

**UCLA**

**Comitatus: A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies**

**Title**

A Matter of Context: Early Medieval Use of Origen's Discussion of the Arts

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0ds9q63f>

**Journal**

Comitatus: A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 8(1)

**ISSN**

0069-6412

**Author**

Gottfried, Johanna von

**Publication Date**

1977-10-01

Peer reviewed

A MATTER OF CONTEXT:  
EARLY MEDIEVAL USE  
OF ORIGEN'S DISCUSSION  
OF THE ARTS



*Johanna von Gottfried*

Available to the early medieval student in the classrooms of monastery or cathedral schools and, it seems, in the Carolingian court schools as well, were several different traditions of curricula for studies. Among them is a short introduction to the arts which illustrates in a striking way the influence of Cassiodorus' *Institutiones* in the early Middle Ages.<sup>1</sup> The text of the treatise appears to have been very fluid. It is found, for example, in a ninth century Bible of French origin dated by Bernhard Bischoff to the year 821 A.D., Paris B.N. lat. 11505.<sup>2</sup> This version of the text admirably suits its Biblical context. But a copy of it, or of its exemplar, is scribed on two folia and a singleton of a manuscript in Leiden, B.P.L. 28, of Beauvais provenance, which otherwise contains a tenth century collection of Horace's poetry glossed from the commentaries of Acro and Porphyry.<sup>3</sup> Here the text is quite incongruous, but it was the first place the reader had encountered the treatise.

This version of the text presents a tripartite division of philosophy, some inelegant diagrams of the same, glossed by excerpts from the section on dialectic in Cassiodorus' *Institutiones*. This is followed by a discussion of types of interpretation.<sup>4</sup> The medieval compiler recognized Cassiodorus' source for the discussion of active and inspective arts which follows Ammonius' scheme of the parts of philosophy presented in diagrammatic form in the third chapter of his second book.<sup>5</sup> This source is Origen's *Tractatus* on the Song of Songs in Rufinus' translation, which Cassiodorus tells us his library at Vivarium possessed.<sup>6</sup> The compiler followed up by excerpting from the preface and first chapter of Origen's *Tractatus*, to supplement and reiterate the theory of interpretation and its relation to the divisions of the arts that he had found. The compiler of this version of the text, who cannot be later than the early ninth century and may very well be earlier, had both a copy of Cassiodorus' *Institutiones* and some version of the treatise on the arts at his disposal. He recognized the excerpts of Cassiodorus in this little treatise and did what several generations of scholars have failed to do: he found out what Cassiodorus' source was in his library at Vivarium. Even if the excerpts from Origen do not show scholarly investigation toward the end of the so-called Dark Ages, but instead only demonstrate a familiarity with certain texts, we are reminded in a humbling fashion that the science of scholarly examination of textual transmission supplements, but cannot substitute for, familiarity with the texts themselves.

The text of the compiler's copy of Origen's *Tractatus* on the Song of Songs, to be distinguished from his *Homiliae*, seems to have been quite good. Baehrens' edition posited a tradition for the rare *Tractatus* to the tenth century, but here we have indication that it was in use in the ninth century as Baehrens had conjectured from the dissemination of Cassiodorus' library.<sup>7</sup>

The usual form of the treatise was in the grammar compendium context. It was not unusual for a grammar compendium to contain discussions of the arts in general before launching into the exposition of Latin syntax. More importantly, it was not unusual for a Christian grammarian to extract from Patristic commentaries discussions of syntax and interpretations.<sup>8</sup>

Although the work is attributed in one manuscript to Marius Victorinus, it seems usually to have been entitled "Dynamius Grammaticus ad Discipulum Suum ait." Cardinal Mai cast doubt on the idea that this might be the same Dynamius who, in the sixth century, made such a poor show as governor of Marseilles (Gregory of Tours' *Hist. Franc.* VI, 7 and 11). In 1852 Mai published the only edition of this treatise from the

famous Lorsch manuscript Vat. pal. lat. 1746, in *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca* vol. 1:2.<sup>9</sup> But this is only one of the grammar contexts in which this treatise is found.

The Lorsch manuscript is an early copy of that sent by Paul the Deacon at Monte Cassino to Charlemagne before 782 when he went to the Court. It corresponds to item 412 in the Lorsch catalogue reproduced by Becker.<sup>10</sup> In an article in 1958, "Eine verschollene Einteilung der Wissenschaften," Bernard Bischoff drew attention to eight ninth century manuscripts and one of the tenth century containing variations of the text.<sup>11</sup> B.P.L. 28 in Leiden must be added to the list, and also the famous Add. C. lat. 144 in the Bodleian, an eleventh century Italian manuscript from Monte Cassino copying an eighth century exemplar with Cornish influence.<sup>12</sup> One of the manuscripts that Bischoff mentions, of Bamberg and dating from the tenth century he thinks to be either Breton or Cornish. Insular symptoms are evident in the transmission of this text. It seems that the form of the work took shape in Italy, for our two Monte Cassino contacts point to early exemplars. If St. Riquier catalogue item 51 indicates where Paul the Deacon's contribution to the Palace School ended up,<sup>13</sup> the pseudo-Dynamian grammar was there early in the second quarter of the ninth century during the reign of Louis the Pious. It seems to be more than a coincidence that the only early catalogue which mentions Origen's *Tractatus* on the Song of Songs (as distinguished from his Homilies) is that of St. Riquier. Item 79, "In cantica canticorum, qui sunt libri IV," refers to the preface and commentary in four Books of Origen.<sup>14</sup> Thus we can place and put a terminal date on the variation from pseudo-Dynamius' grammar made expressly for the Biblical context. Further, item 173 in the catalogue, "Quaestiones septem artem" seems to describe the work and follows the listing of seven psalters.

How did this text in the context of the Horace manuscript in turn make its way to Beauvais? That is more difficult to say. The earliest catalogue we have of Beauvais is the eleventh century donation of Roscelin, master of the song-school at the cathedral. This list of books contains a Horace (item 10), but it is not necessarily the same tenth century manuscript that is housed in Leiden. The donation of school texts seems to have left Beauvais quite quickly, for they do not show up in the later catalogues.<sup>15</sup>

But there is a notation in a fifteenth century catalogue which corresponds exactly with B.P.L. 28. That is item 16:

Item epistole et sermones Oracii in uno volumine, sine asseribus, incipientes in secundo folio "rara inventus", et in penultimo folio "dumque Chrysis"; precii viii solidorum.<sup>16</sup>

It is clear that the first pages of the manuscript were ruled for the Horace only. It was some individual scribe's idea either to use the parchment for another purpose or to add to the already completed Horace manuscript an introduction to the arts on the first two un-inscribed folia. He had to add a singleton to complete his copy of the excerpts from Origen, and this was bound in the wrong order much later. But it must be admitted that early readers seem to have been of the same opinion as the cataloguer who described these fragments of rhetoric and theology as of little worth.<sup>17</sup>

The recto of the first folio is almost illegible, but it contains a very interesting diagram of the cosmos. This seems to be a visual interpretation of Philosophia's Hymn to the Creator in Book III of the *Consolatio Philosophiae*, which begins "Tu triplicis mediam naturae cuncta moventem/ conecdens animam per consona membra resolvis . . ."

You, fixing the soul of triple-formed Nature at the center of the universe, resolve its movement through harmoniously joined members.

The usual procedure in glosses on the text seems to have reflected the schematization of Isidore<sup>18</sup> or even to have fused Boethius' vision with that of Pseudo-Clement's world-egg in the *Recognitiones*.<sup>19</sup>

A slightly later addition to the general presentation of the arts, a diagram of the parts of rhetoric, can only come either from Boethius' *de differentiis Topicis* or his little work *Locorum Rhetoricorum Distinctio* which made the schematization more easily available. These highly interesting diagrams suggest more than we can ascertain of school culture in tenth-century northern France, and the use of at least one text which has not heretofore been considered in use this early in the Middle Ages.<sup>20</sup> I hope to have an opportunity of addressing the topic of Boethius' use circa 900 A.D. and a little later at another time.

The profuse *probationes* of many pens on the first three folia, together with the overwriting of the *ex libris* on the first page, let us know that the effort was not taken seriously by the eleventh century readers of the manuscript, probably because it was already illegible from not having been bound in boards, and because it was out of context. But there seems to have been some effort to trace the text anew.

Within its proper contexts of grammar book and Bible aid, the early popularity of pseudo-Dynamius' compilation indicates its influence in the late eighth century and the ninth in Italy, Germany, and northern France. These are precisely the general areas in which Cassiodorus' *Institutiones*

themselves seem to have exerted some influence through insular transmission. The two Books of *Institutiones* have been discussed by Pierre Courcelle and Leslie Webber Jones as having two separate traditions in the Middle Ages, one of which alone could not have generated the little work. But it is at least possible that the text as it was edited by Mai may represent what was to accompany the first Book of Cassiodorus' *Institutiones* if the second were lacking, thus supplying the missing discussion of the arts. The insular transmission of Cassiodorus' *Institutiones* has been described by Courcelle and Jones and is quite evident from the manuscripts.<sup>21</sup> Those precious and few manuscripts from Vivarium which were preserved at the Lateran and brought to England were treated with care. In some cases the actual manuscripts, in others, English copies, made their way to the continent, notably Corbie. But still other texts from Vivarium were transmitted from the Lateran to the Carolingian court as Courcelle points out.<sup>22</sup> However, the enthusiasm over the influence of Cassiodorus in the Middle Ages waned when scholars were unable to perceive the direct effects of his catalogue of books at Vivarium upon the monastery and cathedral school libraries.

In 1901 Herbert Bloch published "Ein karolingischer Bibliothekskatalog aus Kloster Murbach" in a Strassburg Fest-Schrift. The more recent work of Prinz, Schuling, and Milde rely on the identification of a catalogue in a Colmar manuscript as a copy of the ninth-century list of books at Murbach.<sup>23</sup> Murbach is in south-eastern France, is closer to St. Gallen than to Lorsch, was founded from Reichenau and, together with Reichenau was entitled the "Vivarium peregrinorum" in the age of Pippin and Charlemagne. Not without reason: for Milde has proven conclusively that part of the catalogue is a list of books falling into the categories delineated by Cassiodorus. Furthermore, the *Desiderata* list is in part taken from the list of books noted by Cassiodorus which Murbach evidently did not possess.

I would like to suggest that at least part of this catalogue is older than the foundation of Murbach. The list of Bede's works is very long and is not a list of incipits or titles only, but contains modest descriptions of the works in the first person. The "auctor huius registri" is Bede, at the end of his *Ecclesiastical History*, where he lists his writings, from which the cataloguer excerpts his finding list.<sup>24</sup> As Milde points out, Freising and Lorsch had finding lists.<sup>25</sup> But this cataloguer enlightens the concept by matching his library against that of Cassiodorus. He also makes use of the list in Augustine's "Contra Julianum" and in his *Retractations*. These last excerpts are not preserved in the first person format. Could an

insular "bibliothecam Vivarium peregrinorum" of sorts have been devised for missionaries and scholars headed to the continent? If so, its relations to this catalogue, its initial form, and any responsibility of Pirmin, the attributed founder of Murbach and Reichenau are still unclear. But the dependency of the cataloguer on Cassiodorus' *Institutiones* is strikingly clear.

If we turn to the little text with which we began, we notice another aspect of it that is characteristic of the period in which it was popular. In the grammar in the Lorsch manuscript, no less than three traditions on the arts are represented. The grammar treatise proper draws largely from the grammarian Audax, an excerptor of Terentius Scaurus. Audax states that the arts are of three sorts, of the soul, of the body, and mixed. Our grammarian quotes this division, but then presents the five mixed arts as the corporal ones. These five are the agricultural arts, wrestling, medicine, mechanical arts, and the arts of building. The seven arts of the soul are the poetical, music, astrology, grammar, rhetoric, law and philosophy. The grammar continues to draw from Audax, supplemented by Priscian, Servius and Herodianus. It seems to me at least arguable that the tradition is here Italian as well as insular. Herodianus is cited for his discussion of syllabification, and the citation may merely indicate a borrowing from Martyrius. Both Martyrius and Audax seem to have had a strong tradition at Bobbio. Jerome's discussion of the invention of letters and borrowings from the grammarian Pompeius show the eclectic tendencies of the compiler of this treatise, who often names his sources. The heavy reliance on Audax may indicate that the seventh century was the period in which the treatise was assembled.<sup>26</sup>

The general introduction to the grammar has very little to do with it and sandwiches two more divisions of the arts into a discussion of interpretation. It begins with a series of antitheses between the way of the world and the way things ought to be. The author ends with a prayer, and then begins a series of questions on the arts. He attributes to Plato a tripartite division of philosophy into physics, ethics and logic. This differs from the division of theoretical, practical and logical, or rational, arts which he presents later.

Physics he divides into seven disciplines: arithmetic, geometry, music, astronomy, astrology, mechanics and medicine. The tradition of this division, as Bischoff has shown,<sup>27</sup> was surprisingly influential, passed on by Aldhelm, Rabanus and in the manuscripts of Alcuin where diagrams presented this schematization. Origen seems to have had an influence on Jerome, who passed on this tradition. Our author's discussion of ethics is confined to a broad definition and enumeration of the four virtues. Logic

is defined as the "ars quae cuncta rationabiliter considerat, ut a falsitate veritatem discernat." It is divided into rhetoric and dialectic. Isidore, who also presents this last division in his compilation of definitions of philosophy, again attributes it to Plato. But the tradition is Stoic, as is further shown in the definitions of dialectic and rhetoric that pseudo-Dynamius gives:

Dialectica est quae per disputandi regulam intellectum mentis acuit, veraque falsis distinguit . . . et in disputandi efficacia quattuor haec agit: proponit, adsumit, confirmat, concludit: id est proponit problema, adsumit doctrinam, confirmat testimoniis, concludit perfectione. Rhetorica . . . Adsimulatio veri, ubi adsimulatur veritas magis quam dicatur; ubi ratio dicendi. . . .<sup>28</sup>

For pseudo-Dynamius, grammar is not included in these structures, and he asks, "Is grammar a true art?" In answering the question, he compiles the description of grammar as the art of emending faulty prose with Jerome's criterion for "scientia pietatis": reading and understanding the prophets, believing the Gospel, and obeying the dicta of the Apostles.

It is at this point that he attaches a new division of the arts which is so like that of Cassiodorus' source, Ammonius. Indeed, the only difference is that, where Cassiodorus and Ammonius present a dual division of theoretical and practical arts, our author adds *Logica*, which he divides, as did Aristotle the syllogism, into dialectical disputation, apodictic demonstration and sophistry.<sup>29</sup>

The version of the text devised for the Biblical context presents only this classification system and the accompanying diagrams. A three-fold theory of spiritual interpretation, including "scientia tropologica", follows.

All of these divisions of the arts are conceptualizations of them as parts of philosophy. But they are not harmonious with Origen's views on why certain of the Greeks do not count logic as a fourth major division, to be added to physics, ethics and "theorican" or inspective arts. If logic is the exercise of reason, it is to be found throughout the three named categories.<sup>30</sup> In Cassiodorus' period, it is Boethius who transmits the notion that logic is an instrument of philosophy, rather than a branch of it. In the introductory pages to his first Dialogue on Porphyry's *Isagoge*, he sketches his division of the arts which, as Shiel has shown, derives from some Greek source, other than Ammonius of Alexandria.<sup>31</sup>

Various schematizations of the arts abounded. Whether Isidore, who draws so much from Cassiodorus, had before him a compilation of various divisions of the arts would be difficult to say. Alcuin in his *Dialectica* himself passes on the variation from Isidore on the four-fold division of physics, retaining the division of logic into rhetoric and dialectic and passing



on the distinction of Varro between these two.<sup>32</sup> The placement of diagrams in ninth century manuscripts and earlier must have made these divisions very vivid for the audience, as Bischoff reports.<sup>33</sup>

Diagrams were employed by Victorinus, Cassiodorus and early glossators to accentuate for the schoolroom the structure of what was to be memorized. When, as in Add. C. lat. 144 we see what is more an illustration than a diagram, we realize that the purpose was aesthetic as well as didactic.<sup>34</sup> There the grammar compendium seems to be a show-piece of insular grammatical erudition at Monte Cassino, culling from various authorities, notably Paul the Deacon, from a grammar which is not identical with that edited from the Lorsch manuscript in Rome.

I have only touched on some of the interesting material compiled in "Dynamius Grammaticus ad discipulum suum ait." In B.N. lat. 11505, the seven wise men reported by Diogenes Laertes and Demetrius Phalerus are listed with their (mostly) appropriate aphorisms in Greek capitals and Latin translations. There are other indications of Greek sources in this manuscript. Indeed, the number of versions of the text has yet to be determined. The rearrangement and selection of content to suit context is a sign of the fluidity of texts to which Bischoff has called attention. In schoolbooks, the transformations of compilations can be seen as evidence of use rather than indifference to known textual traditions. The important thing to see in the varying shifting divisions of the arts is a desire for arrangement. The early Church Fathers passed on structures which were incorporated in glosses and treatises. We have also been reminded, once again, of the influence of Cassiodorus in transmitting the views of the Fathers, and in the selection and organization of the readings of divine and secular texts.

**Johanna von Gottfried** received her B.A. in English Honors and Philosophy from the College of Holy Names in Oakland and her M.A. from the Department of Rhetoric, UC Berkeley. She is currently finishing her dissertation on interpretive theory in early Medieval school books and hopes to be awarded the doctorate in June, 1977.

#### Notes

1. I wish to thank the Regents of the University of California for a Regents' Traveling Fellowship 1974-75 which made possible my exposure to manuscripts and texts of the early Middle Ages.
2. Bernhard Bischoff, "Eine verschollene Einteilung der Wissenschaften," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et litteraire du moyen age* vol. 25 (1958), pp. 5-20. Reproduced in *Mittelalterliche Studien* Band I (Stuttgart: Hiersemann,

1967), pp. 273-288. See n. 2 of his article, in which he lists some manuscripts containing parts of the text.

3. B.P.L. 28 appears to me to have been written early in the tenth century. Its relations to other Horace manuscripts has not yet been disclosed. Chatelain long ago pointed to the resemblance with B.N. lat. 7972, which is not from this area, and which he dates "à la fin du IX<sup>e</sup> ou au commencement du X<sup>e</sup> siècle." (p. 24, col. 1; Plate 28 and p. 23, col. 2). He believed both manuscripts to derive from the same exemplar. Indeed, part of the fourth quire is to be found in the Paris manuscript. The median measurement of the first three folia is 300mm x 200mm. Emile Chatelain, *Paleographie des Classiques Latins* (Paris, 1884), t. 1.

H. Omont (*Recherches sur la Bibliothèque de Beauvais* [Paris, 1916]) notes that B.P.L. 28 was long a Beauvais manuscript because of the ex libris on 1<sup>r</sup>. He fails, however, to do more than describe the first folio (p. 82), and to list the manuscript (p. 88) among the Beauvais catalogue entries (Roscelin 10; s. XV catalogue, items 16 and 120; s. XVII catalogue, item 144). He did not, apparently, recognize that it fits the s. XV catalogue description of item 16, quoted in the text of this article.

4. B.P.L. 28 and B.N. lat. 11505 have the quotations as glosses on the diagrams. These three glosses correspond to sections of pseudo-Dynamius' preliminary remarks to the grammar compendium reproduced by Cardinal Mai in *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*, t. I, 2 (Rome, 1852), p. 185, lines 5-7 (actualis, haec est prima . . .), lines 13-15 (Inspectiva dicitur . . .), except that the text follows Cassiodorus, p. 111, lines 3-5, lines 15-19 (Inspectiva est, quae iam post priora exercitia inspicit vel contemplatur non ea quae videntur, sed quae non videntur . . .), of which I have not located the source. In these two manuscripts, "Practica haec dividitur in historiam et spiritalem intelligentiam," line 15, follows with the discussion "Doctrina historiae . . ." lines 10-13 and the three subdivisions of spiritual interpretation presented in diagrammatic form, corresponding to lines 22-23; lines 24-30 describing "Scientia tropologica" are supplemented with Cassian's four-fold partition of "Interpretatio." In fact, our author is quoting *Collatio* 14, cap. 8 complete with the quotation from Paul (Cor. I, 16,6). I think that I have unscrambled the text sufficiently to indicate that at least part of this text was first compiled for the Biblical context. The Cassian dropped out altogether in the grammar compendium edited by A. Mai.
5. *Cassiodori Senatoris Institutiones*, ed. R. A. B. Mynors, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937), pp. 111-112. Mynors ignores most Patristic sources in his critical apparatus of this text.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 24, lines 6-9. That this text is the source of Cassiodorus' discussion of active and inspective arts was unknown to: Pierre Courcelle, *Les Lettres Grecques en Occident de Macrobe à Cassiodore* (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1948), pp. 321 sq.; Paul J. Lehmann, "Cassiodor-Studien" in *Philologus* t. 71, 72, 73 (1912-1917); and Leslie Webber Jones, "The Influence of Cassiodorus on Medieval Culture," *Speculum* vol 20 (1945), pp. 433-442, and in *An Introduction to Divine and Human Readings by Cassiodorus Senator*, trans. L. W. Jones (New York: Columbia University Press, 1946).

In *Isidore de Seville et la Culture Classique* (Paris, 1959) vol. 2 *Etudes Augustiniennes*, p. 601, Jacques Fontaine points out that Isidore derives his notion that logic is found in scripture in the Song of Songs and the Gospels

from a letter of Jerome (found in *Patrologia Latina* vol. 22, col. 441), which in turn derives from Origen's *Commentary* on the Song of Songs. Isidore did not include all of Cassiodorus' Origenistic dilation on inspective arts in his compilation on philosophy in the *Etymologiae*, and so Fontaine does not discuss it (see esp. pp. 604-606).

Cassiodorus shapes his material to fit the Ammonian diagram of the divisions of philosophy he has presented. His borrowings are: "Moralis autem dicitur, per quam mos vivendi honestus aptatur et instituta ad virtutem tendentia praelegantur. Naturalis dicitur, ubi uniuscuiusque rei natura discutitur, quo nihil contra naturam geratur in vita, sed unumquodque his usibus deputetur, in quos a creatore productum est. Inspectiva dicitur qua supergressi visibilia de divinis aliquid et caelestibus contemplamur aequae mente sola intuemur, quoniam corporeum supergrediuntur ad aspectum." *Origenes Werke* vol. 8, ed. C. Baehrens (Leipzig: J. Hinrichs, 1899-1919), p. 75; *Cassiodori Senatoris Institutiones*, p. 111, lines 3-9 and p. 112, lines 2-4.

7. See the opening pages of *Origenes Werke* vol. 8 and Baehrens's discussion in *Ueberlieferung und textgeschichte der lateinische erhaltenen Origeneshomilien zum Alten Testament*, (Leipzig 1916).
8. See Chapter III of my dissertation, "Grammatica Disciplina," for a discussion of this topic. An example is Bede's *de Schematibus et Tropis Liber*, in which examples from Scripture are used to illustrate the figures and tropes of Donatus. Bede gets his inspiration from Julian of Toledo and Cassiodorus *In Psalmis*.
9. *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca* I, 2, pp. 182-198.
10. G. Becker, *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiquae* (Bonn: Max. Cohen et Fr. Cohen, 1885) Number 37, pp. 82-120.
11. See n. 2.
12. A fairly complete description of this very complicated compendium was recently published by Colette Jeudy in *Viator*. See "L'ars de nomine et verbo de Phocas: manuscrits et commentaries médiévaux," *Viator* 5 (1974), pp. 61-157. Add. C. lat. 144 is described on pp. 120-123. See also P. Lehmann, "Mitteilungen aus Handschriften," *Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss., Sitzungsber. d. Phil.-Klass.* 1933.
13. G. Becker, *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiquae*, Number 11, pp. 24-29.
14. According to Cassiodorus, Rufinus had added passages to three books on the Song of Songs; it is difficult to ascertain whether Cassiodorus understood that this was a translation of a treatise by Origen, or whether he thought that Rufinus was interpreting Jerome's translation of the Homilies in his own work. In any case, he had the two works bound together with Epiphanius so as to collect "diligentissimos expositores" in one codex. *Cassiodori Senatoris Institutiones*, p. 24.
15. According to Omont, by the late eleventh century a certain Roscelin had established canons-regular at St. Vaast and given to his own cathedral of Beauvais, where he was chanter, his own little collection of arts texts, most of which seem not to have stayed at Beauvais. Boethius *Consolatio Philosophiae*, Augustine's *de doctrine Christiana*, Cicero's *de Inventione*, an anonymous *Dialectica*, Juvenal's *Satires*, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Statius' *Thebaid* and Macrobius disappear from the lists, not to be replaced in this library. Such a collection would have made a good basic collection for any new library.

In his section on the schools of canons-regulars, Phillipe Delhay ("L'Organisation scolaire au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Traditio* 6 [1947], p. 241) provides us with a clue of what perhaps became of Roscelin's books: "On sait que la congrégation de St. Victor fut fondée par Guillaume de Champeaux, chanoine de Notre-Dame par Guillaume de Champeaux, chanoine de Notre-Dame à Paris, ancien élève de Roscelin et de Manegold de Lautenbach." However, I believe this Roscelin is the logician, and not the song-school master; so, until further evidence is brought forth, the matter is unsure.

16. See n. 3.
17. The *Bibliotheca Publica Leidensis* cataloguer described these fragments as "Nugae monasticae fragmenta rhetorica, theologica nullius pretii."
18. For example, a French manuscript in Bern of the *Consolatio Philosophiae*, Bern 179, contains a diagram from Isidore's *de natura rerum*, reproduced in Plate 37 of Otto Homburger's recent book on illuminated manuscripts in Bern.
19. As did the San Gall commentator in Einsiedeln 179, whose thoughts have been translated and discussed by Peter Dronke in *Fabula. Explorations into the Uses of Myth in Medieval Platonism* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974), pp. 85-86.
20. From usage in compilations, it seems more likely that the source is the *Distinction* rather than de *Differentiis Topicis*.
21. P. Courcelle, *Les Lettres Grecques*, pp. 356-382. L. W. Jones, "The Influence of Cassiodorus on Medieval Culture" pp. 433-442.
22. P. Courcelle, *Les Lettres Grecques*, p. 377.
23. Bloch's article is in *Festschrift zur XLVI Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner*. (Strassburg, 1901), pp. 257-285. Hermann Schuling, "Die Handbibliothek des Bonifatius. Ein Beitrag zur Geistesgeschichte der ersten Hälfte des 8 Jahrhunderts," *Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens* 4 (1963), pp. 285-348. F. Prinz, *Fruhes Monchtum im Frankenreich* (Vienna: Ouldenburg, 1965). Wolfgang Milde, *Der Bibliothekskatalog des Klosters Murbach aus dem 9. Jahrhundert* (Heidelberg, 1968).
24. W. Levison, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946), p. 140, following Bloch, points out that Lull, the secretary to Boniface, quoted from the list of books at the end of the *Ecclesiastical History* in order to request works of Bede. But it is not clear to me that the *Ecclesiastical History* was acquired through the letters of Boniface. The date and particulars of the Murbach copy of the text might shed light on this issue.
25. Wolfgang Milde, *Der Bibliothekskatalog des Klosters Murbach aus dem 9. Jahrhundert*, p. 108.
26. H. Keil, *Grammatici Latini* vols. 1, 4, and 5. (Leipzig: Teubner, 1864 sq.).
27. See Bischoff's discussion "Eine verschollene Einteilung . . ." in *Mittelalterliche Studien I*, pp. 276-277.
28. *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca* vol. I, 2, p. 184, section 10. Cf. Diogenes Laertes' *Vitae Philosophorum*, ed. S. Cobet (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1878), p. vii.
29. *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca* vol. I, 2, p. 185, section 16. Cf. I. M. Bochenski, *Ancient Formal Logic*, (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co., 1957), pp. 25-27.
30. Baehrens, *Origenes Werke*, Band 8, p. 75: Nonnulli sane apud Graecos etiam logicen, quam nos rationalem possumus dicere, quarto in numero posuerere.

Alii non extrinsecus eam, sed per has tres quas supermemoravimus, disciplinas innexam concertamque per omne corpus esse dixerunt.

31. Boethius, *In Porphyrium Dialogi* in *Patrologia Latina* vol. 64, col. 11-12; Actually, Shiel in his article "Boethius' Commentaries on Aristotle," *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* vol. 4 (Boston, 1958), pp. 234-237, does not say the source is Proclean; rather, that it is post-Porphyrian and pre-Ammonian.
32. Alcuini *de Dialectica*, *Patrologia Latina* vol. 101, col. 952 sq.
33. "Eine verschollene Einteilung . . .," pp. 275-276.
34. The diagrams in Add. C. Lat. 144 are found on folios 63<sup>v</sup>-65<sup>v</sup>, and still show traces of color.