

CATALOGUES AND OTHER MANUSCRIPTS FROM LORSCH

CHAUNCEY E. FINCH

Saint Louis University

The Benedictine monastery of St. Nazarius at Lorsch was founded in 763, just a little over 1200 years ago. In the course of the ninth century this institution developed a library which has been cited by various modern scholars as being one of the richest collections of its time both in classical and mediaeval holdings.¹ In the following six or seven centuries many of these early manuscripts were no doubt destroyed by accident or dispersed to other points, but those which survived, along with others which had been more recently copied, were transferred to Heidelberg in the sixteenth century by Kurfürst Otto Heinrich. From this location, in turn, many of these documents were taken to Rome as spoils of war in 1623 and there were mingled with other manuscripts to form the Palatine Latin collection of the Vatican Library.²

In the past century much effort has been devoted by various individuals to the task of identifying those Lorsch manuscripts which have survived in the Vatican and elsewhere. Almost exactly a hundred years ago, August Wilmanns published descriptions of 28 manuscripts which he regarded as having originated at Lorsch. Most of these he identified with manuscripts now in the Vatican Palatine group.³ In 1890 Theodor Gottlieb identified a somewhat larger group of Lorsch manuscripts, as a part of his longer work on mediaeval libraries.⁴ In

¹ See, for instance, James W. Thompson, *The Medieval Library* (New York 1957) 80-82.

² F. Falk, "Beiträge zur Rekonstruktion der alten Bibliotheca laureshamensis," *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, Beiheft 26 (Leipzig 1902) 48-50.

³ August Wilmanns, "Der Katalog der Lorsch'schen Klosterbibliothek aus dem zehnten Jahrhundert," *RhM* 23 (1868) 385-410.

⁴ Theodor Gottlieb, *Über mittelalterliche Bibliotheken* (Leipzig 1890; repr. Graz 1955) 334-37.

1902 F. Falk published a report on the Lorsch library in which he discussed a number of the surviving Lorsch codices.⁵ In 1924 W. M. Lindsay provided a detailed account of a number of the earliest documents which can definitely be ascribed to Lorsch.⁶ In his work on the musical manuscripts in the Vatican Library, E. M. Bannister has assigned to Lorsch some of the Palatine manuscripts which contain musical notes.⁷ The most extensive list of Lorsch manuscripts of which I know, however, is that published in 1912 by Paul Lehmann.⁸ This list, which is a composite of lists prepared by others including those of Falk and Gottlieb, contains approximately 100 items, some of which are mere fragments. In view of the historical circumstances outlined above, it is not surprising that a vast majority of these items—76—are Vatican Palatine codices. In the interval since the publication of Lehmann's list, various scholars have, of course, claimed Lorsch origins for various other individual manuscripts.⁹

There are four main criteria which are useful in determining that a given codex was either copied in Lorsch or resided in that center for a part of its history. Perhaps the most important of these is the presence of a Lorsch "ex libris" in some part of the document. The conventional Lorsch "ex libris" takes several forms, some in prose, some in poetry, as indicated by Lindsay.¹⁰ A second criterion is the presence of a listing or description of the manuscript in question in one or more of the ninth century catalogues of Lorsch, which will be discussed in detail below. A third criterion is the existence within a manuscript of the rather distinctive script which was developed at Lorsch in the early ninth century. The fourth is the occurrence in a codex of certain so-called omission signs. When passages had been omitted from a manuscript by the original scribe, it was the custom in mediaeval times for this material to be inserted in the margins by the same scribe

⁵ Falk (above, note 2) 53-75.

⁶ W. M. Lindsay, "The (Early) Lorsch Scriptorium," *Palaeographia Latina* 3 (1924) 5-48.

⁷ E. M. Bannister, *Monumenti Vaticani di Paleografia Musicale Latina* (Leipzig 1913).

⁸ Paul Lehmann, *Johannes Sichardus* (Munich 1912) 138-39.

⁹ See, for instance, Karl Forstner, "Schriftfragmente des 8. und früheren 9. Jahrhunderts in Salzburger Bibliotheken," *Scriptorium* 14 (1960) 235-56, where some fragments in Salzburg are attributed to Lorsch.

¹⁰ Lindsay (above, note 6) 11.

or by some other, with one of a number of different symbols prefixed to the marginal material to label it as an insert and with the same symbol on some occasions, but usually with a different one, added in the text at the point at which the marginal material was to be inserted.¹¹ Lindsay has shown that in Lorsch manuscripts a line slanting downward from right to left with dots on each side was often used both in margins and in texts as an omission sign. More commonly, however, pairs of letters with a horizontal bar drawn through their tops were used.¹² Although most of these symbols were used in other centers besides Lorsch, Lindsay has established that use of the *h l* symbol was peculiar to Lorsch alone.¹³ In 1934, at the time of the publication of Volume 1 of his *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, E. A. Lowe seemed to be giving only tentative acceptance to this criterion when he wrote of codex Vat. Pal. Lat. 202, "The occasional use of *h l* before insertions in the margin may point to Lorsch."¹⁴ By 1959, however, the date of the appearance of Volume 8 of the same work, Lowe had apparently come fully to accept the validity of the *h l* criterion, since, in ascribing codex Aug. cv of the Landesbibliothek in Carlsruhe to Lorsch in this volume, he referred to the existence of *h l* before insertions in the lower margin as "... the Lorsch earmark."¹⁵

The purpose of this article is a twofold one: first, to provide fuller information about the early catalogues of the Lorsch library; and second, to call attention to a number of manuscripts which, though not previously listed as Lorsch documents, deserve to be so classified on the basis of one or more of the criteria noted above.

It has frequently been reported in print that there are three early catalogues of the Lorsch collection, all of which are preserved in the

¹¹ For a thorough discussion of omission signs in manuscripts see E. A. Lowe, "The Oldest Omission Signs in Latin Manuscripts," *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, Vol. 6 (*Studi e Testi* 126, Rome 1946) 36-79.

¹² Combinations listed by Lindsay (above, note 6) 43-44 as occurring most frequently in Lorsch manuscripts are as follows: *h d* in text and margin; *d h* in text and *h d* in margin; *d h* in text and margin; *h d* in text and *h p* in margin; *h d* in text and *d h* in margin; *d* in text and *h* in margin (which is English usage); *d h* in text and *h* in margin; *h d* in text and *h* in margin; *d* in text and margin; *h* in text and margin; *h l* in text and margin; *h d* in text and *h l* in margin.

¹³ Lindsay (above, note 6) 13.

¹⁴ E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores* 1 (Oxford 1934) plate 83.

¹⁵ E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores* 8 (Oxford 1959) plate 1080.

Vatican Library.¹⁶ Wilmanns has reported that one of these, which he labeled A, occupies folios 1-34 of codex Vat. Pal. Lat. 1877; that another (C) occupies folios 44-79 of the same codex (with the intervening folios devoted to a catalogue of Fulda manuscripts); and that a third (B) occupies the first seven folios of codex Vat. Pal. Lat. 57.¹⁷ (Henceforth in this paper the symbols A and B will be used for the two catalogues so designated by Wilmanns, but his use of C will need to be modified for reasons to be given later.) These catalogues have occasionally been dated in the tenth century, but Lindsay has shown that A comes from a part of the ninth century antedating A.D. 820, and that C comes from a later portion of the ninth century. According to him B is equally old.¹⁸ As a part of his study Wilmanns published a collation of descriptions contained in these catalogues of items which he considered of special interest to philologists. His work, as far as it went, maintained a high level of accuracy, and is of great value to the classicist, since it provides an almost complete list of the manuscripts of classical authors located in the Lorsch library. Since Wilmanns' announced purpose, however, was to select only works of interest to the philologist, it naturally follows that many segments of the catalogues were left untouched by him.

In summarizing information about the Lorsch catalogues, scholars often indicate that the two parts of codex Vat. Pal. Lat. 1877 referred to above as containing such catalogues (designated by Wilmanns as A and C) have been printed by G. Becker as items 37 and 38.¹⁹ Actually, Becker's 38 is a reprint of the collation by Wilmanns described above, and hence contains only selected items from C (as well as selected items from A and B). Gottlieb provided information which should have served to set the record straight, so far as this one printed catalogue is concerned, when, in designating Vat. Pal. Lat. 1877, folios 44-79, as catalogue 108 of his collection, he noted that only selections from this of interest to the classicist had been published by Wilmanns, whose work in turn had been reprinted as Becker 38.²⁰ Gottlieb

¹⁶ Lindsay (above, note 6) 10. Thompson (above, note 1) reports on p. 80 that there are two catalogues, but on p. 200 he changes the number to three.

¹⁷ Wilmanns (above, note 3) 385-87.

¹⁸ Lindsay (above, note 6) 10.

¹⁹ G. Becker, *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui* (Bonn 1885) 82-125.

²⁰ Gottlieb (above, note 4) 48.

went on to designate Vat. Pal. Lat. 1877, folios 1-34, as catalogue 109 in his collection, with a note that it had been published as Becker 37, and Vat. Pal. Lat. 57, folios 1-7, as his own catalogue 110, with a statement that up to his time it had remained unprinted.²¹ This statement about the last mentioned catalogue was not completely true, since citations from it had been included in Wilmanns' collation.

But this is of considerably less importance than the fact that Gottlieb's survey promotes two other false assumptions about the Lorsch catalogues which are perpetuated in all subsequent literature on the subject. One is the assumption that Vat. Pal. Lat. 1877, folios 44-79 (Wilmanns' catalogue C), is a single catalogue; the other, that Becker 37 is a complete printed edition of the catalogue contained in Vat. Pal. Lat. 1877, folios 1-34 (Wilmanns' A), and of this catalogue alone. As to the first of these assumptions, it should be noted that the text of Vat. Pal. Lat. 1877, folios 44-79, in fact is not a single catalogue, but is made up of two quite separate catalogues which in large part duplicate each other.²² The first of these includes folios 44-66; the second, folios 67-79. (Henceforth, as a modification of Wilmanns' usage, the first of these two catalogues will be designated C1 and the second C2.) In their present form C1 and C2 are just about equal in length. Neither, however, is complete. They were originally, in all probability, almost identical in content, since they clearly date from the same period.²³ But in their present form they differ somewhat by reason of the fact that the last few folios of C1 and a few folios at the beginning of C2 were lost, possibly when the two documents were bound together. In addition, some of the material at the beginning of C2 has been bound in the wrong order: some lost folios and the one now numbered 67 should appear between folios 69 and 70. Since, according to the general format of these catalogues, there was concentration on ecclesiastical works in the earlier portions of each and a listing of classical and miscellaneous works at the end, C1 contains no classical items, while C2, though lacking some of the ecclesiastical titles, has

²¹ Gottlieb (above, note 4) 49.

²² Information about this manuscript and all other Vatican manuscripts discussed in this paper is based on microfilm copies of these documents made available to me by The Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library at Saint Louis University.

²³ Both employ the symbol consisting of *t* surmounted with a 2-shaped form for *-tur*. This points to a date after 820 and indicates that both are later than catalogue A.

its full quota of classical works. This concentration of classical titles at the end of the combination of C1 and C2 no doubt accounts for the fact that Wilmanns, who was interested only in works of this type, failed to note that he was dealing with two separate catalogues.

As to the second of the false assumptions noted above—that Becker's catalogue 37 provides an accurate edition of the material contained in Vat. Pal. Lat. 1877, folios 1–34—it must be reported that this printed catalogue, which is a reprint of an earlier study by Angelo Mai, on numerous occasions departs rather radically from the manuscript on which it is supposedly based. These departures in some instances consist in the omission of quite lengthy lists of chapter headings included in the manuscript under the titles of certain individual works. Such omissions of chapter headings constitute a distinct handicap for scholars attempting to identify existing codices by a comparison of these with catalogue entries. (In listing examples of such omissions below I prefix to each entry the number of the preceding entry in Becker 37, with the letter *a* added, or *b*, if a second omission follows in the same series.)

Omissions from Becker 37

- 66a item regum et paralipomenon in alio codice
- 73a liber Machabaeorum II in uno codice
- 117a eiusdem [Augustini] de doctrina Christiana libri IIII in uno codice
- 238a item [liber dialogorum Gregorii] in tertio codice²⁴
- 271a [Bedae] super Esdram prophetam libri III in uno codice
- 271b [Bedae] in proverbial Salomonis libri III et super Tobiam liber unus in uno codice²⁵
- 375a libri V Iacobi episcopi. I de bono mortis. II de figura saeculi. III de beata vita. IIII item alii. V de resurrectione. in uno codice
- 391a epistolae sancti Paulini episcopi ad diversos et metrum eiusdem
- 394a epistolae Ciceronis diversae²⁶
- 416a item eiusdem [grammatica Augustini abbreviata].

The omission of such items by itself gives the impression that the Lorsch collection was smaller in the early ninth century than it actually

²⁴ This entry appears in the margin, but is apparently by the first hand.

²⁵ In Becker 37 *et super Tobiam liber unus in uno codice* appears in a wrong position at the end of entry 271.

²⁶ This item is written between lines in A, but apparently by the first hand. Its presence in A was noted by Wilmanns.

was. This is more than counterbalanced, however, by the fact that in some places Becker 37 lists large blocks of titles which are not to be found in catalogue A. This is true, for instance, of blocks of entries numbered 243-67, 313-23, and 512-64. These titles have actually been taken from C1 or C2. Obviously there is no reason why an editor of one catalogue should not add material from other catalogues of the same monastery's holdings, provided he warns the reader that this is being done. Unfortunately no such warning is to be found anywhere within the text of Becker 37. Hence the reader can never be certain whether a given entry comes from catalogue A or from one of the later catalogues. Another serious defect of this printed catalogue consists in the fact that the editor has on some occasions deliberately rearranged titles for the purpose of achieving a more logical order, and then, apparently having forgotten about the rearrangement, has listed these same items a second time in their regular positions. Likewise, in adding titles from other catalogues, he has often duplicated items which had already been recorded from catalogue A. These two types of repetition give the impression that the Lorsch collection was richer in certain fields than was actually the case. This applies especially to its holdings in classical literature. Items 382 and 398 in Becker 37 are both designated as copies of the *Epistolae* of Seneca. Actually, only one such manuscript is listed in catalogue A. The genuine entry is 398; the other is a phantom entry resulting apparently from the editor's desire to list the manuscript of the *Epistolae* immediately after 381, which is listed in the manuscript as *Ennii* (sic) *Senicae* (sic) *libri VII de beneficiis. eiusdem de clementia libri II. in uno codice*. Four items in Becker 37 (402, 406, 407, 408) are listed as *grammatica integra Prisciani grammatici*. In reality only three copies of this work are included in catalogue A (406, 407, 408); item 402 is another phantom entry. From a study of Becker 37 it appears that, in addition to manuscripts containing the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* of Vergil (457, 458), the Lorsch library also contained two other manuscripts designated simply *liber Vergilii* (546, 590). But, as a matter of fact, these two numbers refer to a single codex listed once (as 590) because it is included in catalogue A and listed again (as 546) because it is included in a segment of catalogue C2 inserted without warning into the text of Becker 37. Exactly the same is true of the manuscripts of Pliny's *Natural History*. From

consulting Becker 37 one would gain the impression that Lorsch had two separate copies of this work contained in two separate pairs of manuscripts (399, 400; and 554, 555). Again, however, only one pair (399, 400) is actually listed in catalogue A. The other reference is to the same pair of manuscripts taken from C2. Item 80 of Becker 37 is *historia Iosephi lib. XI in uno codice*; 96 is *item libri antiquitatum Iosephi historiographi a duodecimo usque ad nonum decimum in uno codice*; 541 is *libri antiquitatis Iosephi historiographi a XII libro usque in XIX*. Items 80 and 96 are actually to be found in catalogue A, but 541, which is obviously a duplicate of 96, has been taken from C2. The variation in case forms between *antiquitatum* in 96 and *antiquitatis* in 541 is duplicated in the two manuscript catalogues. Thus it is seen that a completely false impression with regard to the classical holdings in Lorsch in the early ninth century is provided by Becker 37. For works of interest to the classicist, Wilmanns' collation provides a much more accurate guide. But this work, too, has some serious shortcomings. It fails to note, for instance, that A includes the title *Pompeii Trogi (troi in codex) epitoma lib. XLIII in uno codice* (89 in Becker 37). In view of the facts brought out above it is clear that there is need for a new edition of the catalogues of Lorsch which will make available the full texts of all four of them.²⁷

There are several manuscripts which have tentatively been ascribed to Lorsch on the basis of somewhat limited evidence. My study has brought to light additional information which confirms the assumption of Lorsch connections in some of these cases.

In describing codex Vat. Pal. Lat. 14—a ninth century manuscript containing a portion of the *Old Testament*—Bannister suggested that the presence in the document of the entry, "Tres digiti scribent" etc. might indicate that the work was copied in Lorsch.²⁸ The full text of the entry quoted only in part by Bannister is, "Tres digiti scribent (*sic*), duo o<cu>los (*sic*) vident, totum corpus laborat. Amen" (folio 178^v). It is true that this saying was employed by scribes at Lorsch, as can be seen from the description of Vat. Pal. Lat. 46 given below. But of much greater significance as proof that the document comes

²⁷ I am at the present time engaged in the preparation of such an edition which I hope to be able to complete at an early date.

²⁸ Bannister (above, note 7) 13.

from Lorsch is the fact (not mentioned by Bannister) that the *h l* omission sign is used in a great number of instances (folios 8^r, 9^r, 9^v, 15^v, 30^v, 31^v, 36^v, 38^v, 40^r, 45^r, 48^r, 49^r, 51^r, 57^r, 62^r, 62^v, 69^v, 71^v, 73^v, 74^r, 74^v and elsewhere). Furthermore, the writing is in the typical Lorsch script.

Codex Vat. Pal. Lat. 135 is a ninth century manuscript containing *Interpretatio vocum Hebraicarum ex s. Hieronymo* (folios 1–36) and *Expositio in quattuor Evangelia* (folios 37–52). The style of the crucifix on folio 1^r led Bannister to believe that the document had been produced in Lorsch.²⁹ He tentatively identified the first portion as corresponding to item 218 of Becker 37. In support of his conclusion it may be pointed out that the flyleaf contains an entry in a fifteenth or sixteenth century hand which reads, “In veteri indice librorum manuscriptorum monasterii sancti Nazarii in Laurissa titulus huius libri sic notatur Glossae secundum hebraicam veritatem translatae a s. Hieronymo.” It is impossible to determine which of the catalogues was being referred to here, since the entry is found in all four: in A on folio 18^v (= Becker 37, 218); in B on folio 4^r; in C1 on folio 64^v; and in C2 on folio 75^v. In addition, this manuscript was copied in the typical Lorsch script and has the *h l* omission sign on folios 27^v and 35^r.

Codex Vat. Pal. Lat. 281—a ninth century manuscript of the *Etymologiae* of Isidore—was designated by Wilmanns as probably being one of the two copies of this work listed in catalogue A (Becker 37, 328 and 329).³⁰ Bannister, in noting that Wilmanns had expressed this view, stated that Wilmanns had given no reason for his assumption and indicated that there was nothing in the manuscript to establish Lorsch as its point of origin.³¹ Actually, however, the presence of early ninth century Lorsch writing in the manuscript and the use of the *h l* omission sign on folios 35^r and 70^r indicate that Wilmanns was right.

Codex Vat. Pal. Lat. 1701, which contains the *Satires* of Juvenal, is a questionable case. This codex has been listed by Knoche in his catalogue of Juvenal manuscripts as dating from the end of the ninth

²⁹ Bannister (above, note 7) 13.

³⁰ Wilmanns (above, note 3) 395–96.

³¹ Bannister (above, note 7) 10.

century. In presenting a brief description of the document, which he designated p, Knoche, without giving his reasons, expressed the opinion that it almost certainly came from Lorsch.³² There was certainly a manuscript of Juvenal in Lorsch in the early part of the ninth century, as is indicated by its mention in catalogue A (Becker 37, 427), but this could not have been p, since this codex clearly dates from a later period than does catalogue A. Furthermore, Lindsay has identified another Juvenal manuscript—Montepessulanus Bibl. Med. H 125 (P)—as item 427 of Becker 37.³³ This, of course, does not eliminate the possibility that a second Juvenal manuscript was produced at Lorsch at a later date. But if this assumption is to be made, the possibility that p was copied from P must be ruled out, since the two manuscripts represent different textual traditions. There is one minor point not developed by Knoche which, though it does not prove his thesis that p came from Lorsch, does tend to argue in its favor. It was noted by Knoche in his *apparatus criticus* that p, along with several other manuscripts, omits 8.231. He failed to note, however, that the full line (with the exception of the initial Q) was copied in the margin by the original scribe (folio 40^r). The letter *h* (with transverse stroke) appears in the margin before the omitted line, while *d* (with transverse stroke) appears in the text at the point at which the insertion is to be made. As noted above (note 12), this *d-h* combination of signs (which is English in its origins), though not peculiar to Lorsch, was used there very frequently. Hence, though its presence in p certainly does not prove that this manuscript was copied in Lorsch, it may be said to point in that direction.

There are 11 manuscripts which, as far as I have been able to determine, have not yet been assigned to Lorsch by anyone else, but which, on the basis of one or more of the criteria listed earlier, I wish to propose for membership in the Lorsch family. These are Vat. Pal. Lat. 46, 167, 174, 183, 186, 207, 211, 218, 487, 846, and Vat. Lat. 11506.

Codex Vat. Pal. Lat. 46—an early ninth century manuscript made up primarily of *Quattuor Evangelia*—can be ascribed to Lorsch both on the basis of its script and on the basis of its use of the *h l* omission

³² Ulrich Knoche, *D. Iunius Iuvenalis Saturae* (Munich 1950) xxiv.

³³ Lindsay (above, note 6) 12.

symbol on folios 73^v, 82^v, and 107^v. It is possibly to be identified with Becker 37, 2. On folio 137^v appears the following entry in square capitals: QVI SCRIBERE NESCIT NVLLVM PVTAT SE ESSE LABOREM. TRES DIGITI SCRIBVNT, DVO OCVLI VIDENT, VNA LINGVA LOQVITVR, TOTVM CORPVS LABORAT ET OMNIS LABOR FINEM HABET ET PRAEMIUM EIVS NON HABET FINEM. QVAM DVLCIVS (*sic*) EST NAVIGANTI OPTIMVS PORTVS ITA SCRIPTORI NOVISSIMVS VERSVS. EGO IONATHAM CLERICVS DOMINO OPITVLANTE HVNC CODICEM SCRIBERE STVDVI. ORA PRO ME SCRIPTOREM SI DEVM HABEAS PROTECTOREM. AMEN.

Codex Vat. Pal. Lat. 167, which contains a part of *Hilarii expositio in Evangelium Mathei*, can be dated in the early part of the ninth century by reason of the fact that it employs the symbol consisting of *t* surmounted by an apostrophe for *-tur*. I have been unable to find any instances of the *h l* omission sign, but the manuscript can definitely be ascribed to Lorsch both on the basis of its having been copied in a typical Lorsch script and on the basis of information contained in catalogue A. On folio 28^r of A the following entry appears: "eiusdem Hilarii expositio super Matheum usque ad eum locum ubi dicit: audivit Herodes in uno codice" (= Becker 37, 341). In the codex the last subdivision of the text (at the top of folio 55^r) begins with the words *In illo tempore audivit Herodes*. . . . This is almost certainly the document to which item 341 in Becker 37 refers.

Codex Vat. Pal. Lat. 174, which has on its title page the entry, "In hoc corpore continentur sancti Hieronymi presbiteri in Osee profeta (*sic*) libri III. in Amos libri III. in Abdiam liber I. ad Pammachium episcopum," can clearly be dated in the early ninth century, since it uses the *t*-apostrophe symbol for *-tur*. Its script is definitely of the Lorsch type. It appears to correspond to entry 196 in Becker 37, which reads, "eiusdem [Hieronymi] super prophetas tres, id est Osee, Amos, Abdiam in uno codice." And finally, its Lorsch origin is confirmed by its use of the *h l* omission sign on folios 49^r, 78^r, 79^v, and 84^v.

Codex Vat. Pal. Lat. 183—*S. Hieronymi liber quaestionum hebraicarum*—can be dated in the early part of the ninth century by reason of its use of the *t*-apostrophe symbol for *-tur*. It employs a typical Lorsch script and can probably be identified with entry 199 in Becker 37, which reads, "eiusdem [Hieronymi] liber quaestionum Hebraicarum

nominum sive locorum interpretatio in uno codice." Additional evidence for its Lorsch origin is provided by its use of the *h l* sign on folios 4^r, 10^r, 11^r, 18^v, 28^r, and 32^v.

Codex Vat. Pal. Lat. 186, which is made up for the most part of *S. Efre[m] opuscula de paenitentia*, is written in a typical Lorsch script and apparently dates from the early ninth century, although I have been unable to find any *-tur* abbreviation symbols. The manuscript is probably to be identified with entry 476 in Becker 37, which reads *liber sancti Ephrem in uno codice*. The *h l* omission mark appears to have been used on folio 16^r, but these letters have faded to such an extent that it is impossible to be absolutely certain about their identity.

Codex Vat. Pal. Lat. 207—*S. Augustini pars media in Iohannem*—is in the early Lorsch script and is to be dated in the early ninth century by reason of its use of the *t*-apostrophe abbreviation for *-tur*. It is probably to be identified with Becker 37, 98, which must be interpreted in connection with 97. Entry 97 reads *tractatus sancti Augustini in Iohannem XII in uno codice*, while 98 reads *in alio LII*. Actually the manuscript does not contain this number of tractates, but an entry at the end of the text on folio 127^r reads *Explic. LII tractatus*. It is just possible that the individual who prepared catalogue A, on seeing this entry, mistakenly assumed that this indicated the number of tractates in the codex. Proof that the manuscript definitely comes from Lorsch is provided by the large number of instances in which the *h l* omission symbol appears (folios 34^r, 56^r, 64^r, 64^v, 68^r, 74^v, 76^v, 78^r, 82^r, 97^v, 107^v, 111^r, 114^v, 119^v, 120^r, 125^v). This manuscript also contains many of the other omission signs listed earlier as being frequently used in Lorsch, but not peculiar to it.

Codex Vat. Pal. Lat. 211, which contains *S. Augustini epistolae XVIII*, was copied in the regular Lorsch script, and most portions of its text can be dated in the early ninth century because of its use of the *t*-apostrophe symbol for *-tur*. Folios 117–20, however, were copied in a somewhat later hand, as is indicated by the fact that *t* surmounted by a 2-shaped character is consistently used for *-tur* in this part of the document. On folios 14^v–15^r of catalogue A the following entry appears (= Becker 37, 183):

In uno codice epistolae [Augustini] numero XXI. I ad Volusianum.
II item rescriptum Volusiani ad sanctum Augustinum. III item epistola

sancti Augustini ad Volusianum. IIII item eiusdem ad Bonifacium episcopum ut non noceat parvulis baptizatis iniquitas parentum cui nulla voluntate consentit (*sic*). V item eiusdem ad Armentarium et Paulinam (*sic*) de votis reddendis. VI item eiusdem ad Marcellinum de sacrificiis veteris et novi.³⁴ VII item eiusdem ad Lactum de tolerantia passionum. VIII item eiusdem ad Italicam de fide. VIII item eiusdem ad Marcellinum de magis Pharaonis. X item eiusdem ad Paulinam de videndo deo. XI epistola Maximi grammatici Madaurensis ad Augustinum. XII epistola Augustini ad Maximum. XIII epistola Augustini ad Valentinum de Pelagiana (*sic*) errore videndo. XIII item Augustini de solutione quaestionum: prima de resurrectione. secunda de tempore Christianae religionis. tertia de sacrificiorum distinctione. quarta de eo quod scriptum est: in qua mensura mensi fueritis remetietur vobis. v de filio Dei secundum Salomonem. vi de Iona propheta. XV epistola Machedonii ad sanctum Augustinum. XVI epistola sancti Augustini ad Machedonium. XVII epistola sancti Augustini ad Paulinum episcopum de psalterio. XVIII epistola sancti Augustini ad Probam viduam de modo orandi. XVIII constitutio sancti Augustini quid observare debeant in monasterio constituti. XX sermo sancti Augustini de vita et moribus clericorum. XXI item sermo ad se ipsos ad quos supra. in uno volumine.

This same description is contained in catalogue C1 on folio 56^r and in C2 on folios 71^v and 72^r. Aside from minor differences in orthography, the only significant variants from A in either of the other catalogues are the omissions by C1 of *ad Italicam* from entry VIII and of sections v and vi from item XIII. On the flyleaf of the codex there is a table of contents written in the same hand which copied the manuscript proper. The first two items included in the descriptions in the catalogues are missing from the table of contents; but all other items (with appropriate changes in numbering) are retained in the same order and in the same form in which they appear in the catalogues, with the one exception that the words *grammaticum Madaurensis* are added in the table of contents after *Maximum* in item XII. The fact that even the grammatical errors of the table of contents (such as *consentit* for *consentiunt* in item III) are retained in the Lorsch catalogues provides ample proof that the manuscript is the same as that referred to in the catalogues, in spite of its omission of the first two items.

³⁴ The word *testamenti* is added at the end of this entry in Becker 37, 183, though it appears in none of the three catalogues containing descriptions of the codex.

The *h l* omission sign appears on folio 82^r and several other omission signs often used in Lorsch appear in other parts of the codex.

Codex Vat. Pal. Lat. 218—*S. Augustini homiliae decem in epistolam Ioannis*—employs the typical Lorsch script and can be dated in the early ninth century by the presence of the *t*-apostrophe abbreviation for *-tur*. It can clearly be identified with Becker 37, 155, or 156 (both titles are identical). The *h l* omission sign is used on folios 39^v, 40^r, and 41^r. Many of the other omission signs frequently employed at Lorsch are found in other parts of the codex.

Codex Vat. Pal. Lat. 487, which is made up of various liturgical items (folios 1–30) and miscellaneous *carmina* (folios 31–45), can be dated in the early ninth century by reason of its use of the *t*-apostrophe symbol for *-tur*. Among the *carmina* is to be found (folios 33^v–40^r) the text of a portion of that part of *Anthologia Latina* known as *Carmina duodecim sapientum*.³⁵ Although this codex cannot definitely be identified with any of the entries in the Lorsch catalogues, it can with certainty be ascribed to Lorsch on the basis of the Lorsch script found in it. I have been unable to locate any instances of the *h l* omission sign, but omission signs consisting of *h d* in text and *d h* in margin are to be found on folios 18^v and 21^v, and *h d* in text and margin on folio 19^r.

Codex Vat. Pal. Lat. 846, which is made up of *Lives of Saints*, is in the typical early Lorsch script and can be dated in the early ninth century, as is indicated by its use of the *t*-apostrophe symbol for *-tur*. It is possibly to be identified with one of the group listed as 43–46 in Becker 37. The heading for this group in Becker 37 reads *passiones sanctorum martyrum per totum anni circulum in codicibus quattuor divisae*. The *h l* omission sign is found on folios 31^v, 57^r, 57^v.

Codex Vat. Lat. 11506, which contains Cicero's *De inventione* (folios 2^r–62^v) and Priscian's *Periegesis* (folios 62^v–82^v), dates from a portion of the ninth century following the year 820, as is indicated by its frequent use of the *t* surmounted with 2 for *-tur*. A copy of the *Periegesis* is listed in both catalogue A (folio 30^v) and catalogue C2 (folio 77^v). Hence it can be assumed that this work definitely existed in the Lorsch library. The copy contained in Vat. Lat. 11506, however, is clearly too late to be the manuscript referred to in catalogue A, but

³⁵ Alexander Riese, *Anth. Lat.*, part 1, fasc. 2 (Leipzig 1906) 59–104. Riese has employed this codex in the preparation of his text. It is designated P by him.

it could conceivably be a copy of it. There is no reference in any of the Lorsch catalogues to Cicero's *De inventione*. But many other works by Cicero are included in catalogue A and he was obviously one of the favorite authors in this center. It is not surprising, therefore, that a copy of this work should be found at Lorsch. That the codex originated in this center is indicated by the fact that the *hl* omission sign appears on folios 8^v, 18^r, 23^r, 34^r, and 38^v. Since the marginal texts preceded by *hl* in all these cases are by the first hand, this indicates that the manuscript was not merely corrected at Lorsch, but was originally copied there. The description of this manuscript contained in the official Vatican catalogue³⁶ points out that the codex had reached Italy by the fifteenth century. Hence it had obviously been removed from Lorsch before the Lorsch collection was transferred to Heidelberg.³⁷

³⁶ José Ruyschaert, *Codices Vaticani Latini 11414-11709* (Vatican City 1959) 155-56. Brief descriptions of all the Palatine manuscripts discussed in this paper except Pal. Lat. 1877 and Pal. Lat. 1701 can be found in Henricus Stevenson Junior, *Codices Palatini Latini Bibliothecae Vaticanae*, Vol. I (Rome 1886).

³⁷ The copy of Priscian's *Periegesis* contained in Vat. Lat. 11506 was utilized by Paul van de Woestijne in the preparation of his critical edition of this work (Brugge 1953). But no collation of the portion containing Cicero's *De inventione* has yet been published. I have collated this text and can testify that it is a *gemellus* of H (= codex Herbipolitanus Mp. m. f. 3, saec. ix.) This might lead one to expect that our manuscript (here designated V) would be very useful for improving the text of *De inventione*, especially that portion extending from the beginning to *prima conflictio* (1.10.5), since this is missing from H. Unfortunately, however, V, in addition to retaining most of the errors of H, adds a vast number of its own. Hence its readings must be viewed with caution by future editors of this text.