem as a 'personal' touch. This would explain the poem's unusual position at the end of the book when a more logical place would have been at the beginning, as in the case of Montecassino 99, the other surviving instance to date of a Beneventan manuscript with a dedicatory text³². This book was copied at the abbey itself and presented to St. Benedict. Here the purpose is clear and in keeping with the dedicatee: the codex contains a homiliarium and was intended for monastic use. The texts in our manuscript from Telese could also be considered 'monastic', and the book may well have been destined originally for San Salvatore itself.

In one sense the contents were not entirely unsuitable for Ebulus. By giving him the manuscript, the monastery must have wished to continue the special relationship it had with Roger which meant, in concrete terms, protection from loss of property. The relationship had been cemented by the reception of Roger and his son into the fraternity of the monks, and as such it had a religious aspect. Thus the works of Honorius, Hugh, and the anonymous compiler may have been deemed sufficiently awesome to impress and to instruct Ebulus as regards his Christian duty. Certainly a novelty in the Beneventan region, they contained important and weighty truths which could have some influence on his actions towards the monastery. Hence the manuscript would have served its purpose.

But even if the book were not originally intended for Ebulus, there is no reason, palaeographically speaking, to assign it a date that differs radically from the period suggested by the colophon. As noted

32. On this dedication see F. Newton, 'Leo Marsicanus and the Dedicatory Text and Drawing in Monte Cassino 99', *Scriptorium* 33 (1979) 181-205 and pl. 20 (pp. 3, 4). The dedicatory poem is placed below the miniature portraying the donor, recipient, etc. on p. 3. The angel on f. 2r of the Rimini manuscript demonstrates that there was a capable artist at San Salvatore, and, if the manuscript had been intended for Ebulus all along, a miniature with the donor and recipient would have been a logical accompaniment.

on p. 115 above, the codex seems to have been copied by a single scribe. There is no discrepancy in appearance between the script of the colophon and that of the rest of the book other than the varying size of the writing, and this is probably the sign of a 'provincial' scribe. The colophon may have been an afterthought, but one that seems to have occurred, happily, at the same time that the book was nearing completion. Thus the period 1144-54 suggested on p. 128 above as the broad date for the colophon may be put forward for the manuscript as a whole.

SOURCES AND ORIGIN OF THE 'FLORILEGIUM PECCATORUM'

The series of fifty-seven excerpts beginning on f. 72r is arranged in an orderly manner so as to deal fairly systematically with various doctrines pertaining to sin, punishment, and repentance³³. There is no title or preface and hence no immediate clue to the identity of the compiler. The collection begins abruptly with a passage from *Epistle* 164 of Augustine (cf. plate II), and the transition to the next and succeeding excerpts is effected by a wavy line at the end of the passage and often the insertion of the author's name and/or title of the work in red at the start of the next excerpt³⁴ or, less frequently, a kind of subject heading (as in nos. 40, 45-47). Nos. 1, 7, 18, 29, 34-37, 44, 52, 55-57 lack any indication of either author or subject heading. The florilegium ends as abruptly as it began, and also with a selection from Augustine (*De natura et origine animae*).

33. As they appear in the florilegium, only nos. 15 and 33 appear to have no direct bearing on these topics; yet they do have a general connection in that they are linked to the excerpt immediately preceding by a key word (Solomon [15] and resurrection [33]). No. 15 is a truncated version of an excerpt which does bear directly on the issue being discussed (cf. n. 36 below), and possibly there is a similar explanation for no. 33. I have prepared an edition of the florilegium to appear in a forthcoming study.

34. Nos. 3-6, 8-17, 19-28, 30-33, 38, 39, 41-43, 49-51, 53, 54. In no. 2 the heading is 'Idem', which is rather curious as no. 1 lacks a heading altogether. If we exclude nos. 46 and 48 where 'Theodorus' is the abbot who is actually speaking in the *Conlationes* and not the author, the only instances of wrong attribution are in nos. 9 (where the 'Hilarius' quotation is actually a combination of excerpts from Augustine, Faustus of Riez, and Gennadius), 10 (where 'Macharius' is an understandable slip for 'Bacharius'), and 33 ('Gregorius' for 'Hieronymus'). The titles of

Nearly all of the excerpts that have been identified (54) are taken from writings of the Church Fathers. Augustine, who is quoted twenty-seven times from thirteen works, is easily the most popular authority³⁵. A distant second is Gregory the Great, with selections from the *Epistles* (3) and *Moralia in Iob* (5), followed by Jerome (one passage each from his commentaries on Ezechiel and Matthew and five passages from the *Epistles*) and Cassian (six extracts from the *Conlationes*). Ambrose (*De obitu Valentiniani*, *De sacramentis*, *Hexaemeron*) and Bede (commentaries on Mark, Kings, and I John) are each represented three times. Finally, there are single excerpts from Bacharius (*Epistula ad Ianuarium seu De lapso*), Cyprian (*De dominica oratione*), Faustus of Riez (*Sermo* 3), Gennadius (*De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus*), Hrabanus Maurus (*Commentarius in libros Regum*), and a decree of Pope Urban II (no. 27). This decree was issued at the Council of Melfi, held in 1089, and may constitute a *terminus a quo* for the compilation of the florilegium, although, of course, it could also have been simply added to an earlier existing collection. Another indication of date is furnished by nos. 10-12 (passages from Bacharius, Bede, Hrabanus Maurus) which appear to be derived from a letter of Fulbert of Chartres written c. 1024³⁶. Nos.

works cited are all correct; in nos. 21, 32, and 38 the book number given does not correspond with the numbering used in modern editions.

35. *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* (no. 34); *De bono coniugali* (no. 16); *De ciuitate dei* (nos. 2, 32); *De consensu euangelistarum* (no. 42); *De Genesi ad litteram* (nos. 13, 39); *De natura et origine animae* (nos. 56, 57); *Enarrationes in psalmos* (nos. 6, 36); *Enchiridion* (nos. 28-30, 35); *Epistulae* (nos. 1, 5, 9, 26, 37, 51, 52); *In Heptateuchum (Quaestiones Leuiticae)* (no. 41); *Retractationes* (no. 22); *Sermones* (nos. 24, 43 [Ps.-Augustinus]); *Tractatus in Iohannis euangelium* (no. 38).

36. F. Behrends, ed. and trans., *The Letters and Poems of Fulbert of Chartres* (Oxford, 1976), no. 92, pp. 166-68 (= no. 65 in PL 141.233B-234A). These passages are part of a catena on the salvation of Solomon, a topic of some concern to the eleventh and twelfth century; for other instances of catenae on the same subject see A. Mundó, 'Una lettera di s. Pier Damiani sulla salvezza di Salomone', *Benedictina* 5 (1951) 19-26, R. W. Hunt's addenda to R. Loewe, 'Alexander Neckam's Knowledge of Hebrew', *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies* 4 (1958) 29-34, and U.-R. Blumenthal, 'Canossa and Royal Ideology in 1077: Two Unknown Manuscripts of *De penitentia regis Salomonis*', *Manuscripta* 22 (1978) 91-96. The texts given by Hunt and Blumenthal are particularly close: of the eight patristic excerpts printed by Hunt, nos. 1-5, 7, 8 are also found in Blumenthal's version and in exactly this order. Hunt's no. 2 corresponds to our no. 14 (which, however, is a much longer version), and our nos. 15 and 10, if combined in this order, would be almost the equivalent of his no. 6. The text of Hunt's no. 6 is helpful in perceiving the relation of our no. 15 to the

8 and 9 are 'multiple', consisting of brief passages from different authors³⁷. I have not been able to locate the sources of nos. 7, 18, 55, and the end of no. 51.

To the important questions regarding the origin of the florilegium, its circulation and purpose, only a very guarded answer can be given at present. Our manuscript appears to be the sole witness in Beneventan writing, nor have I been able to find other copies of this work among the numerous surviving manuscripts of the *Elucidarium* and the *De tribus diebus*, both of which are transmitted together with much miscellaneous material including texts of a florilegial character³⁸. Given, however, the situation that there is much still to be explored in the area of florilegia derived from biblical-patristic sources, it would be imprudent to claim that the Rimini codex is the unique exemplar. Certainly, it would be helpful to know of the existence of other copies, for they may well provide clues to the appearance of the florilegium in our manuscript and hence to the culture of medieval southern Italy.

So far as the origin of the florilegium is concerned, a very cautious suggestion may be put forward that it is not likely to have been the Beneventan zone, and thus it is as much of an import as

general theme of the salvation of Solomon. In the Hunt version, our no. 15 begins the excerpt and is then followed by 'Super quem locum ait sepe iam dictus Ambrosius (*sic*): « Salomon ille mirabilis... »' (= our no. 10).

37. Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 2195, 'Poenitentiale Discipuli Umbrensiensis' (s. viii ex., written at Salzburg) contains a very early version of no. 9, although the excerpts are not arranged in precisely the same order as in our florilegium; for the Vienna codex as well as other manuscripts written in or having some connection with Salzburg and exhibiting the excerpts on the Eucharist, cf. R. E. Reynolds, 'Canon Law Collections in Early Ninth-Century Salzburg' in *Proceedings of the Fifth International Congress of Mediaeval Canon Law. Salamanca, 21-25 September 1976*, eds. S. Kuttner-K. Pennington (Vatican City, 1980), p. 20 and n. 28. Similarly, Burchard, *Decretum* 5.18, 15 (PL 140.756) and Ivo, *Decretum* 2.28, 25 (PL 161.167, 166) also give the excerpts, though again they are arranged somewhat differently.

38. I examined the manuscripts either personally or on microfilm or consulted the catalogue descriptions for the 265 codices of the opera omnia of Honorius listed by Flint, 'Works of Honorius Augustodunensis', 119-27 (n. 28 above) and the 112 copies of the *Elucidarium* listed by H. Düwell, 'Noch nicht untersuchte Handschriften des *Elucidarium* von Honorius Augustodunensis', *Scriptorium* 26 (1972) 337-42, and the 114 witnesses of the *De tribus diebus* listed by Goy (n. 31 above), and could not locate another copy of the Rimini florilegium. Nor, curiously enough, did I find another manuscript which contained both the *Elucidarium* and the *De tribus diebus*.

the *Elucidarium* and *De tribus diebus*. The grounds for this inference, which, it should be stressed, is only tentative at best, are the kinds and combinations of texts that tended to be copied in Beneventan scriptoria. Naturally due allowance must be made for the fact that not all manuscripts written in Beneventan have survived or even been located, and also that many Beneventan codices are now represented by only a few leaves. Still, even when such serious considerations as these have been taken into account, florilegia, apart from canonical collections, do not appear to have constituted a stock item in the répertoire of Beneventan scribes. To date, there are only three instances of compilations that, properly speaking, can be termed 'florilegia', namely, Cava 3 (s. xi ex.), Montecassino 384 (s. x in.), and Montecassino 580 (s. xi). The first two utilize many patristic sources but do not exhibit the systematic order of the Rimini text, while the third is a 'Lexicon prosodiacum' drawing on classical authors. A fourth florilegium connected with medieval southern Italy is Venice, Bibl. Marciana Z. l. 497 (1811) (s. xi), copied in ordinary minuscule from a Beneventan exemplar and arranged by its compiler, Lawrence of Amalfi, with a view towards the traditional liberal arts³⁹.

Some further light may be thrown, also in a tentative way, on the Beneventan attitude towards florilegia by an examination of the combination of texts in individual codices. To judge from a survey of the contents of extant manuscripts in Beneventan, and with due allowance here also for the vagaries of bookbinders, we may say that the concept of 'florilegium' as applied to the entire codex was not one that found favor at all periods of the script. On the average, it is the older manuscripts that are more likely to contain works of diverse character, the contents as a whole smacking more or less of the hodgepodge. Some examples are Paris, Bibl. Nationale lat. 7530 (a. 779-797: various grammatical texts, calendar, computistica, etc.), Rome, Bibl. Casanatense 641, ff. 1r-81v (a. 811-812: various works of Alcuin on the Trinity, ecclesiastical computus, calendar, Easter tables, *De aetate mundi* of Bede, etc.), and Montecassino 3 (a. 847-

39. We may note that, generally speaking, apparently there are not many extant pre-thirteenth century florilegia that can be assigned to Italy; cf. B. Munk Olsen, 'Les classiques latins dans les florilèges médiévaux antérieurs au XIII^e siècle', *Revue d'histoire des textes* 10 (1980) 54, who observes the modest contribution of Italy in this regard and lists the four manuscripts named here as the only instances that he has found.

892: astronomica, Alcuin's works on the Trinity, *De aetate mundi* of Bede, etc.). Manuscripts of the eleventh century and later tend to contain single works or works by the same author or various works assembled primarily for monastic purposes⁴⁰ or designed to illustrate certain types of subject matter⁴¹. As suggested on p. 131 above, the Rimini codex may have been originally destined for the monastery of San Salvatore itself, and thus its contents, which would seem to be of interest to the monks, follow the general norms for manuscripts of this period which contain diverse texts; it is only the choice of texts that is unusual.

Another point to be considered is the matter of the compiler's sources, which is interesting in itself and also bears on the question of the origin of the florilegium. It is impossible to tell in every instance whether or not he excerpted the passage directly from the work concerned or from intermediaries, including other florilegia. In the case of excerpts consisting of selections from more than one author (nos. 8, 9) and the catena on the salvation of Solomon (nos. 10-15), he surely took these from intermediaries; the same may also be true of excerpts where the transition from one passage to another of the same work is effected by the phrase 'Et post pauca' (nos. 25, 30, 35, 56). For the sake of demonstration and completeness, let us suppose that our compiler was indeed working in the Beneventan zone: would he have had access to individual manuscripts of the texts cited as well as to intermediate sources? If we restrict ourselves to extant Beneventan codices written before the middle of the twelfth century, a certain indication that the works were available in medie-

40. e. g., Montevergine 2, s. xi: Basilii (*Admonitio ad filium spiritualem*), Evagrius (*Sententiae*), Caesarius Arelatensis (*Sermones*); Vatican Lib., Vat. lat. 4955, s. xi: Vetus Testamentum (Paralipomena), Hrabanus Maurus (*Commentarius in libros Regum*), Augustine (*Confessiones, Soliloquia, Quaestiones in Vetus et Novum Testamentum*); Vatican Lib., Vat. lat. 3542, s. xii in.: Regulae Pachomii, Serapionis, Marcharii; Montecassino 47, a. 1159-73: Regula s. Benedicti, Breve chronicon Casinense, Martyrologium, Homiliae breves, Necrologium Casinense; Vatican Lib., Vat. lat. 5949, s. xii ex.: Martyrologium, Regula s. Benedicti, Sermones, Necrologium, Ordo ad monachum faciendum.

41. e. g., Montecassino 189, s. xi: Boethius (*De arithmetica*), Gerbert (*De numerorum diuisione*), Bede (*De temporum ratione*), Isidore (mathematical excerpts from the *Etymologiae*); Vatican Lib., Barb. lat. 160, s. xi: Herbarium, Galen, Priscianus, Oribasius; Vatican Lib., Ottob. lat. 1406, s. xi ex.: Porphyry (*Isagoge*), Cicero (*Topica*), Boethius (*De topicis differentiis, De hypotheticis syllogismis, De diuisione*).

VERITVR

qđ nemo sciat qđ sit dñs.
 & ualde absurdū uidet̃ no
 bis adoptis qđ nesciamus.
 Jaceq; die in qđ sit dñs.
 Quoniam hominū hęc
 scis. dñs est substantia
 spūalis om̃i inestimabilis
 pulchritudine

hęc qđ sit



divis
 quem
 ineffabi
 lē

suavitatis. uel angeli qui se proprio solē suā uincunt
 pulchritudine hęc dñs est om̃i inestimabilis spūalis.

D. Quomodo inaccessibilis est mater uerū dñs. an. Aspice
 solē. In quo sunt om̃ia. Ignis substantia. splendor. clar
 lor. Quid inaccessibilis sunt inestimabilis uel uel in
 splendoris hęc hęc. p̃ uel mundū solē. Et si uel
 caelostm̃ am̃ p̃. se hęc hęc caelostm̃ solē. Ignis hęc
 substantia inaccessibilis p̃. in splendoris hęc. in caelost
 m̃ sem. D. Quis uocat p̃. an. qđ ip̃s est
 fons & origo equo om̃ia p̃. cui sapientia hęc uoc
 au. D. Quis hęc. an. qđ uel splendor & solē. uel hęc
 a p̃ hęc. D. Quis sp̃s solē. an. quia cornū

p̃ hęc
 hęc

añ hęc.

desiderium dēnoꝝ bonoꝝ p̄sūpimus. J̄dō t̄m̄ x̄p̄s s̄c̄co
 die motuus est. Sep̄timo die in sepulchro lacuꝛ. Dec̄
 uo die resurrexit. uo similit̄m̄ p̄m̄u- p̄c̄c̄t̄m̄q̄e Indit suo p̄c̄
 mot̄m̄ nos acc̄t̄ualib; desideris f̄of̄ occidat. De Indit script̄m̄
 q̄e Indit suo lacus in orb̄e d̄c̄o cōc̄m̄plac̄t̄ōis s̄c̄p̄t̄yca. p̄c̄
 ot̄mo benignitas Indit suo p̄desideriu- diuini amoris ui
 uis uoc̄at̄ s̄c̄uiḡit̄ fecer̄at. q̄e s̄c̄c̄us d̄c̄t̄ ad lab̄ot̄m̄. Sep̄
 t̄imus ad sequit̄m̄. Dec̄imus p̄m̄t̄ ad resurrex̄ōn̄t̄m̄.



E ILLO HOMINE

p̄mo pecc̄to ḡn̄t̄is human̄is x̄p̄s ad Infit̄os
 x̄p̄s descendens cum Indit lib̄t̄er̄it̄. Sed̄
 f̄it̄ acc̄t̄e cōstr̄at̄. quod fact̄ nō Incent̄
 c̄d̄id̄it̄ c̄d̄id̄it̄ est. unde cumq; hoc c̄d̄id̄it̄m̄ fiat. & si c̄d̄o
 nic̄sum s̄c̄t̄ p̄c̄t̄at̄ h̄nc s̄p̄s̄l̄ō nō p̄f̄t̄at̄ c̄uoc̄at̄. quā
 q̄ illud q̄ Inhib̄o s̄c̄p̄t̄is s̄c̄t̄ p̄c̄t̄ est. H̄c̄ illu- qui p̄m̄us s̄c̄
 c̄us est pecc̄t̄. oib; c̄t̄ct̄um cum solus s̄c̄ c̄t̄at̄ c̄ustodiat̄ &
 edux̄at̄ illum ad h̄c̄o suo. & d̄d̄at̄ s̄ūiūat̄m̄ om̄ia cōc̄m̄nd̄i.
 maḡs p̄h̄oc̄ s̄c̄c̄t̄is̄ quā pullo c̄l̄o Inat̄l̄eac̄i f̄c̄c̄t̄e uind̄ic̄.

Adam Insep̄c̄us diuini s̄c̄uiḡit̄ acc̄t̄s Id̄m̄.

In s̄o s̄c̄l̄y p̄c̄t̄at̄ uo ūn̄iāc̄l̄e c̄t̄d̄it̄e s̄c̄ c̄om̄issum.

Continenti...
lomy qm...

quis... Nam et corporalem hominis oculum quis n. d. fingit.
Ejam puca o. q. no. scate. se. in ipso. Et cum seppagint. are
cessat e. Cum g. spm hois in ipso fingat. questendu e uatu no
na insufflacio. an a. seppagint. Et post peuce. Neq. de
nichilo inge. q. sedo p. 2. num. — — — — —

Homini ho...
Horum su...
omnibz tam pro...
bul qd...

Inter udy...

Asinemontana.
Lafizemontana

P ermaenaw filix stiny psona rotul.

A ut me desepia. laudat sic sine dampnis.

N omine px. dicit muni sacphari uhy.

E st qe diuinus lyber hic. abas celestis.

E bulus acceptus. sic abbas dicit cepia.

E bulb sumit bonus. q. g. in pte donum.

C elisus ace us. lyber hic est dialogus.

C elisus stans. stans in mediana laus.

L ande sub i mensa. us et ille eliae in se.

J nique laudat. coruua sacys pteuata.

V elias plus ibi sum. q. sum est cutes.

E st dicit plen celestis. acq. seculus.

N eacor tu sllac. siertat et ptecellac.

Q uisqz accedat. nre tum sias asp. ledac.

E st lyber sepleo polyo de sonac seplent.

D ymarat pluctus. celestis ptebulo ductus.

L itto seoz lyber est. seplimo duoz.

H ic sepleat macl. sacrao unis elupent.

Hominis...

Am...

Faint, illegible handwritten text.

Fugulae seceper q' t' ibi delieraz .
 A cap' inelapsi . u' quillo discipulati .
 V' q'ho que docent . seceperbiem omib' op' .
 E' st' poul' sepleu' . fustax q' q' scop' .
 A' uel' q'nt' s' p'canu' furo . est adli' .
I E' uale' ut' z' . stimp sine st'ouit' f' .
 S' is saluacopi' ut' . m'emo' oib' .
 Q' uat' forma' . q'at' q'q' me' mis'carua' .
 C' ap'ant' e' p'ae' ce'no . sub' p'q' .
 V' a' at' me' tot' . seceper . cum' s'p' .
 M' enat' que' d'icant' . p'canu' istud' co'cio' .
 P' s' u' . ad' u' . s' s' .
 C' a' u' d' i' a' e' u' a' l' l' e' .
 C' o' p' m' s' .
 D' i' y' g' e' r' .
 S' i' l' e' q' u' e' .
 E' x' i' o' e' .
 S' e' p' u' s' .
 V' i' r' i' o' s' u' s' .
 C' u' m' .
 Q' u' i' b' e' n' e' .
 V' i' o' s' u' s' .
 C' u' s' .
 A' d' i' o' .
 S' u' m' i' s' .
 P' o' s' t' .
 Q' u' e' m' .
 P' o' s' t' .



Plate IV - Rimini, Bibl. Civica Gambalunga SC-MS. 74, f. 89v.

val southern Italy, the results show that many, but not all, could have been at his disposal. First, he could have selected the quotations from Augustine in nos. 13, 24, 26, 34, 42 from Eugippius whose *Excerpta ex operibus Augustini* was copied in the Beneventan zone (e.g., Montecassino 13, s. xi ex.), although all except no. 13 are also preserved in Beneventan copies of the works themselves⁴². Likewise, the passages from Augustine in nos. 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 16, 28-30, 32, 35-38 are found in extant Beneventan codices⁴³. Other 'Beneventan' authors represented in the florilegium are Bede (nos. 25, 50)⁴⁴, Cassian (nos. 40, 44-48)⁴⁵, Gregory the Great (nos. 17, 19-21, 31, 49, 53, 54)⁴⁶, Jerome (nos. 3, 4, 8, 14, 33)⁴⁷, and Hrabanus Maurus (no. 12)⁴⁸. On the negative side, some other works of Augustine (nos. 22, 39, 41, 43, 45, 51, 52, 56, 57), Bede (no. 11), and Jerome (no. 23) have not yet been located in Beneventan writing, nor are there known to be Beneventan witnesses for Ambrose (nos. 8, 9, 15), Bachiarius (no. 10), the 'multiple' excerpts (nos. 8, 9), the catena on the salvation of Solomon (nos. 10-15) or the letter of Fulbert of Chartres from which nos. 10-12 in the catena seem ultimately to be derived.

Adding up the figures, we find that well over half the excerpts are taken from authors whose writings circulated in the Beneventan zone. This, however, is not as weighty an argument as it seems for

42. No. 24 (*Sermo* 71) = Montecassino 11, pp. 249-262 (s. xi); no. 26 (*Ep.* 167) = Montecassino 16, pp. 44-54 (s. xi); no. 34 (*Contra Faustum Manichaeum*) = Montecassino 13 (s. xi ex.); no. 42 (*De consensu euangelistarum*) = Montecassino 20 (s. xi). The passages from Augustine in the florilegium do not correspond to any of those in Prosper of Aquitaine's *Sententiae ex operibus Augustini*.

43. Nos. 1, 5, 37 (*Ep.* 164 and 130) = Montecassino 16 (s. xi); nos. 2, 32 (*De ciuitate dei*) = Montecassino 28 (s. xi); nos. 6, 36 (*Enarrationes in psalmos*) = Montecassino 27 (s. xi); no. 9 (*Ep.* 54) = Montecassino 168, pp. 236-238 (s. xi); no. 16 (*De bono coniugali*) = Montecassino 170 (s. xi/xii); nos. 28-30, 35 (*Enchiridion*) = Montecassino 230 (s. x ex.) and 575 (s. ix); no. 38 (*Tractatus in Iohannis euangelium*) = Montecassino 22 (s. xi), 105 (s. xi), and 113 (s. xi).

44. No. 25 (*In Marcum*) = Montecassino 40 (s. x); no. 50 (*In I ep. Iohannis*) = Montecassino 180 (s. xi).

45. Nos. 40, 44-48 (*Conlationes*) = Montecassino 51 (s. xi), 52 (s. xi), 53 (s. xi), 54 (s. xi), and 314 (s. xi, Desiderian); Vatican Lib., Vat. lat. 3549 (s. xi ex.).

46. Nos. 17, 53, 54 (*Ep.* 7 and 9) = Montecassino 71 (s. xi med.).

47. Nos. 3, 4 (*Ep.* 39 and 60) = Montecassino 91 (s. xi); no. 8 (*Ep.* 147) = Vatican Lib., Vat. lat. 356 (s. x); no. 33 (*Ep.* 55) = Vatican Lib., Vat. lat. 355 (s. x).

48. No. 12 (*In libros Regum*) = Montecassino 133 (s. xi).

the assembling of the florilegium in this area since these same authors also circulated freely in other places and there is included no author of 'local Beneventan' interest. Now it may be instructive to speculate briefly on the purpose of the florilegium. Its focus on sin as a main theme and the orderly arrangement suggest that the collection of excerpts was meant to serve as an aid or point of departure for the composition, probably in the twelfth century, of a theological work dealing with these points. Certainly the appearance of similar topics at this time in Sentence collectiones, or in a treatise such as the *Elucidarium*, and the use of Augustine as the chief authority support his hypothesis⁴⁹. There are no twelfth-century collections of Sentences that survive in Beneventan script such as there are in France and Germany⁵⁰. This genre was apparently not in favor in the Beneventan zone, and hence the purpose of the florilegium, if it be such as I have suggested, would be at odds with a Beneventan origin.

The corollary question now to be asked is this: how, then, did such a 'foreign' combination of 'pastorale, mysticum, peccatorium' find its way to Telese? The answer may lie in the link that had been established some fifty years previously between the monastery of San Salvatore and Anselm of Canterbury. In the spring of 1098 Anselm, after his cordial reception in Rome by Pope Urban II, proceeded to Liberi, a village on a mountaintop not far from Caserta, his guide and companion being Abbot John of San Salvatore, a former pupil of Anselm's at Bec. Anselm spent several months at Liberi and finished the *Cur deus homo* there before attending the Council of Bari in October⁵¹. Honorius, who is thought to have studied with Anselm at Canterbury, composed the *Elucidarium* around or before 1100,

49. On the similarity of subject matter in Sentences and the *Elucidarium*, see F. Bliemetzrieder, 'L'oeuvre d'Anselme de Laon et la littérature théologique contemporaine. I. Honorius d'Autun', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 5 (1933) 277-81. For the preeminence of Augustine as an authority for both, see J. Gross, 'Die Ur- und Erbsündenlehre der Schule von Laon', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 76 (1965) 12-13 and Lefèvre, *L'Elucidarium*, p. 193.

50. Cf., e. g., the Sentence collections published by O. Lottin, *Psychologie et morale aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles*, vol. 5 (Gembloux, 1959) and H. Weisweiler, *Das Schrifttum der Schule Anselms von Laon und Wilhelm von Champeaux in deutschen Bibliotheken* (Münster i. W., 1936).

51. R. W. Southern, ed. and trans., *The Life of St. Anselm Archbishop of Canterbury by Eadmer* (Oxford, 1972), 2. 29-30 (for Abbot John and Anselm see p. 106 n. 1).

possibly before 1097 when Anselm began his travels⁵². It is not impossible that the 'tie' between Anselm and San Salvatore is ultimately somehow responsible not only for the arrival of Honorius at Telese but also the other two works since they are of the sort that would have been available to or were read in circles such as that of Anselm and, later on, his pupils⁵³. Obviously this suggestion would gain much in plausibility if we knew more about the dates and literary interests/activities of Abbot John. Obviously, too, it is tempting to speculate that Anselm could have brought the *Elucidarium* with him to southern Italy and that the text of the Rimini manuscript may be a copy of a very early witness. This will become clear only after an exhaustive investigation of the manuscript tradition, a task that still remains to be done. In the meantime it may be helpful to point out that Lefèvre's B strain is found both in our codex and in the bulk of the early English manuscripts⁵⁴, a fact of considerable interest given the assumption that the *Elucidarium* was actually written in England.

52. For the influence of Anselm on Honorius and its subsequent bearing on the date of the *Elucidarium*, see Lefèvre, *L'Elucidarium*, p. 194 and V. I. J. Flint, 'The Chronology of the Works of Honorius Augustodunensis', *Revue bénédictine* 82 (1972) 219-20.

53. Is it merely a coincidence that the florilegium appears in the same codex which also contains a work of Honorius, or is there some connection between the florilegium and Honorius? There is attributed to Honorius a collection of patristic excerpts on free will which is printed in PL 172.1226-30 immediately after his *De libero arbitrio libellus* (1223-26) and described there (1226) thus: 'Sententias autem Patrum de libero arbitrio et gratia (quas inter opuscula Honorii repertas ad verbum subnecto) videtur ipse Honorius pro elucidatione sui opusculi collegisse.' Clearly a number of topics in the florilegium are handled in the *Elucidarium* (e. g., citing Lefèvre's edition, I.101 = no. 29, II.79 = nos. 18-20, II.95 = nos. 7-8, II.100 = no. 25), and we may wonder if Honorius followed a similar procedure in collecting *auctoritates* as a point of departure for the composition of the *Elucidarium*. Whether or not he did, and, if he did so, are the excerpts to be identified with those in the Rimini manuscript — these are questions which remain open to discussion. The inclusion in the florilegium of a decree of Urban II may also be an indication of a connection with Anselm and his circle, since Anselm had dedicated to this pope the second version of the *Epistula de incarnatione verbi* and, as has already been noted, was received by the pope at Rome in a friendly manner.

54. Cf. V. I. J. Flint, 'The Original Text of the *Elucidarium* of Honorius Augustodunensis from the Twelfth Century English Manuscripts', *Scriptorium* 18 (1964) 91-94.

CONCLUSION

The undisputed facts to be gleaned from the colophon of Rimini SC-MS. 74 are these: the codex was copied during the reign of King Roger by a scribe named John at the command of Stephen, abbot of a monastery at Telese, and dedicated to Ebulus. From the evidence of charters and other historical sources, the personages named by the scribe can be identified as King Roger II of Sicily (1130-54), Stephen who was abbot of the Benedictine monastery of San Salvatore, Telese in the 1140s, and Ebulus of Magliano Vetere who served Roger II as chamberlain for the principality of Capua from 1140 to 1156-60. Thus the manuscript must have been written between at least 1144 (the first mention of Abbot Stephen in surviving documents) and 1154 (the date of Roger II's death). Certain internal evidence in the colophon allows us to surmise that the actual date of copying falls between 1150 and 1154, and that the dedication to Ebulus may have been an afterthought prompted by a sense of impending conflict between Roger and his opponents which might signify trouble for the monastery.

The contents of the manuscript further support the hypothesis that the codex was not originally destined for Ebulus since the selection of works by Honorius (*Elucidarium*), Hugh of St. Victor (*De tribus diebus*), and an anonymous compiler ('*florilegium peccatorium*') would seem to be an odd choice for a royal official. All three appear to be 'imports' to the Beneventan zone, and their inclusion in a manuscript from Telese may possibly be explained as a result of the connection between Anselm of Canterbury and John, his former pupil at Bec, who was abbot of San Salvatore in 1098 and served as Anselm's guide and companion when Anselm came to southern Italy in the spring of that year.