Francia. Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte
Herausgegeben vom Deutschen Historischen Institut Paris
(Institut historique allemand)
Band 27/1 (2000)

DOI: 10.11588/fr.2000.1.46588

Dürkop, Studien zur Geschichte der europäischen Skulptur im 12./13. Jahrhundert, Frankfurt a. M. 1994, passim.

Christian FREIGANG, Göttingen

Bernhard BISCHOFF, Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der Wisigotischen). Teil I: Aachen-Lambach, Wiesbaden (Harrassowitz) 1998, XXVIII–495 p. (Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für die Herausgabe der mittelalterlichen Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz).

The achievements of the Carolingian renaissance have come to be seen as rooted in a tremendous expansion of the production of books during the course of the ninth century. Since 1930 all attempts to describe and evaluate those Carolingian manuscripts which have survived have been dependent on the unsurpassed learning and generosity of Bernhard Bischoff. The great catalogues, of Latin manuscripts prior to the ninth century, of classical manuscripts copied before 1200, of early liturgical manuscripts, of manuscripts of capitularies, gospel books or works of individual authors, all drew on his expertise. His verdicts on the date and the localization of manuscripts acquired an authority which all too often appeared to justify omission of any of the arguments which he had furnished in support of those verdicts.

Bischoff's authority depended on an unrivalled first-hand knowledge of surviving western manuscripts copied before the end of the millennium, and an unrivalled visual memory of the scripts of these manuscripts. The sophistication of his monograph on the writing centres of south-eastern Germany (Die südostdeutschen Schreibschulen und Bibliotheken in der Karolingerzeit) has not been acknowledged: it was the first attempt to map the development of scripts in a region, rather than a scriptorium. From the 1950s he had conceived the project of a catalogue which would date and localize all surviving continental manuscripts copied east of the Pyrenees in the ninth century. The first volume, containing slightly over one third of the material now in libraries from Aachen to Lambach, has now appeared, and must transform our understanding of Carolingian culture.

Since scarcely any early medieval manuscripts offer direct evidence as to their origins, students of early medieval manuscripts have tried to localize them in the major scriptoria and libraries of great religious houses on the basis of their scripts. A small number have been seen as the products of royal or imperial patronage, chiefly because of their decoration. Many Carolingian manuscripts can only be grouped by their script, which may have distinctive features not yet attributable to a particular centre, these groups may display the skills of a scribe rather than a school. Bischoff's catalogue – depending on an unequalled palaeographical investigation of each manuscript or fragment – provides an analysis of surviving Carolingian manuscripts as deep as it is wide-ranging. For an exemplary account of a script difficult to localize the entry for Cologne 100 should be read in full.

In general the laconic prose requires exegesis. The descriptions are terse – but Bischoff was always terse. While he had the visual equipment to reflect very fine distinctions, palaeography has not established a vocabulary to describe such distinctions. He described hands as ›anspruchlos‹ (Göttweig 499), ›diszipliniert‹ (Chigi Frag. 9), ›fest‹ (Cologne 29), ›gleichmäßig‹ (Copenhagen Gl. Kgl. S. 1338), ›hart‹ (Karlsruhe Aug. Perg. 108), ›länglich‹ (Kiel K.B. 144), ›streng‹ (Brussels II 2206), ›leicht‹ (Cambrai 471), ›regelmäßig‹ (Einsiedlen 347), ›rundlich‹ (Colmar 49), ›spröde oder schlecht geschlossen‹ (Hague 130 E 15), ›etwas unausgeglichen‹ (Colmar Fragm. 274), and ›unruhig‹ (Karlsruhe Aug. Perg. 111). Few readers will find it easy to make these distinctions meaningful, especially without photographs. Some descriptions offer more clues: specific letter-forms may be noted, especially

open *a* and round *d* (which suggest an early date), the shape of *g* and the form forms of ligatures with *r*. But whether when Bischoff described scripts as ›diszipliniert‹ and ›fest‹ or ›regelmäßig‹ he had a clearly articulated sense of the values of these nuances, and whether those values can be recovered, remains to be seen. Bischoff's way of describing the homes of manuscripts reflects a similar degree of sensitivity to his material, hampered by our lack of historical knowledge about scriptoria. Thus manuscripts are attributed to ›Reims‹, ›Reims oder Umkreis‹, ›Reims, Umkreis‹ and ›Reimser Einfluß‹. Sometimes the palaeographical analysis is highly sophisticated. Florence Laurenziana pl. XIV 15 is a manuscript of Boethius which was begun in a scriptorium on the Loire, and continued in the script of Fulda, with marginalia perhaps by Lupus. Berlin Phillipps 1741 is a *Collectio Dionysio-Hadriana* copied in Reims minuscule of the time of Hincmar, but frequently interrupted by hands ›from different schools‹. Cambrai 352 presents an unresolved problem: is the change of script ›durch Willkür des Schreibers oder doch durch Handwechsel zu erklären?‹

Yet Bischoff's command of his material has brought us far closer to an understanding of the world of ninth-century book production. These succinct descriptions also include a wealth of detail about what can be found in the manuscripts: corrections, sketches, glosses, neumes and later entries in the manuscript are all frequently noted, often by a series of abbreviations. (The list of abbreviations employed fills seven pages, each in two columns of fifty lines.) These listings are of importance to art historians and musicologists, for much of what Bischoff records represents random additions not found except by a comprehensive search. These added entries and names can help to establish the provenance of the manuscripts, but I note that Bischoff is very careful not to use tenth-century entries to suggest anything about the ninth-century home of a manuscript. To quote one example, Copenhagen Gl. Kgl. S. 170 2° was given to St-Germain-des-Près by Gundoinus in the late ninth century, but Bischoff did not think that it was copied there.

It is important to stress that, before his death in 1991, Bischoff had seen proofs of the text for manuscripts in libraries from Aachen to Köln, but had left gaps for Erfurt, Gotha, Halberstadt, Halle and Hildesheim, and for some items which required further checking. Bischoff's ›Summarisches Programm‹ of 1955 has been reprinted at the beginning of this volume in place of a new introduction, his own table of abbreviations, bibliography and index were never written. This volume was subsequently prepared for the press by Brigitte Ebersperger, working for the Bavarian Academy, what she has edited and supplied may not necessarily be what Bischoff intended us to read. As he continued to consider the grouping and dating of manuscripts he sometimes changed his mind, so that the sequence in which he saw manuscripts and their problems may be of telling importance. When it is possible to establish the date at which he saw manuscripts, it becomes clear that some entries are the fruit of examination made in the 1950s or earlier, supplemented by work from photographs. In the 1980s Bischoff seemed much more ready to attribute manuscripts to Auxerre, or Fleury/Auxerre than he was in this catalogue: of those manuscripts linked with Auxerre in an unpublished list of the 80s, Amsterdam 73 (Caesar, *de bello Gallico*) is here probably Fleury, and Angers 148 (Cyprian) is attributed to Angers. Some of the verdicts of 1991 must also have been provisional ones.

Bischoff worked by attributing manuscripts to scriptoria. In this volume the scriptoria of Arras, Cambrai, Cologne, Corbie, Fleury, Freising, Fulda, Lorsch, Lyons, Mainz, Murbach, Reichenau, Reims, St-Amand, St-Denis, St-Gall, St-Germain-des-Près, Tours, Verona, Werden and the court of Louis the Pious each have more than ten surviving manuscripts. Other manuscripts are grouped together by their scripts, even though it is not clear where they were copied. The vast majority are only localized to regions: West Germany, Southern Germany, France, Eastern France, and Northern Italy. So for most of the manuscripts included in this catalogue palaeography has not yet been able to supply precision in the analysis of the protean variety of regional letter-forms. Is this because the formal con-

ventions of Caroline minuscule might reduce the distinctive features which aid the localization of earlier cursive scripts? And are those features of script and abbreviation which have enabled palaeographers to suggest sequences of development in a writing centre less the result of formal training in a scriptorium and more the result of shared implicit assumptions about written language among scribes – who were prone to change script to suit the copying of different sorts of text? Until we have more monographs about the evolution of scripts in Carolingian writing centres we cannot answer such questions. Bischoff himself investigated how Salzburg adopted the script of St-Amand when Arno became archbishop, and how scripts changed at Lorsch and Regensburg. Further detailed investigation of developments in script such as the change from insular to continental script in manuscripts from Fulda (see Cologny 84 + New York Academy of Medicine 1, Hippocrates and Apicius, or Bern 234, Cassiodorus) will be essential before we can understand how and why such scripts change.

This volume does not supply enough evidence to evaluate all the products of any one scriptorium, but the large number of Tours bibles and gospel books included which were clearly copied for export shows why Bischoff believed Tours was particularly influential in the spread of Caroline minuscule. Nor was Tours alone in copying books for other places: sacramentaries copied at St-Amand are now in Cambrai and Harvard; a life of Amandus went to Ghent, a copy of Martin of Braga from St Amand came to Anglo-Saxon England (Cambridge Corpus Christi College 430); and the Prachtcodex of Bede's computistical works went to Reims (Berlin Phillipps 1895). Reims was probably copying canon law texts for export. To my own list of manuscripts copied at Corbie for export Bischoff has added Brussels 15111–15128 (a martyrology), grammars in Florence San Marco 38 and a leaf of Jerome's life of Hilarion (now Darmstadt 3710).

In exploring how books circulated from one house to another in this period palaeographers have been slow to learn the lessons of John Contreni's study of Laon: in ›The Cathedral School of Laon from 850 to 930‹ he described how a major Carolingian school survived without a significant scriptorium, procuring books from other houses and not least from the gifts of its schoolmasters. While the concept of the school is new to palaeographers, the ›Schulzentrum‹ has a significant place in this catalogue. Instances include Florence Ashburnham 1899 (a copy of Valerius Maximus) copied by ›sehr verschiedene Hände‹ and Bern 180 (Hegesippus) possibly copied as ›Gemeinschaftsarbeit in einem Schulzentrum?‹ Berlin Lat. Qu. 690 (works of Augustine probably from Mainz) is the work of scribes from Mainz, Reims and St-Amand and of two insular scribes. These scribes are regarded as working within the circle of the Irish teacher Probus, who died in 859. Here palaeographical analysis has allowed Bischoff to suggest a context. Probus is known as a friend of Walahfrid Strabo and Lupus, and he gave Reims 130, a copy of Hrabanus on Exodus, to the Reims Cathedral Chapter.

Anyone concerned with the function of books should learn from this catalogue. Liturgical book types are well differentiated (although not yet indexed). Another important question, the distinction between institutional and private ownership of books, is sometimes elucidated by evidence provided here. Yitzak Hen has recently suggested that Brussels 10127–10144 was copied for a priest. This hypothesis is confirmed by a late ninth-century entry ›*de servitio domni episcopi et archidiaconi*‹ about dues to be paid by a rural church. Bischoff printed this entry and noted that the manuscript was copied by several hands working in an unspecified north-eastern French scriptorium. Other candidates for priest's books might include the Fragments of a pocket-format copy of the *Canones Theodori* (Basel N 1 6 no. 44), which was written with ›large spaces between the words and groups of words‹, or Basel F III 15 e (ff. 10–15, *De discretione orationis dominicae*), copied at Fulda in ›singulärer persönlicher karol. Min.‹ Colophons recorded by Bischoff identify a priest named Ainardus as one of the scribes of a gospel book, now Avignon 22; the Breton priest

Martin copied the *de decim categoriis* in Avranches 229, Bern 50, a Josephus, was given to Micy by a priest named Augustine, Bern 831 is a copy of Remigius on Matthew copied by a priest called Thomas for a deacon called Rachinald; Berlin Lat. Fol. 270 is a southern French lawbook copied by a priest named Martin for Count Aymohenus, and Breslau R. 108 (Orosius) was copied by the priest Rismar for Bishop Theodgrim of Halberstadt who died in 840. It is worth speculating whether any of these priests was working in a monastery, and how their work was recompensed.

To what extent can we infer the availability of a text or book-type from the number of surviving copies? Every parish priest was supposed to own a lectionary. But few have survived. The catalogue has only eight lectionaries among its 2038 entries (including Epinal 105, copied around 800, which does not seem to have been studied). Lectionaries, however, must have been among the most common types of book in the Carolingian world. Seventy-two gospel books are listed in the catalogue. Were they really ten times as common as lectionaries, or merely ten times as likely to be preserved? There are eight surviving copies of the *Regula Benedicti*, including three which are glossed (and the *Glossae super Regulam S. Benedicti* in Brussels 15111–15128 part 2 surely deserve an edition). Palaeographers are wary of such statistics, but it may be significant that in this volume of the catalogue Hrabanus is the most frequent Carolingian author, followed by Alcuin. There are six manuscripts of Hrabanus's works copied at Fulda, and eleven not from Fulda. The most popular works of Carolingian authors are Smaragdus's *Expositio Libri Comitis* and Paul the Deacon's *Homiliarium*. Each was copied throughout the ninth century all over the Carolingian empire.

How is this volume to be used? Its model is *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, but without a set of plates comparable to CLA it will remain as difficult of access as Bischoff's earlier work. His great article on Chelles was published without any plates, for he assumed that his readers would be able to find all the volumes and articles listed in his footnotes. The terse descriptions in the catalogue are a summary of what Bischoff had seen, often using photographs. The only means of evaluating Bischoffs palaeographical verdicts is to look at the details, and so it is imperative that the Bavarian Academy publish a volume of the plates which they helped Bischoff to obtain. To develop a palaeographical eye, the best method is to look at a manuscript described by a master until you have understood why that master has selected certain features of the manuscript as significant. Therefore these descriptions cannot be a substitute for the manuscripts, nor can these dates or localizations be a substitute for that detailed examination which every manuscript deserves. The dating of manuscripts can only achieve precision when textual, historical or scientific arguments are assembled to sustain a date. Assumptions behind the palaeographical notions of ›early‹, ›Generation‹ or ›region‹ must be investigated in situations and periods where scribal careers can be securely documented. In this respect early medieval palaeography is always going to be more tentative than work on Italian humanistic script.

One important consequence of Bischoff's catalogue will be a further re-evaluation of *Codices Latini Antiquiores*. There are over twenty items here which were not included in CLA though dated s. VIII/IX. But many items in CLA have an equally vague date. The year 800 had no palaeographical significance, and when Lowe and Bischoff imposed it as a boundary they excluded some manuscripts clearly copied in the reign of Charlemagne which might well have been included. By Volume X they had realised that it was better to be more inclusive than they had been in earlier volumes.

Clearly the catalogue must be used by editors to ensure that manuscripts are correctly dated and not misplaced in a stemma. In one of the shortest entries Bischoff has redated Hildesheim Dombibliothek 31 (Boethius, *de Arithmetica*), previously thought to have been copied for Bernward of Hildesheim, to the middle third of the ninth century. Florence Laurenziana pl. XII. 21, a copy of the *de Civitate Dei* once owned by Sassetti was exhibited in Florence in 1997, where it was dated to 1100. In fact Bischoff thought it was copied at Tours

in the third quarter of the ninth century. Its readings remain unrecorded. Those who choose to approach the work via its index may be disappointed. This volume has indices of manuscripts cited in addition to the catalogue entries and of ›Schreiborte und Schriftprovinzen‹ (where Bischoff offered several possibilities all have been indexed), but lacks indices of names of authors, scribes, or owners and types of book. The localizations depend on modern geography, so that Belgium and the Netherlands become ›Schriftprovinzen‹. Though there are five entries under England all have queries beside them: many are Werden manuscripts, most probably copied at Werden. The reader who searches for the bibliography on the manuscript which was in Hernstein until the Second World War, and of which photographs apparently survive in Leipzig, will learn much about Anglo-Saxon medical illustrations of the ninth century.

There is rich material here for original research on countless topics. I urge a study of Reginbert, the librarian and scribe of Reichenau, who is associated here with twenty-six manuscripts (now chiefly in Karlsruhe). I look forward to an edition of the late antique glosses on the *City of God* copied in the margins of manuscripts in Angers, Brussels, Cologne and Copenhagen. What is the late ninth-century *Consuetudo Monastica* added on ff. 243v–244r of Cologne 60? There is material for political historians too. Bischoff links two manuscripts with Pippin of Aquitaine. Cologne 125 was the copy of the 836 Synod of Aachen made for him at Aachen, Bern 303 is a copy of the same text made in haste in the circle of Jonas of Orleans. A study of these manuscripts must reveal the mechanics of relations between the Carolingian episcopate and the imperial chancery and so clarify how far Louis the Pious had regained control of his empire after the events of 833. Annotated civil and canon law manuscripts such as Berlin Lat. Fol 269 or Lat. Qu 150 (which has a ninth-century flyleaf with verses from Martial) will also repay investigation.

This catalogue is essential reading for early medievalists because of its range of material and because it records the verdicts of the greatest expert on that material. In several cases these verdicts have explicitly been revised from earlier published accounts of Bischoff's views. It was never intended to provide more than a laconic palaeographical account of much of that material, and it is those details and groupings which Bischoff alone could see which will take us further. Thus the catalogue will be the securest starting point for anyone who wants to find Latin manuscripts copied in the ninth century, many of which are misdated in all other published accounts. (The catalogue also lists and provides brief descriptions of manuscripts which had previously been incorrectly dated in the ninth century.) In 1955 Bischoff described his project as a ›Hilfsmittel‹ and hoped for detailed monographs which would draw on it. It is our duty to make the most of the help he has so generously assembled.

The following ninth-century manuscripts which were not seen by Bischoff can be added. For knowledge of those in Cambridge I am indebted to Michael Gullick. The descriptions follow Bischoff's model:

CAMBRIDGE University Library, Ms. Dd.12.54. Wandalbertus, Opera poetica.
51 leaves (f. 35 is an inserted slip); 149 x 118mm, written space 100 x 73mm; 21 lines. At least four hands, the smallest on ff. 27–28 and 31–35. Poor rustic titles. On the outer flyleaves a letter to an archbishop of Reims; on the verso of the front flyleaf a text on ›*Dies Egyptiaci*‹; on f. 51r (back flyleaf) a text on Ides and Nones. F. 15v: *Hymnus in Laude Beati Amandi*; f. 50v *Ymnus de Festivitate Sci. Lupi Episcopi*. Contemporary marginal notes and corrections, including the obits of Hachaldegarius and Wandalbert on f. 38r. – Reims, after 850.

Ms. Ff 3.34. Eucherius, Instructionum Liber.
5 leaves (misbound, f. 3 should follow f. 5); 279 x 190mm, written space 235 x 160mm, 27 lines. One hand which gets increasingly smaller; f. 1v, exzellent Franco-Saxon initial I with animal terminals followed by monumental capitals; f. 5r *gauffredus cumparavit istum librum*. – Franco-saxon, first third of the ninth-century.

CHAPEL HILL University of North Carolina Rare Book Room, Ms. B785 P2 1572 (parchment cover of printed book). Single leaf of Epiphanius Latinus, Sermo 41.
One hand, writing capitals followed by minuscule. – Germany, first half of the ninth-century.

David GANZ, London

Die nichtarchivischen Handschriften der Signaturengruppe Best. 701 Nr. 1–190, ergänzt durch die im Görres-Gymnasium Koblenz aufbewahrten Handschriften A, B und C, bearbeitet von Christina MECKELNBORG, Wiesbaden (Harrassowitz) 1998, VIII–623 p., 48 pl. (dont 16 en couleurs); index, incipitaire (Mittelalterliche Handschriften im Landeshauptarchiv Koblenz, 1).

Ce catalogue fournit la première description scientifique de 90 manuscrits médiévaux, c'est-à-dire d'environ la moitié des volumes de ce type qui sont aujourd'hui conservés dans le Landeshauptarchiv de Coblence. Les manuscrits qui appartiennent en propre à l'établissement sont en nombre restreint. La plupart des entrées correspondent à un dépôt, effectué en 1908, des manuscrits du Gymnase de Coblence, qui restent la propriété de la Stiftung Staatliches Görres-Gymnasium. Cinq volumes, qui en 1911 avaient été déposés à la Stadtbibliothek de Trèves, sont revenus à Coblence en 1988, où ils ont rejoint le reste du fonds. Trois autres, cotés de A à C, se trouvent toujours dans les locaux du Gymnase: un bréviaire commandité vers 1336 par l'archevêque de Trèves, Baudouin de Luxembourg; une Bible du XIII^{e} siècle de la Chartreuse de Mayence, reliée avec un missel et un bréviaire à l'usage de cette maison; un livre d'heures enluminé du diocèse d'Utrecht, copié à Delft vers 1455–1465. Il s'agit de trois manuscrits prestigieux qui sont longuement analysés aux p. 449–480 et sont illustrés par 9 des 16 planches en couleurs.

Le Gymnase de Coblence a connu une histoire mouvementée, et ses manuscrits sont de provenance variée. Le fonds initial est celui des Jésuites de la ville, qui avaient acquis en 1580 les livres d'une maison de Chanoines réguliers de saint Augustin, fondée en 1428 dans l'île de Niederwerth (»monasterium beate Marie uirginis in insula sub Confluencia«). Après la suppression des jésuites en 1773, leur collège conserva sa fonction d'enseignement dans un autre cadre institutionnel, et, sous l'administration française, c'est lui qui recueillit les fonds des établissements sécularisés en 1802: franciscains, dominicains et chartreux de Coblence, carmes de Boppard, ainsi que divers manuscrits, dans des circonstances plus obscures, de la Collégiale de Münstermaifeld. Un professeur du Collège, Joseph Görres (1776–1848), profita des troubles de l'époque révolutionnaire pour acquérir près de 200 manuscrits ayant appartenu aux bénédictins de Saint-Maximin de Trèves et aux Cisterciens d'Himmerod: en 1840, il donna une partie de sa collection (environ 80 volumes) à son ancienne école de Coblence.

Ces différents enrichissements furent, hélas, contrebalancés par des prélèvements dont se rendirent coupables les autorités françaises et prussiennes. A l'aide de documents d'archives, l'auteur a relaté en détail les confiscations des années 1794 et 1796 et la gabegie consécutive à l'installation de l'administration française. Son étude est excellente et fait bien la différence entre les années d'occupation militaire (1794–1797) et celles de l'annexion à la France (de facto à partir de 1797; en droit après 1801). Coblence devint alors préfecture du nouveau département de Rhin-et-Moselle. Sur le rôle que joua l'ex-bénédictin Jean-Baptiste Maugérard, nommé en 1802 ›Commissaire pour la recherche des sciences et arts‹, on consultera désormais l'article fouillé de Bénédicte Savoy, »Codicologue, incunabuliste et rabatteur. La mission de Jean-Baptiste Maugérard dans les quatre départements du Rhin (1802–1805)«, dans: Bulletin du Bibliophile (1999) n° 2, p. 313–344. Pour juger de la politique culturelle sur la rive gauche du Rhin, il faudrait la comparer systématiquement à celle