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Summary
In this thesis it is argued that the various stylistic elements of a selection of manuscripts containing Peter Lombard’s *Collectanea* demonstrate changes in reading practices in thirteenth-century Paris. The six manuscripts at the core of the study were chosen primarily due to the lack of existing scholarship associated with them. The one exception to this is the two-volume copy of Lombard’s text; Bibliothèque nationale de France MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 which has been studied before due to the large number of fine decorated initials contained therein. This thesis provides an overview of the six manuscripts, their physical form as well as their content, in order to understand how Lombard’s text was used in the thirteenth century. This overview demonstrates that the design of the layout of the text became largely standardised in thirteenth-century copies, and explores the choices made in this process.

The analysis includes surveys of the textual and decorative elements included in the six manuscripts. To support the analysis of text, a collation of the commentary to Titus and Philemon has been created (this is included in an appendix). The collation is based on one of the core manuscripts, Bibliothèque nationale de France MS 14267 and illustrates that the text remained remarkably standard into the thirteenth century. The main differences are in the abbreviations used, but overall the text is the same in all six manuscripts. This in itself is interesting as it is an indication that the original text was copied with a remarkable degree of consistency.

Another element of the textual analysis revolves around the marginal rubrics, which unlike the main text vary considerably in the later copies. For this portion of the research, three early copies of Lombard’s commentary, which were made c. 1160 – c. 1180, are added to the study in order to attempt to trace the rubrics back to the original version of Lombard’s text. The rubrics, as they appear in the six manuscripts as well as three earlier copies of Lombard’s text, are organised into two tables for each epistle. The first table organises the manuscripts by their respective dates of production and the placement of the rubrics within Titus and Philemon is illustrated. The first table for Titus and Philemon demonstrate that the twelfth-century copies of the commentary include the greatest number of marginal rubrics while the number decreased in the thirteenth century. The second table for each epistle illustrates the content of the rubrics which then provides the opportunity to understand the sources from which Lombard borrowed. These tables along with the collated text add new findings to the current scholarship on Peter Lombard’s commentary to the Pauline Epistles. The final portion of the research project involves an overview of the decorative elements of the manuscripts. The level of decoration varies greatly in each manuscript and this provides insight into the patrons and makers of these books. As part of this comparison it was necessary to compare the decoration in contemporary Bibles and other manuscripts in order to trace trends in decoration used in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

In summary, this thesis provides a multidisciplinary analysis of different copies of Peter Lombard’s commentary to Titus and Philemon from the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. It argues that detailed analysis of later copies of the *Collectanea* can provide insights into shifting attitudes to this text, and therefore to biblical study in the emerging university at Paris in the thirteenth century.
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Introduction

Peter Lombard was a theologian who became a successful teacher in Paris in the 1140s and 1150s before becoming Bishop of Paris in 1159. He died in 1160, but his works continued to circulate widely and his most famous text, the Sentences, went on to form an important part of the university curriculum in Paris into the thirteenth century. During his career as a teacher, he wrote several theological works including commentaries and sermons. Amongst his best-known works (both now and in the Middle Ages) are two commentaries, one on the Book of Psalms and one on the Pauline Epistles, along with the Sentences, which is divided into four books: on the Trinity, creation, incarnation and the sacraments. Of these three works, Lombard wrote the commentary on the Psalms first, during his time at Rheims, and had finished it before 1138. He then wrote the commentary on the Pauline Epistles, before beginning work on the Sentences in the mid-1150s with the final version of the text in circulation by 1158, a date recorded in some manuscripts. This thesis focuses on his commentary on the Pauline Epistles, also known as the Collectanea, a collection of sources on the Pauline Epistles in the form of a gloss. The term Collectanea has been used to refer to the text since the sixteenth century. However, his commentaries on the Psalms and the Pauline Epistles are also collectively known as the Magna Glossatura. After Lombard’s death in 1160 there was a demand for his text and it was most likely the scribes in Paris who were responsible for the Collectanea being available for copying c. 1163. This work was extremely popular and survives in at least sixty-seven manuscripts from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (see Appendix I). The list includes manuscripts believed to have been made in France. Copies were also made elsewhere in Europe, with early copies produced in Germany for the bishop of Salzburg. The large number of existing copies demonstrates the popularity of Lombard’s text in this period.

In creating the Collectanea, Lombard drew from various patristic sources as well as works by his contemporaries in order to communicate as much as possible for the reader of the epistles. His commentary is therefore part of the much longer tradition of glossing texts. In particular, he borrowed a substantial
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1 For Peter Lombard’s biography see Marcia L. Colish, Peter Lombard, 2 vols (Leiden, 1994); Philipp W. Rosemann, Peter Lombard, (New York, 2004); Matthew Doyle, Peter Lombard and His Students (Toronto, 2016).
3 Rosemann, Peter Lombard, pp. 60-61; Smith, Masters of the Sacred Page, pp. 113-116.
4 Colish, Peter Lombard, I, p. 23; Rosemann and Brady believe Lombard began the commentary while in Rheims, Rosemann, Peter Lombard, p. 43; Ignatius Brady, ‘Pierre Lombard’, in Dictionnaire de spiritualité 12 (1986), cols. 1604-12, at 1606.
6 Rosemann, Peter Lombard, p. 44
7 Rosemann, Peter Lombard, p. 44.
9 Christopher de Hamel, Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Booktrade (Woodbridge, 1984), p. 23, p. 44.
amount from the *Glossa Ordinaria* (subsequently the *Gloss*), which was a well-known glossed Bible from the early twelfth century.\(^\text{10}\) Thus as Philipp Rosemann has observed, the *Collectanea* shows that Lombard was ‘torn between *sacra pagina* and systematic theology, that is to say, between the traditional mode of reflection on the faith [...] and more recent attempts to articulate the elements of the faith in a logical system of doctrine.’\(^\text{11}\) Although this thesis seeks to understand the *Collectanea* as a work of twelfth-century theology, the main aim of the study is to provide insight into the manuscript tradition of this work in the thirteenth century, focusing on copies associated with Paris, which up to this date, have received very little detailed study. Given the large number of surviving copies of Lombard’s *Collectanea*, and his debt to existing texts, it is not surprising that until recently, only the most ornately decorated copies have been studied extensively.\(^\text{12}\) In addition, later copies of twelfth-century works have, understandably, been of less interest to scholars interested in thirteenth-century theology than texts created in the thirteenth century. Nevertheless, the survival of a large number of copies made in the thirteenth century, demonstrates that the *Collectanea* continued to be studied. Moreover, the layout, text and decoration of these manuscripts provide insights into the status, reception and use of the work in the century after its creation, and these issues are the subject of this thesis.

The core aim of this thesis is to provide a close study of a selected group of manuscripts containing Lombard’s *Collectanea* in order to understand how the text was used in the thirteenth century, and more importantly, what the differences in the manuscripts can tell us about their respective uses during that time. As the full text is very substantial, sometimes prompting the work to be divided into two volumes in manuscripts, and survives in a very large number of copies, this thesis will focus on Lombard’s commentary on the letters to Titus and Philemon as it appears in a set group of manuscripts, subsequently referred to as the Parisian group, all believed to have been made in or around Paris from c. 1160 to c. 1250. Titus and Philemon were initially selected because they are the shortest of the Pauline Epistles. The decision to focus on Paris was due to the fact that Lombard spent much of his career there and helped to shape the future of theology in Paris. Additionally, manuscript production in Paris accelerated at the start of the thirteenth century with the emergence of the university in Paris, which coincides with the popularity of Lombard’s text. Another reason for choosing these books as a focus for the project is due to the fact that in the early stages of the research project, it became clear that there was a lack of existing scholarship on these books and Lombard’s corresponding commentary. Thus this thesis adds to the body of knowledge on these books and breaks new ground in the study of the copying of glossed manuscripts into the thirteenth century.

---


\(^\text{11}\) Rosemann, *Peter Lombard*, p. 45.

Titus and Philemon are part of the fourteen Pauline Epistles included in the New Testament. These two letters are attributed to Paul and are considered to be important to the development of the early church. Paul’s letter to Titus is instruction for Titus, who is in Crete, to make men priests. These men must be of a certain character, for example they must be ‘without crime, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot, or unruly. For a bishop must be without crime, as the steward of God: not proud, not subject to anger, not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre.’  

Paul’s letter continues with instructions on how a servant of God should behave. This letter might therefore be expected to be of particular interest to churcmen like Lombard, who ultimately became a bishop. Paul’s letter to Philemon follows in a similar vein, as the idea of being a servant of God is repeated. Paul writes to Philemon to ask him to take back his slave Onesimus who had run away from Philemon and ended up with Paul. Paul wants Philemon to take Onesimus back as a converted Christian brother and not as a slave. It must be noted that seruus is most often translated as ‘slave’ but the Douay-Rheims Bible uses ‘servant.’

In general, in his commentary to all fourteen Pauline letters, Lombard paid close attention to the text as well as the historical context. Lombard was not the first person to comment on the Pauline Epistles, and instead he drew on a long tradition of wrestling with these texts. The chapter on text discusses the history of his Collectanea including which sources he borrowed from. Lombard’s commentary on Titus revolves around themes of truth, eternal life and embracing love. As Paul’s letter to Titus revolves around instructing him what kind of men to ordain as priests, Lombard provides further details concerning what these men should be like. When Paul notes that the ordained priests should be without crime, at Titus 1:6, Lombard spends time discussing the idea of being without faults. Towards the very end of his commentary he comes back to this idea when he discusses that baptism is when man becomes new again and he is able to be forgiven for all of his sins.

The major themes in Lombard’s commentary on Philemon are pity, trust, charity and faith in Christ. These themes are juxtaposed with the overall theme of slavery in Paul’s letter to Philemon. Lombard refers to the idea of slavery in relation to Onesimus and Philemon as well as the fact that man is a slave to Jesus Christ. The idea of captivity is communicated more explicitly in Lombard’s commentary than in Paul’s letter itself. Seruus, uinctus, custodia and numerous different conjugations of servire are used to describe Onesimus and the major themes of the main biblical text. These repetitions of words related to slavery found in the commentary create a connection to the main theme of the letter. Lombard’s commentary is reaffirming the beliefs and themes already established in Paul’s letter to Philemon which enables his commentary to act as exposition of the letter. Lombard’s commentary contains much more vocabulary related to prison and slavery than Paul’s letter. In his letter, Paul describes himself in 1:1 as a uinctus Christi Jesu and then describes Philemon in the same way at 1:9. He only refers to Onesimus as a
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13 Douay-Rheims Bible, Titus 1:6 to 1:17.
14 Douay-Rheims Bible, Philemon 1:16.
15 Colish, Peter Lombard, I, p. 196.
16 PL 192:393B Salvos fecit, dico, per lavacrum regenerationis, id est per baptismum in quo deposito veteri homine generatur novus, et renovationis Spiritus sancti, quia quotidie magis ac magis renovamur per Spiritum in baptismo datum. Quem spiritum, scilicet effudit in nos abunde, scilicet ad remissionem omnium peccatorum, et copiam virtutum, et hoc per Jesum Christum Salvatorem nostrum.
slave at 1:16: *non ut seruam sed pro seruo.* The only other obvious mention of prison or slavery is at 1:23 when Paul addresses Epaphras *Salutat te Epaphras concepiarius meus in Christo Jesu.* As the *Collectanea* is a commentary, Lombard provides further information on Paul’s epistle to Philemon. An example of this is found in an argument made by Allen Dwight Callahan who says; ‘The exegetical consensus holds that Onesimus is a fugitive, yet there are no verbs of flight in the entire epistle.’ Although this remark by Callahan may be true, at the first mention of Onesimus in Lombard’s commentary, he is described as fleeing; *pro Onesimo seruo suo, qui cum danno ejus fugerat.* Another mention of Onesimus’ flight is found in the section of commentary associated with verse two of the biblical text. This section reads *Onesimum profugum decurrentem ad divinum auxilium.* These two examples demonstrate what Lombard adds to the interpretation of the biblical text. His choice of diction in relation to Onesimus reinforces the idea of slavery and Onesimus’ attempt to escape it.

In this thesis Titus and Philemon provide case studies for the treatment of Lombard’s text in the developing manuscript tradition. The main questions of the thesis are to determine how the text is presented in these manuscripts, what this reveals about how they were used, and what they can tell us about the manuscript tradition in Paris in the thirteenth century. The manuscripts studied here have been associated with Paris on the basis of their provenance and style. The latter is potentially problematic, as it risks creating circular arguments, thus the provenance evidence for these manuscripts is considered in chapter one. Library catalogues were looked at as well as databases such as *La Bibliothèque virtuelle des manuscrits médiévaux* (BVMM) as part of the *l’Institut de recherche et d’histoire des textes* (IRHT-CNRS) and *Enluminures*, in order to compile an initial list of manuscripts (see Appendix I). In the initial search for existing copies of Lombard’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles those with confirmed ties to Paris or those thought to have been made in Paris were chosen in order to have a selection of Parisian manuscripts to use as comparison to others. Several of these include *ex-libris* of Parisian libraries while others do not. Some of the manuscripts have more decoration than others and this distinction went into the initial selection process of the manuscripts in order to understand the differences and what impact, if any, decorative choices would have had for readers in the thirteenth century.

Although there are plenty of other copies of the *Collectanea* from this period, it was necessary to select a small group to work with in order to make the study manageable. The collation of the text of the six chosen manuscripts provides a basis for a comparison with other copies (Appendices II and III). Manuscripts were selected from across the period in order to explore changes to the text over time in a particular region. Further aims of the project include narrowing down the individual provenances of each manuscript in order to allow for conclusions to be drawn regarding any similarities they may share. In order to attempt an answer to the questions of the thesis a detailed analysis of the textual and decorative elements of the six manuscripts is completed in order to determine whether they were indeed made in Paris.
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17 All translations for the main biblical text are taken from the Douay-Rheims Bible while translations of Lombard’s commentary are my own. ‘Not now as a servant.’
18 ‘There salute thee Epaphras, my fellow prisoner in Christ Jesus.’
19 Callahan, ‘Paul’s Epistle to Philemon’, p. 357.
20 ‘for his own slave Onesimus, who fled with his (slave) with harm’.
21 ‘Onesimus running in flight to divine help’.
The overall analysis is concerned with the reception of Lombard’s commentary. In order to complete this analysis, the thesis is divided into five chapters which cover a selection of elements of Lombard’s commentary on Titus and Philemon in a selection of manuscripts. The chapters discuss the evidence used to establish provenance, provide an overview of the physical form of each manuscript, the various elements of the text as a whole, iconographic choices and reader response. The multidisciplinary nature of this project makes it unique within the existing scholarship on Lombard’s Collectanea. There is a lot of twentieth-century scholarship in which imagery was looked at without consideration of the text and vice versa.\(^2\) This project is an attempt to bring all of the material together which is what makes this study new. However, before we turn to the manuscripts, some additional background on Peter Lombard, the Collectanea and the existing scholarship may be helpful as orientation for the overall study.

**Peter Lombard and the origins of the Collectanea**

Although this is not a thesis on Peter Lombard or his theology, it is helpful to understand his educational background, successes as a teacher and master of theology, and the atmosphere in which he wrote his commentary on the Pauline Epistles in order to approach the content of the manuscripts. Not much is known about Lombard’s early life except for the fact that he was from Northern Italy, as his name suggests.\(^3\) Matthew Doyle’s recent study, *Peter Lombard and His Students* provides a clear introduction to Lombard’s early life, career, initial journey to France and his success as a teacher.\(^4\) An important figure in Lombard’s life was Bernard of Clairvaux, the Cistercian abbot of Clairvaux in the 1130s.\(^5\) Bernard became acquainted with Hubert, Bishop of Lucca, when he visited Italy in the early 1130s and it was then that Hubert recommended Peter Lombard to Bernard.\(^6\) Bernard helped fund Lombard’s initial stay and education at Rheims where Lombard first settled sometime after 1133.\(^7\) After spending a few years at Rheims, Lombard moved to Paris in 1136.\(^8\) The most important document regarding Lombard and his connection to Paris is a letter written c. 1134 – c. 1136 by Bernard of Clairvaux to Gilduin, the abbot of the
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\(^3\) Rosemann, *Peter Lombard*, p. 34.

\(^4\) Matthew Doyle, *Peter Lombard and His Students* (Toronto, 2016).


\(^8\) Colish, *Peter Lombard*, I, p. 17.
Augustinian house of St. Victor on the outskirts of medieval Paris.²⁹ Philipp Rosemann provides the following translation of the letter:³⁰

To the reverend fathers and sirs, and dearest friends, to Gilduin, by God’s grace venerable abbot of St. Victor of Paris, and to the entire holy convent, brother Bernard, called abbot of Clairvaux: greeting and all our prayers.

We have to ask much, since much is asked of us, and we cannot spare our friends, since we are not spared by other friends. The Master Bishop of Lucca, our father and friend, recommended a venerable man to me, Peter Lombard, asking that, through our friends, I provide for him what is necessary for his sustenance, for the short time that he would stay in France to pursue his studies. I have done this while he stayed in Rheims. Now that he is sojourning in Paris I commend him to your love, asking that it may please you to provide him with food during the brief time that he has betaken himself here, up to the Nativity of the blessed Virgin May. Fare ye well.³¹

Rosemann emphasises that the letter does not imply that Lombard stayed at the Abbey of St. Victor but he agrees that it is probable that he spent some time there given the influence that some of Hugh of St. Victor’s works had on him.³² Once Lombard arrived in Paris, Marcia Colish notes that there is no evidence as to what he was doing in the city ‘until he emerged in ca. 1142 as an acknowledged writer and teacher.’³³ Lombard then made a name for himself as a teacher at the cathedral school of Notre-Dame in the 1140s where he ended up teaching for approximately twenty years until his election as bishop of Paris in 1159.³⁴ Ignatius Brady establishes this claim motivated by the fact that Lombard would have needed a connection to Notre-Dame in order to be nominated as Bishop of Paris in 1159 by the canons of Notre-Dame.³⁵ In order to prove that Lombard was himself a canon, Brady examined charters associated with the canons of Notre-


³⁰ Doyle, Peter Lombard and His Students, p.27 provides the Latin text, taken from Ep. 410, Sancti Bernardi opera, ed. Leclercq, Talbot, and Rochais, 8: 391.

³¹ Rosemann, Peter Lombard, p. 35.

³² Rosemann, Peter Lombard, p. 36.

³³ Colish, Peter Lombard, I, p. 17.


Dame from 1133 to 1161 to confirm whether Lombard’s name was amongst the documents. \(^{36}\) Brady concluded that Lombard was most likely a cleric in minor orders when he first arrived in Paris and that he became a canon of Notre-Dame by 1145, and continued to rise through the ranks before being made archdeacon sometime between 1152 and 1156. \(^{37}\) However, Constant Mews and Clare Monagle highlight the fact that although Brady believes the documents may be referring to Lombard, a document firmly identifying Lombard as a canon of Notre-Dame has not been found. \(^{38}\) Further evidence of Lombard’s connection to Notre-Dame is the fact that he owned a house near the church of St. Christopher and the fact that he ended up bequeathing the house and his possessions, including his own copies of his most famous works, to the cathedral. \(^{39}\) Patricia Stirnemann highlights an important twelfth-century manuscript from the Abbey of St. Victor in Paris, Paris, Arsenal MS 265, which includes a list of thirty-four items which Lombard donated to the cathedral of Notre-Dame. \(^{40}\) These findings associated with Lombard’s time in Paris, notably at Notre-Dame, are important as they help to establish where Lombard was when he wrote his commentaries and the *Sentences*. With this in mind it is reasonable to assume that Lombard wrote the first redaction of the *Collectanea*, as well as the second, at Notre-Dame in Paris in the 1140s and 1150s. It is also worth noting that Paris was a much smaller city in the twelfth century than it is now and the main area of manuscript production during this time was roughly between Notre-Dame and the Abbey of St. Victor, on the left bank of the Seine. \(^{41}\)

Lombard’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles exists in two redactions. Colish refers to the important work of Mark Zier and Ignatius Brady when she argues that the first redaction of the text was written ‘between 1139 and 1141 and the second, which revised some but not all parts of the work, between 1155 and 1158.’ \(^{42}\) She notes that Zier ‘has followed Brady in arguing for a date of ca. 1147-48 for the first recension because of Peter’s familiarity with the ideas of Gilbert of Poitiers’, but she claims that Zier ‘ignores the fact that Gilbert taught in Paris for several years prior to his elevation to the see of Poitiers in 1142, and the fact that Peter was informed on Porretan teachings well before the end of the decade.’ \(^{43}\)

Admont, Benediktinerstift MS 233 is a copy of the first edition of Lombard’s commentary and it will be discussed in further detail along with several other earlier copies of the text in chapter three. In addition to the previous scholarship which has established these dates of composition for Lombard’s texts, it has also been established that Lombard’s text was available for copying c. 1163 and that by 1166, copies of his commentaries on the Psalms and the Pauline Epistles were being made in large numbers. \(^{44}\) Although some

\(^{36}\) Brady, ‘Peter Lombard: Canon of Notre Dame’, (p. 282).
early copies of the *Collectanea* are looked at in chapter three, the six manuscripts at the heart of this study all include the second redaction of the text which is the version that became the successful study text.\(^45\)

Peter Lombard’s works, including the *Collectanea*, were shaped by his time in Rheims and Paris, both of which were important educational centres in this period.\(^46\) However, it is important to understand that Lombard had not intended his gloss on the Psalms to be published but rather, he first wrote it for personal study.\(^47\) This was communicated by one of his students, Herbert of Bosham, in the preface to the first volume of his own copies of Lombard’s gloss on the Psalms.\(^48\) Herbert of Bosham and his remarkable copies of Lombard’s commentaries on the Psalms and Pauline Epistles are discussed in much more detail in chapter five. Herbert does not say that Lombard’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles had also originally been meant for private study, but Colish believes that Lombard would not have updated the *Collectanea* ‘unless he was planning to use it as a teaching text, side by side with the *Sentences*’.\(^49\) On this basis it has been assumed that it was only once his *Sentences* were becoming famous that his students began to ask him to lecture on his glosses on the Psalms and Pauline Epistles.\(^50\)

The rise of the Parisian schools in the later twelfth century corresponded with a rise in the demand for books.\(^51\) The craftsmen with the skills for book production (parchmenters, scribes and artists) were attracted to the city and Paris also had a trade in second-hand manuscripts.\(^52\) The manuscripts included in this study are evidence of a text becoming popular and thus copied in great numbers. By focusing on the manuscripts with stylistic and provenance connections to Paris containing Lombard’s commentary it will be possible to note any changes in the layout or style which will then open up the discussion as to why these changes occurred. The process of making manuscripts requires specific skills and organisation. Once the parchment is prepared, the lines are pricked and drawn, and the text is copied. Any decoration is then added before the leaves are sewn into quires and bound. The manuscripts analysed as part of this study illustrate the fact that there were scribes, artists and rubricators along with the artists who were responsible for the penwork which was a specialist skill who might all be involved on a single manuscript. Therefore, multiple participants would have been required in the making of each volume. Large-scale manuscript production in cities like Paris allowed for the development of specialists and collaborative practice. This thesis focuses on

\(^{45}\) Doyle, *Peter Lombard and His Students*, p. 90.
\(^{46}\) Doyle, *Peter Lombard and His Students*, p. 35.
\(^{48}\) Herbert of Bosham’s preface to his version of Lombard’s commentary on the Psalms, Cambridge, Trinity College B. 5. 4, f. 2r. printed in Glunz, *History of the Vulgate in England*, p. 343: Nam cum hecc opera scriberet, nequaquam sicut ipsomet referente didici, ipsi venit in mentem, quod in scolis publicis legerentur; solum ob id facta, ut antiquioris glosatoris, magistri videlicet anselmi laudunensis, brevitatem elucidarent obscuram.
\(^{51}\) Smith, *Masters of the Sacred Page*, pp. 33-34.
some of the more lavishly decorated copies which demonstrate a particular investment of skills and resources.

The Existing Scholarship

This project has been shaped by literature from a range of disciplinary perspectives, dealing with history, literature, theology and manuscripts. The existing scholarship on Peter Lombard is substantial, especially in terms of his biography and works, notably the *Sentences*. The fact that there is considerably more scholarship on the *Sentences* is appropriate given its impact on theology in the twelfth century. This work draws upon previous scholarship as it provides a new look at Lombard’s *Collectanea* as well as a particular focus on Titus and Philemon. There are several sources which have been crucial to this study as they focus on Lombard’s *Collectanea* specifically, and other works are related to the broader literature on the intellectual context as well as the manuscript tradition in Paris during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The *Collectanea* has a significant amount of existing scholarship, but it most often revolves around the content of the text and not so much on manuscript production. Matthew Doyle notes that Lombard’s commentary is directly informed by his lectures as there are sections of text which ‘have the definite character of theological instruction.’\(^{53}\) However, the manuscripts considered here were high-quality, authoritative study texts, rather than lecture notes.\(^{54}\)

In general, this study argues that the *Collectanea* has attracted less attention because there were similar, but more innovative, commentaries on the Pauline Epistles from the same period by scholars including Gilbert of Poitiers, Robert of Melun and slightly later, Thomas Aquinas. Gilbert of Poitiers’ commentary on the Pauline Epistles was written c. 1130 while that of Robert of Melun is dated to c. 1145-1155 and Thomas Aquinas wrote in the thirteenth century.\(^{55}\) Yet Colish has demonstrated how Lombard stood out from his contemporaries in his particular analysis of the Pauline Epistles.\(^{56}\) She notes that he used patristic authorities as well as contemporary sources in order to produce a clear approach to the Pauline Epistles.\(^{57}\) In comparing him to his contemporaries, Colish remarks that ‘he is more concerned than are other scholastic exegetes of Paul during his time with confronting the fact that the authorities may not agree in their interpretation of Paul.’\(^{58}\) The *Sentences* has attracted a significant amount of study, in part due to its immediate reception in the twelfth century, but unlike the *Sentences*, the *Collectanea* was never considered controversial. After Lombard’s death in 1160, his *Sentences* drew criticism due to his comments on Christology from his contemporaries in the 1170s, notably Walter of St. Victor and John of Cornwall, who suggested it contained heresy.\(^{59}\) The claim was brought to the Third Lateran council in 1179 though it was

\(^{53}\) Doyle, *Peter Lombard and His Students*, p. 91.


\(^{55}\) Colish, *Peter Lombard*, I, pp. 196, 199.


\(^{58}\) Colish, *Peter Lombard*, I, p. 207.

subsequently dropped. Lombard’s work was attacked as being heretical once more by Joachim of Fiore, at the Fourth Lateran council in 1215, though ultimately it was dismissed. In the first book of the Sentences, Lombard emphasised ‘a conceptual distinction between the supreme divine essence and the three persons, namely Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.’ The phrase in the text which irked Joachim of Fiore most was one which he actually misquoted: Lombard wrote una et summa quaedam res sit divina essentia while Joachim of Fiore left out una et which then meant Joachim of Fiore believed Lombard was attempting to create a fourth entity other than the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. In dismissing the claims brought against Lombard in 1215, Pope Innocent III ‘was seeking to suppress any lingering voices of criticism being made against a theologian, whose Four Books of Sentences were proving an immensely popular founding for theological study.’ All of the controversy that surrounded Lombard and his Sentences ended up helping to ensure his work was widely read and that his status as an authority remained intact. In 1215 ‘Lombard’s Sentences were mandated as required reading for doctoral candidates in theology in the statutes legislated by the University of Paris.’ It also provides an explanation as to why this particular work has received more attention from modern scholars than his commentaries on the Psalms and Pauline Epistles.

The next two categories of literature which are crucial to this project are history and theology. There are several sources which provide overviews of Lombard’s entire corpus as well as his life. Matthew Doyle’s recent work, Peter Lombard and his Students (Toronto, 2016) provides a comprehensive introduction to Lombard’s early life and career. This work was very helpful for this research as it provides information on his time as a teacher and the impact that his works had on theology in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In particular, the discussion of Herbert of Bosham’s copies of the Collectanea was very helpful to this work. However, Doyle does not discuss any other manuscripts containing Lombard’s commentary which demonstrates what this research will bring to the field of Lombard studies. The other work which provides a solid understanding of Lombard’s entire career is Philipp W. Rosemann’s Peter Lombard (New York, 2004). Rosemann provides background information on Lombard’s life and works before focusing on the Sentences for the greater part of the book.

Marcia Colish has written a significant amount on Peter Lombard. Her most comprehensive work, the two-volume Peter Lombard (Leiden, 1994) provides an understanding of Lombard’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles as well as a thorough reading of his Sentences. She provides background information regarding Lombard’s life, career and works, with the Sentences at the core of her analysis. Her discussions of the Abbey of St. Victor, notably its decline in the last quarter of the twelfth century, and Walter of St. Victor’s attack on Lombard at the Third Lateran Council in 1179 provide insight into how Lombard was
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received during this time. The most useful aspects of the work for this research are the arguments regarding dates of both redactions of the Collectanea as well as the overview of the text, Lombard’s use of authorities in his works, his relationship with the Gloss and the discussion on the different approaches of Pauline exegesis by monastic and scholastic authors. Although the analysis of the Collectanea is useful to this research in that she deconstructs Lombard’s approach to the Pauline Epistles and compares them to other commentaries on the Pauline Epistles written c. 1115 to c. 1160, Colish only discusses Lombard’s commentary to Romans, I Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, I and II Thessalonians and Hebrews. Therefore, her analysis does not include Titus and Philemon. Another article by Colish, ‘Peter Lombard as an Exegete of St. Paul’, in Ad Litteram: Authoritative Texts and Their Medieval Readers, ed. Mark D. Jordan and Kent Emery (Notre Dame, 1992), 71-92, provides more insight into Lombard’s study of the Pauline Epistles. This thesis aims to build on her analysis of the epistles by providing an analysis of Titus and Philemon. Although this particular work by Colish is a large source for understanding what Lombard tried to achieve in his multiple theological works, she does not focus on any manuscripts containing the Collectanea. This thesis is not a study of Peter Lombard, thus it has relied on the work of Doyle, Rosemann and Colish for the historical background and context of production of the original text. In addition to these main sources for information on Lombard, it was necessary to become familiar with scholarship on manuscripts from this period given the fact that this research places the manuscripts at the core.

The large volume of biblical material produced in the thirteenth century has proven to be a daunting task for modern scholars, who have, on the whole, preferred to concentrate on twelfth-century manuscripts. Some of the earliest copies of Lombard’s works have been studied. Two authors whose work has been particularly helpful to this research project are Patricia Stirnemann and Jacqueline Perry Turcheck. In particular, Patricia Stirnemann’s article entitled “Où ont été fabriqués les livres de la glose ordinaire dans la première moitié du XIIe siècle” provides crucial analysis regarding production of glossed books in Laon, Chartres and Paris in the first half of the twelfth century. This article provides insight into the culture of manuscript production in the early twelfth century. A significant amount of her discussion revolves around manuscripts with connections to the Abbey of St. Victor as well as the impact that the Victorines had on the Gloss. The discussions of Paris and the Abbey of St. Victor are important to this research given Lombard’s connections to both locations. As part of her analysis of the manuscripts, she looks at the decorated initials, script, layout and any details regarding the provenance. She compares decorated initials from different glossed books in order to demonstrate the style that was in circulation at that time and she makes note of when it appears to be the same artist. Stirnemann mentions Bibliothèque nationale de France MS Latin 14409, which is included in this project’s analysis of the Gloss. This manuscript includes the glossed Pauline Epistles and the text on Titus and Philemon are part of the textual analysis in chapter three. Stirnemann’s work confirms that this manuscript was made in Paris and she notes that the decorated initials are found in two other manuscripts with ties to St. Victor. This comparison is helpful as she notes the specific styles associated with St. Victor. As this project includes several manuscripts which were once in
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the library of St. Victor, Stirnemann’s analysis of the style associated with the abbey is helpful in my work on the manuscripts and their provenances, and this analysis has helped to inform my own approach to the study of these manuscripts.

Turcheck’s article has also been helpful for this research; ‘A Neglected Manuscript of Peter Lombard’s “Liber Sententiarum” and Parisian Illumination of the Late Twelfth Century.’ Her discussion includes an analysis of some of the historiated initials in Bibliothèque nationale de France, MSS Latin 14266 and 14267, a two-volume manuscript of the Collectanea at the heart of this study. She reads the imagery in the context of the “author as scribe” tradition of portraying Paul in manuscripts from this period. In addition, Turcheck discusses Herbert of Bosham and his own copies of Lombard’s Collectanea; Cambridge, Trinity College MSS B.5.6 and B.5.7. Her analysis of the decoration provides the opportunity to compare and contrast it to the French copies included in this study. Herbert was an important figure in Lombard’s life and he played an important part in getting Lombard’s texts into circulation after his death in 1160. This research project will go beyond Turcheck’s discussion of the imagery in Bibliothèque nationale de France, MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 by making comparisons with other copies of the Collectanea in this study.

One work in particular by Ignatius C. Brady provided an invaluable starting point for this research in providing a list of early copies of Lombard’s Collectanea. This is Brady’s Prolegomena to Sententiae in IV libris distinctae, ed. Ignatius C. Brady, 2 vols (Rome: Editiones Collegii S. Bonaventurae ad Claras Aquas, 1971-1981). Although, like Colish, Brady’s work focused mostly on the Sentences, it provided important insights into the tradition of glossing and Lombard’s use of authorities. In this work Brady focused primarily on Lombard’s Sentences but, in terms of Lombard’s Collectanea, Brady provided crucial information regarding the following four early copies of the text:

- Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (subsequently BAV) MS Vat. Lat. 695
- Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (subsequently BAV) MS Lat. Vat. 144
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France (subsequently BnF) MS Latin 649
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France (subsequently BnF) MS Latin 17246.

According to Rosemann, these four manuscripts contain a “first edition” of the Collectanea, which Lombard must have released for copying and circulation after the council of Rheims, in 1148, for the text contains explicit references to matters discussed at that council, in particular arguments relating to Gilbert de la Porre’s Trinitarian theology. Brady draws attention to the fact that this first version is more extensive than the second one published in the Patrologia Latina, 191, 1297-1696, notably in passages in
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Romans and I Corinthians. Following Brady, I used two of these manuscripts, BnF MS Latin 17246 and Vat. Lat. 144, in the collation and analysis of the text in the thirteenth-century copies. There are no significant changes to Titus and Philemon between these two editions. BnF MS Latin 17246 has special status in this study due to its early date of production and its Parisian style of decoration. Although it is not included in the core group of manuscripts it is used as an important point of comparison. As this study looks at the reception of Lombard’s text, the focus is not on the earliest copies. Even though this copy of Lombard’s commentary was added to the study after the main textual analysis of the core group of manuscripts was completed, it is included in the discussion of the marginal rubrics in chapter three.

Stirnemann has studied the artist of BnF MS Latin 17246, arguing that he subsequently worked in England in the 1160s which is interesting as it demonstrates the potential for specialist artists to travel between centres of manuscript production for work. In her discussion of this manuscript she refers to the other three early copies of Lombard’s text which Brady mentioned and she notes that BnF MS Latin 17246 ‘présente l’édition «primitive» du texte du Lombard, dont quatre exemplaires subsistent.’

Notable exceptions to my generalisation about the lack of scholarship on thirteenth-century biblical manuscripts include the work of Robert Branner and Laura Light. Branner’s Manuscript painting in Paris during the reign of Saint Louis: a study of Styles (Berkeley, 1977) examines a large number of Bibles and glossed books made in Paris in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and provides an important reference point in order to establish the style of decoration included in the manuscripts within this study. Branner attempts to define the different ateliers that were in Paris in the thirteenth century and his work demonstrates that Paris supported a large number of workshops. This study will add to Branner’s list of glossed manuscripts on the Pauline Epistles associated with Paris and will make connections between the manuscripts at the core of this study to some of those which he mentions.

Another scholar who focuses on manuscript production in Paris is Christopher de Hamel. His work entitled Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Book Trade looks specifically at the development of the Glossed Bible. This work provides a thorough explanation of how manuscripts containing Lombard’s commentary were organised and he also provides an introduction to glossed books of the Bible and their popularity throughout the twelfth century. De Hamel’s analysis of the changes in the layout of the main biblical text as well as the commentary in manuscripts from the twelfth century and into the thirteenth century helps to better understand the manuscripts included in this study and provides insight into their possible uses. In addition to providing a thorough analysis of the layout of the selected manuscripts, he also offers information on Admont, Benediktinerstift, MSS 36 and 52, which are the earliest known copies of Lombard’s commentaries on the Psalms as well as the Pauline Epistles; ‘The earliest datable manuscripts of the two texts are a pair of books which are not even French productions but were copied in a Germanic hand for St Eberhard, archbishop of Salzburg, who died in 1164 and who
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presented them to Admont Abbey. His comments on the glossing tradition are useful to this research project given the layout of the manuscripts including Lombard’s commentary. De Hamel’s analysis includes descriptions and information regarding the provenance of BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267, the two-volume copy of the Collectanea which is one of the main manuscripts in this study. De Hamel lists several other copies of the Collectanea which was helpful during the preliminary research for this study and the narrowing down of manuscripts. The fact that this work revolves around Paris is the other reason it has been so helpful for this research study. Understanding the style of Parisian manuscripts during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries enabled the initially large group of manuscripts to be narrowed down to a group of six.

The other exception to the lack of existing scholarship on thirteenth-century Bibles is Laura Light. Her works were helpful for understanding the general status of the production of thirteenth-century biblical manuscripts. In addition, a similar work which ended up being crucial to this study is Luba Eleen’s The Illustration of the Pauline Epistles: in French and English Bibles of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. This is an important source for understanding trends in iconography associated with the Pauline Epistles in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Her study was especially helpful for understanding the artwork included in Mazarine MS 266, one of the main manuscripts in this thesis. Eleen’s study provides examples of Bibles as well as copies of commentaries on the Pauline Epistles which proved helpful for the chapter on iconographic choices. The most helpful element of her work is the discussion on the iconography associated with the Paul and Plautilla myth. She makes note of two Bibles which she believes are the only two Bibles to include this myth along with the scene of Paul’s execution. However, one manuscript in this study, Mazarine MS 266, includes these particular scenes. As it is not a Bible, Eleen does not include a reference to this manuscript within her study. Therefore, this study will go beyond Eleen’s work in adding this copy of Lombard’s commentary to the other manuscripts which she discusses. These works by Laura Light, Robert Branner and Luba Eleen were also helpful in establishing probable provenance for the manuscripts included in this study as they provide information regarding styles used in Paris in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

In addition to the scholars who have spent time looking at early copies of Lombard’s works and related manuscripts, the main source for information on the manuscripts included in this study are library catalogues. However, most of the descriptions provided are extremely short and often only list a possible century for a date of production. The common theme of a lack of scholarship on certain manuscripts within this study is clear when looking at the main sources. The comparison of these manuscripts is a large part of what makes this research project unique within the large field of study related to Peter Lombard and his works. This thesis provides detailed analysis of a group of manuscripts which have not yet been looked at in great detail, considering their design, text, provenance, and decoration.
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Another important work in regards to understanding manuscript production during the period when Lombard’s commentary was being copied is by Richard H. and Mary A. Rouse, *Manuscripts and their Makers: Commercial Book Producers in Medieval Paris 1200-1500*, 2 vols (Turnhout, 2000). This work provides an understanding of commercial production of manuscripts in Paris in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. They highlight the emergence of the Abbey of St. Victor as a producer of manuscripts and the fact that it ‘fostered the growth of the city’s commercial book trade by engaging lay scribes and illuminators to make manuscripts, when necessary.’ Their work provides insight into the sophisticated book-making process that was already in place in Paris in the first half of the twelfth century. This work is useful for this thesis as it provides an introduction to understanding how books were commissioned to be made and how sophisticated the process became during Lombard’s lifetime. Richard and Mary Rouse also provide information on the Abbey of St. Victor which is important for this research given the time that Lombard spent there. Their book is helpful for understanding how and why Paris became such a large centre for manuscript production. However, they do not specifically address any of the manuscripts at the core of this study.

The last main category of literature which is crucial to this study revolves around understanding the intellectual context within which Lombard wrote the *Collectanea*. Beryl Smalley’s *The Study of the Bible of the Middle Ages* is an immense source for information regarding the Victorines as well as the differences between monastic and cathedral schools. This work is cited often by more recent scholars of Lombard given its success as a thorough study of the Bible in the medieval period. Although Smalley discusses manuscripts in detail, she does not include analysis of any manuscripts in this study. In addition, Lesley Smith’s work on the *Glossa* was helpful for understanding its composition as well as the relationship between this text and Lombard’s works. The manuscripts in this study which are not mentioned in any of these works are Angers MS 69, Dole MS 27, Paris Mazarin MS 264 and Mazarine MS 266. This research therefore adds detailed information regarding their provenance, layout, and any decoration to the existing scholarship. In addition, drawing together some of the threads in this diverse body of scholarship has informed my own, multidisciplinary, approach to these books.

**Methodology**

This project is based on close scrutiny of the selected manuscripts. It approaches each manuscript as evidence of engagement with a text at a particular place and time by a patron, scribe, and artist. It treats the physical object of the book as evidence for the investment of time and resources in the creation of a copy of Lombard’s text, and as an expression of attitudes towards the text. In addition, it considers changes to the design, text, and decoration as significant choices on the part of the makers of the volume. The main elements of the manuscripts analysed in detail are the physical form, layout, text, decoration, marginal annotations, and evidence for early provenance.
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These factors are important because patterns of changes to these elements in copies of Lombard’s *Collectanea* help to provide insight into how the text was used. The fact that there are slight differences to these elements in the manuscripts demonstrates differences in use and help us to understand for whom the copies were made. However, similarities in these elements are also important to note as this reflects the fact that this text was copied from existing exemplars, and may also provide insights into workshop practices. In terms of establishing provenance, it is not always possible to determine where manuscripts were made. Therefore, it becomes necessary to go with the best evidence based on the style of script and decoration. In addition, there are examples where evidence for possible provenance are in the form of *ex-libris* notes on the flyleaves. Attempting to establish provenance emphasises the importance of the physical form of these manuscripts as it provides significant information regarding the purpose of these manuscripts and their use. The size and treatment of the manuscripts provide evidence for levels of investment in the book. Manuscripts with ornate historiated initials were clearly treated differently to manuscripts with more modest decoration, representing a greater investment of resources.

For the most part, digital images of the manuscripts were the main resource used in the study. Naturally, consulting images, whether in a digital format or printed in books, presents some difficulties and is never the same experience when compared to viewing original sources. One of the first issues in consulting the digital images is the fact that they are not all of the same quality. Once the core manuscripts were selected, the libraries of those volumes not available as part of online catalogues were contacted in order to acquire images of the manuscripts. Most of the manuscripts had already been digitised with the exception of Angers MS 69. The project was supplied with digital images of the folia containing Titus and Philemon of Angers MS 69 as well as the first and last few folia and flyleaves. However, the remaining folia were not acquired. Another issue of acquiring digital images of the manuscripts was that many had been scanned from existing microfilms which are most often in black and white ink. Therefore, although I obtained a scan of Troyes MS 175, the images were in black and white. This is an example where *La Bibliothèque virtuelle des manuscrits médiévaux* (BVMM) was a crucial resource to this project as all of the images of the manuscripts included in this study which are on this database are provided in colour. However, the database is only helpful in terms of viewing the decoration opposed to the complete text. The other issue of using digital images was with Mazarine MS 264. The bindings of this manuscript are quite tight and therefore, in the digital images it is not always easy to read notes in the inner margins. Overall, consulting the digital images of the manuscripts allowed for an analysis of the layout and textual elements of Lombard’s commentary.

The manuscripts which were consulted in person are Angers MS 69 and BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267. The advantage of viewing them in person was the opportunity to appreciate the large size of these manuscripts. Although measurements of the volumes help to comprehend the size of the volumes, there is no comparison to actually consult the manuscripts in person. It was most helpful to view Angers MS 69 in person as, up to that time, only a selection of the folia had been consulted.

As explained above, there are six manuscripts at the core of this project and they are listed below in order of their dates of production, starting with the earliest:
Angers, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 69, 246 folia, 374 x 270 mm, c. 1160 – c. 1180

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 14267, 158 folia, 390 x 270 mm, c. 1175 – c. 1200

Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 175, 217 folia, 375 x 255 mm c. 1200

Dole, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 27, 242 folia, 374 x 267 mm, c. 1200 – c. 1225

Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine MS 266, 304 folia, 400 x 250 mm, c. 1215 – c. 1230

Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, MS 264, 282 folia, 447 x 303 mm, c. 1250

All of these manuscripts are large volumes, representing a significant investment of resources. This increases the likelihood that they were made for communities rather than individuals however this is a generalisation as there are examples where the evidence clearly suggests that an individual commissioned a copy of Lombard’s text. As noted earlier, de Hamel observes the addition of the main biblical text to copies of Lombard’s text demonstrating a shift in readership.81 This period also saw the miniaturisation of Bibles made in Northern France, wherein the large Bibles of the Romanesque period became significantly smaller and more easily portable.82 De Hamel explains that from roughly 1180 onwards ‘The glossed books grew and the Bibles diminished until they matched each other in size…and then kept on growing and diminishing respectively.’83 This explains why copies of Lombard’s commentary from this period are still in quite a large format, and it is this large size which allowed for a sophisticated layout of the text and decoration. The manuscripts included in this study have a very similar layout and usually place the main biblical text and commentary in two equal-sized columns. The texts in all the manuscripts are distinguishable by the size of script; a slightly larger script for the main biblical text and smaller one for the commentary. The only manuscript not to include the main biblical text is Vat. Lat. 144 which corresponds to its early date of production.

A collation of the commentary to Titus and Philemon is included in Appendices II and III in order to ascertain whether the text went through any changes during the thirteenth century. The existing Patrologia Latina edition is used as a base to work from though the collation is based upon the text in BnF MS Latin 14267, which was chosen for the pragmatic reason that the script is the easiest to read when compared to the other manuscripts, ensuring an accurate transcription.84 In addition to the biblical text and commentary, some of the manuscripts contain marginal annotations. These were an established part of the glossing tradition, but nevertheless provide insights into the copying and reception of the text over time, which will be discussed in detail in chapter three. It is not clear which manuscript the edition used in the Patrologia Latina is based on, however it was completed in the nineteenth century. Rosemann remarks on the fact that the text of Lombard’s gloss on the Psalms as it appears in the Patrologia Latina is based on a

version published in 1541 which resulted in plenty of errors. However, as the manuscripts included in this study are at the core of the project, the edition of Lombard’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles as it appears in the Patrologia Latina is merely used as a starting point.

The non-biblical text contained in the manuscripts consists of three different layers; Lombard’s commentary is primary, the marginal rubrics secondary and any additional notes in the margin are tertiary. The Collectanea is a reflection of Lombard’s success as a theologian and master in Paris: he incorporated passages from patristic and contemporary authors as well as relying heavily on the early twelfth-century work the Gloss. Nearly all the manuscripts in this study include marginal rubrics which are notes in red ink found in the margins. The notes are abbreviations of the names of sources from whom Lombard borrowed, for example, ‘Aug’ for Augustine. These notes are most often accompanied by symbols which are also found within the text in order to notify the reader when a portion of text has been borrowed from another source. Although nearly all of the manuscripts in this study include marginal rubrics, the number of the rubrics changes drastically which is interesting as it demonstrates a change in terms of how the text was read and interpreted. Tables for the rubrics in both Titus and Philemon have been compiled in order to visualise how the rubrics change in the manuscripts. A reader who was well-read in Augustine’s works, for example, would potentially not need the additional rubrics in order to recognise that a certain passage within the text was borrowed from Augustine. Similarly, if a copy of Lombard’s Collectanea was intended for a student of theology they would theoretically need all of the rubrics in order to understand Lombard’s approach in borrowing from several other sources. Angers MS 69 is an example of a copy of Lombard’s text which was most likely used as a study text. This will be demonstrated in the chapters on the rubrics and context of scholarship. Some manuscripts also include marginal notes in either a contemporary hand or a hand from a later period demonstrating reader response. Although the text remained remarkably similar in these manuscripts, the design and the decoration is different in each manuscript. It is obvious that some manuscripts were afforded a larger budget given the level of decoration including the use of gilding in some of the decorated initials. This fact, along with the addition of marginal notations and biblical cross-references, helps to understand how these manuscripts containing Lombard’s commentary were used. If a copy of Lombard’s text was only needed for study then the decoration was not as important unless it added something to the text. Similarly, a copy of the text with a substantial amount of ornate decoration would most likely have been used to demonstrate a patron’s wealth along with the fact that usually, the decoration included in these manuscripts depict scenes from Paul’s life which then act as a secondary source of communication between the reader and the manuscript. These are two examples of possible uses of a manuscript.

This thesis is organised around five chapters. The first chapter looks at the provenance of each manuscript. This chapter is designed to provide details regarding the individual histories of the six main manuscripts included in the study. Drawing from the information provided in the second chapter will help to see which manuscripts share similarities in terms of their layout of text and decoration. Similarly, any clues as to their respective provenances will be looked at in detail. Examples of clues regarding provenance
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are notes with specific details in the outer leaves of the manuscripts and whether the manuscripts include an *ex-libris* denoting a particular abbey or library.

The second chapter discusses the overall design and layout of the six manuscripts included in this study which provides a basis for general comparisons to be made before each manuscript is looked at in greater detail. The decoration in general, size of the manuscripts, and other features of the physical form will be discussed. This chapter acts as an introduction to the study of Parisian culture and medieval book production. Most importantly this chapter aims to demonstrate the similarities these manuscripts share in terms of their physical features.

The third chapter concentrates on the text. Three of the earliest known copies of Lombard’s text are brought into the study in order to compare and contrast with the Parisian group. A significant portion of the third chapter revolves around analysing the marginal rubrics in order to understand which texts of the authorities Lombard found the most influential. The marginal rubrics in the earlier copies will be compared to those in the main group of manuscripts. As part of this analysis, the collated text is included in Appendices II and III. A catalogue in the form of tables is included and this catalogue will then be used in order to find similar quotations which are used and whether any discrepancies between the author and the text cited are discovered. This chapter also discusses the *Gloss* in order to see how much of this text Lombard included in his commentary. Scholars of the *Gloss* including Beryl Smalley and Lesley Smith have stated that Lombard takes everything from the *Gloss*, but it will be important to know exactly what he took and whether he looked at any other material. This chapter looks at the culture in which the manuscripts were made in order to understand the impact which Lombard’s text had in the thirteenth century. This analysis of the text as it appears in the manuscripts contributes to the aim of understanding how Lombard’s text was used.

The fourth chapter looks at the iconography included in the manuscripts. It becomes clear once the manuscripts are looked at that the decoration is not standard. The decoration as a form of response is discussed in this chapter as it is obvious that certain manuscripts had instructional value both in terms of their decoration and text while those without decoration only had instructional value through text. The fifth and final chapter concentrates on the context of scholarship. This chapter focuses on the manuscripts and an understanding of reader response. Herbert of Bosham is an important example of an early reader of Lombard’s material. He was responsible for editing the unfinished work after Lombard’s death.86 His editions of Lombard’s *Collectanea* provide insight into how the text was received in the twelfth century. The rest of the chapter will refocus on the manuscripts at the core of this study in order to determine reading practices of Lombard’s text in the thirteenth century.

This thesis focuses on Paris because it was a major centre of manuscript production and study during this period. The selection of manuscripts from c. 1160 to c. 1250 provides a visual timeline to mark changes in layout, decoration as well as any changes to Lombard’s text. This study is designed to explore changes in manuscripts containing the same text in order to learn more about reader response. The first step

in producing a thorough analysis of Lombard’s commentary to Titus and Philemon is to introduce the manuscripts and the clues included in them in order to provide information regarding their provenance.
Chapter One: Understanding Provenance

Establishing the provenance of the manuscripts included in this study is at the core of the project as it provides a foundation for understanding them as products of a particular place, in this case Paris. Of the six manuscripts at the heart of this research, nearly all had been identified with Paris in previous catalogues, either on the basis of their style or inscriptions. However, as Stirnemann and others have noted, it is not always easy to distinguish products of the city of Paris from those of the wider region covered by the archdiocese of Sens.¹ This chapter will set out the evidence for the place of production of each manuscript in terms of the style of decoration and script. In addition to establishing provenance, this chapter will look at any additional information included in the manuscripts which might provide insight into previous ownership and use. An initial search for the provenance of each manuscript resulted in the names of people and places with possible ties to the manuscripts. Determining when these inscriptions were written on the folia and whether they communicate anything of substance was then necessary in order to have a better understanding of the history of these manuscripts. Knowing when these statements of origin or ownership were added to the manuscripts is important when attempting to establish the history behind them. Each of the manuscripts at the centre of this study contains at least one clue as to their history though the clues do not always provide information as to their production, but more often to their ownership at different times. As establishing the provenance of the manuscripts is not an easy task, it is not always possible to know where things were made. Therefore, it is necessary to determine the best evidence available and then to use that to make the final determination as to provenance. This chapter aims to demonstrate that, based on notes included in the manuscripts along with stylistic evidence, it is plausible that the six manuscripts at the core of the study were made in Paris. However, there are problems with using style as an indication of origin due to the fact that there were several workshops in Paris in this period, and the movement of books and people makes it difficult to pin down the work of individuals with any degree of precision.² With this in mind, we have to do the best we can by comparing and contrasting the manuscripts, taking into account any other evidence, for example in inscriptions which will be discussed in this chapter.

Of the manuscripts included in this study there are three which have definite connections to a particular place. BnF MS Latin 14267 and Mazarine MS 266 both include ex-libris inscriptions from the Abbey of St. Victor in Paris indicating that they were owned by the abbey in the Middle Ages. As the ex-libris inscriptions are of multiple dates, it is difficult to determine a date when the library began to catalogue its manuscripts. Previous scholarship has dated BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 to the end of the twelfth century and Mazarine MS 266 to the middle of the thirteenth century.³ Similarly, it has already

² Branner’s Manuscript Painting in Paris during the Reign of Saint Louis provides an overview of workshops which were active in Paris towards the end of the twelfth century and throughout the thirteenth century.
³ Christopher de Hamel dates BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 to the twelfth century in Glossed books of the Bible and the origins of the Paris booktrade (Woodbridge, 1984), p. 33. For Mazarine MS 266 see Auguste Molinier, Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Mazarine, 4 vols (Paris, 1885-1898), I (1885), 96 ; Initiale, IRHT, Mazarine MS 266: <http://initiale.irht.cnrs.fr/codex/6366/8834> [accessed July 2018].
been established by other scholars that Troyes MS 175 was made in Paris in the first quarter of the thirteenth century.¹ The remaining three manuscripts, Angers MS 69, Dole MS 27 and Mazarine MS 264, have rough dates of production though it is the intention of this chapter to add to current research by testing the evidence provided by these manuscripts for a Parisian origin and refine the assessment of their place and date of production.² The initial opinion as to the manuscripts having been made in Paris came from the Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes (IRHT) database Initiale which provides information regarding the possible provenance for Angers MS 69, Dole MS 27 and Mazarine MS 264. The Initiale database indicates that these three manuscripts were made in Northern France but they question whether they were made in Paris.³ In addition to the Initiale database, library catalogues provided a starting point for the identification of information regarding the six manuscripts in the initial stages of this research project. With all of this in mind, the style of illumination and script will be looked at in order to provide these manuscripts with more concrete evidence as to their provenance of Paris.

**Manuscripts from St. Victor**

BnF MS Latin 14267 is the second volume of a two-part manuscript of Lombard’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles, the first volume being BnF MS Latin 14266. This manuscript was once bound as one volume, but was divided at some point.⁴ There are conflicting views regarding its date of production. Matthias Tischler dates the two volumes to c. 1170 to c. 1180 while Walter Cahn and Léopold Délisle place their date of production more generally in the last quarter of the twelfth century.⁵ Similar to Tischler, Larry Ayres believes the main artist for this manuscript began the illuminations in the 1160s or 1170s due to the fact that the artist’s ‘style has closer associations with or emerges from Mosan circles.’⁶ Ayres’s basis for dating this manuscript to the 1160s and 1170s is due to the style of decoration.⁷ However, Tischler’s basis for this date is due to several notes found in the flyleaves of both volumes which will be explained shortly. The two volumes provide numerous notes and ex-libris inscriptions which demonstrate that the volumes continued to be consulted throughout the Middle Ages. However, these notes are not all helpful in establishing where the manuscript was made. A selection of these notes will be discussed in chronological

---


order to understand the history of this manuscript, and for the fact that when compared to the other manuscripts in the study, BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 include the greatest amount of such evidence for ownership.

The style of decoration will also be looked at in terms of placing this manuscript within that particular decade. BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 contain a tremendous amount of fine artwork; each letter is prefaced with a large detailed painted initial, many of which are historiated. However, the script is looked at first with a section of Lombard’s commentary to Titus as it appears in BnF MS Latin 14267 (Fig. 1.1). The script in BnF MS Latin 14267 is well-spaced and easily legible which corresponds to the fine artwork included in this manuscript. Overall this manuscript appears to have been meant to impress readers. The script appears to be a high-quality Gothic script which fits with the date provided by Tischler. This two-volume manuscript is an example of multiple scribes and artists sharing the workload. Cahn notes that the bulk of the initials were painted by two main artists while three initials (those to II Timothy on folio 99v, Philemon at 112v, and Hebrews at folio 115r) were completed by a third artist. The main artist has been identified by Cahn and Ayres as having English and Mosan connections. The content of the decorated initials is discussed in much greater detail in chapters two and four but the style of the artwork is important for acknowledgement along with the style of script as it helps to establish the place of production.

BnF MS Latin 14267, along with the first volume BnF MS Latin 14266, has received previous study due to its elaborate and ornate decoration. Robert Branner suggests that this manuscript was made in Paris due to its similar style to a copy of Lombard’s commentary on the Psalms, Paris BnF MS Latin 11565. It is believed that BnF MS Latin 11565 was made no later than 1193. Part of the reason for Branner’s claim that this manuscript was made in Paris is due to the style of the illumination, which he suggests has ties to the Manerius shop and to the north of France. The other reason is the fact that BnF MS Latin 11565 was owned by a cleric by the name of Nicolas who retired to St. Victor in Paris and who gave the manuscript to Guérin, who was abbot of St. Victor from 1172-1193. Christopher de Hamel provides an important explanation for this note which mentions Nicolas on folio 172r of BnF MS Latin 11565. He explains that the Nicolas was a cleric who died at St. Victor in Paris and he left his possessions to Abbot Guérin. De Hamel believes that, as Guérin was abbot of St. Victor from 1172-1193, the manuscript’s original owner must have died between these years which is the evidence that BnF MS Latin 11565 was

---

11 Walter Cahn, Romanesque Manuscripts: The Twelfth Century, 2 vols (London, 1996), II (1996), p. 112. *note a small error in Cahn; in left column on page 112 he provides the folia for each initial, here he notes Hebrews begins on f. 115r but in the right column he then refers to folio 115v. The initial is on f. 115r.
17 De Hamel, Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Booktrade, p. 47
made before 1193.\textsuperscript{18} De Hamel notes that there is no evidence to suggest that the manuscript ever left Paris.\textsuperscript{19} These comments by de Hamel clearly point to Parisian origins. The fact that BnF MS Latin 11565 and BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 include similar decoration and all ended up at St. Victor suggests a shared and probably local provenance.

Branner notes the specific style in creating the scrollwork in BnF MS Latin 11565 which includes ‘leaves of a different color from the stems, and particularly in the head type and the animals.’\textsuperscript{20} An example of the decoration is provided in order to compare to the style of decoration in BnF MS Latin 11565 (Fig. 1.2). The initial marks the start to Psalm 1. There is gilding along with vines in blue, red, and green which sprout foliage as well as human faces. This style of foliage and scrollwork is found in decorated initials throughout BnF MS Latin 14267 including examples which match very closely to those in BnF MS Latin 11565 (Fig. 1.3). Figure 1.3 uses a similar amount of gilding and the same colours, blue, green, and red that are used in figure 1.2. Another example taken from another initial in BnF MS Latin 14267 demonstrates the use of human faces which is another similarity to BnF MS Latin 11565 (Fig. 1.4). In addition to Branner’s suggestion of a Parisian style of illumination, BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 also offer important information in the form of inscriptions which help to understand the previous ownership of the two volumes.

On folio 1r of BnF MS Latin 14266 there are a series of different scripts which provide further evidence as to this manuscript’s previous ownership. The first phrase is an anathema in a large clear script from the late twelfth century which reads 
\begin{quote}
Iste liber est s(an)c(t)i uictoris par(isiensis) Q(u)i(e) cu(me) eum furat(us) fu(er)it uel celau(er)it ut tu(itu) m deleuerit anath(em)a sit 
\end{quote}
(Fig. 1.5).\textsuperscript{21} This inscription clearly states the ownership of the manuscript as that of the Abbey of St. Victor and it acts as a warning to those readers who may think of stealing the book. This phrase was a standard phrase attached to manuscripts at the Abbey of St. Victor throughout the Middle Ages, demonstrating that it had become part of a system in place at the abbey to organise the materials in their library.\textsuperscript{22} The fact that other ex-libris from the Abbey of St. Victor appear in a very similar hand in the manuscripts looked at within this study demonstrate the possibility that the ex-libris were added around the same time, presumably as part of a campaign to organise the library. That the books were seen to require anathemas raises the possibility that they were being borrowed and removed from the abbey, and even that they were being made available to people from outside the abbey community. Figure 1.5 appears to be a late twelfth-century ex-libris, suggesting that the abbey had the book around the time of the donation of BnF MS Latin 11565. There is a possibility that BnF MS Latin 11565 and BnF MSS 14266 and 14267 were part of the same gift to the abbey.

\begin{flushright}
\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[21] ‘This book is of Saint Victor in Paris. He who steals or conceals it by removing this inscription is cursed’; See Clemens and Graham \textit{Introduction to Manuscript Studies} p. 125 for a partial translation for this phrase; Cahn, \textit{Romanesque Manuscripts}, II, p. 112.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
\end{flushright}
The next note in BnF MS Latin 14266 is a reference to the book having been redeemed, which is possibly a thirteenth-century inscription, on the basis of the palaeography. There is a flyleaf in the first volume, BnF MS Latin 14266, with sections of text by several different hands. At the very top of the folio there is a note, seemingly in a late twelfth- or thirteenth-century hand, with a mention of Frater Andrew. The note is difficult to read, but as Tischler observed, it appears to say: *Iste liber est pro LX s[olidis] parisien(sibus).*\(^{27}\) This volume was bought by Jacobus Romanus Bobonum who was a cleric of San Lorenzo in Damaso, Rome, and later a canon and prior of St. Victor.\(^{28}\) He most likely purchased this book during his time as prior, which is evidence of a pattern of buying back books at the Abbey of St. Victor. Tischler identified three other manuscripts with a similar inscription and he ties them to Jacobus; Mazarine MS 131, Mazarine MS 126 and Mazarine MS 142.\(^{29}\) Similarly, Richard and Mary Rouse discuss fourteen volumes, Mazarine MSS 131-144 which belonged to St. Victor and ‘shed light on the commercial booktrade early in the thirteenth century.’\(^{30}\) Mazarine MSS 131-144 make up a complete glossed Bible including a copy of Lombard’s *Collectanea* which is found in Mazarine MS 143.\(^{31}\) All of the volumes are believed to have been made in Paris in the thirteenth century and were donated to the Abbey of St. Victor by Friar Pierre de


\(^{30}\) Rouse, *Manuscripts and their Makers*, II, 146.

Châteauroux who had been a canon of the abbey in 1246.\textsuperscript{32} The style of artwork belongs to the Almagest atelier as described by Branner which is further evidence of their Parisian origins.\textsuperscript{33} Rouse note that Mazarine MS 140 includes slashes beside the historiated initials which is evidence of professional production.\textsuperscript{34} Returning to the phrase which mentions Jacobus, in a review of a work by Christopher de Hamel, Patricia Stirnemann highlights this phrase and connects it to another manuscript, Mazarine MS 421, a missal for use in the abbey in Bréventec, which has a near-exact phrase written by the same clerk; \textit{Ego Jacobus Romanus Bobonum Sanctorum Laurentii ac Damasi clericus emi librum istum a Blavio bedello pro C. sol. parisiensi}.\textsuperscript{35} This phrase also appears in a copy of the glossed gospels of Luke and John, Mazarine MS 142.\textsuperscript{36} Richard and Mary Rouse explain that Jacob ‘bought [Mazarine MS 142] second-hand from Blavius the bedel.’\textsuperscript{37} Rouse provides further information as to bedels:

No evidence suggests that bedels at Paris were formally charged with responsibilities in the production of university books, as were their counterparts at Bologna. However, Parisian bedels were responsible for the material of a nation or a faculty, and were involved in procuring goods; as a result, they must often have had to dispose of unredeemed books that students and masters deposited as collateral for fees or debts.\textsuperscript{38}

Similarly, Tischler refers to this note in Mazarine MS 142 although he refers to Blavius as a bookseller [\textit{Buchhändler}].\textsuperscript{39} Although the phrase in BnF MS Latin 14267 does not mention Blavius or another bedel, it is clear that the phrases in all three manuscripts refer to the same Jacob. They note the San Lorenzo church in Rome and they mention that Jacob bought these manuscripts with Parisian currency. The evidence suggests that these volumes were repeatedly used to raise money by being sold and then bought back. This perhaps suggests that they were prized possessions (and therefore worth redeeming), but this presumably means that they were not being read much at the Abbey of St. Victor in the early thirteenth century.

Stirnemann summarises de Hamel’s provenance for BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267, which he believed to have been made towards the end of the twelfth century and donated to the Abbey of St. Victor in Paris in the middle of the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{40} Although there is some disagreement in providing the two volumes with a date of production, it is agreed that the note by Jacob confirms that the abbey received the manuscripts in the thirteenth century. It is important to acknowledge that all of these notes testify to use by different people which highlights the use of these manuscripts. BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 has clear


\textsuperscript{34} Rouse, \textit{Manuscripts and their Makers}, II, 146.


\textsuperscript{37} Rouse, \textit{Manuscripts and their Makers}, II, 146.

\textsuperscript{38} Rouse, \textit{Manuscripts and their Makers}, II, 146.

\textsuperscript{39} Tischler, ‘Die Auftraggeber, Vorbesitzer un schenker der Bibeln von Saint-Victor’, (p. 54).

\textsuperscript{40} Stirnemann, \textit{Bulletin Monumental} (p. 365).
evidence that it was in the Abbey of St. Victor in Paris in the thirteenth century and perhaps earlier, and appears to have been made in Paris.

In addition to the notes which provide information regarding ownership, BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 include painted shields. On folio 4r of BnF MS Latin 14266 there is the coat of arms (Fig. 1.8). The Victorine coat of arms began to be added to the library’s books in the thirteenth or early fourteenth century. The note in red ink which accompanies the coat of arms appears to have been added in the sixteenth century and it references St. Victor and the Augustinians. This is an example of much later inscriptions, of which there are many. These do not help with the early provenance, but they suggest that the two volumes continued to be valued throughout the Middle Ages. Similar to the twelfth or thirteenth-century *ex-libris* inscription already acknowledged (Fig. 1.5), BnF MS Latin 14266 includes a second *ex-libris*, in a sixteenth-century hand and found on folio 2r (Fig. 1.9). In addition to being in a different hand, this version does not contain any abbreviations, aside for an ‘a’ for *amen*, in comparison to the first example. Presumably these differences are a result of the *ex-libris* being added by different scribes and at different time periods. This find is interesting in that it demonstrates how important this volume was to the library and it shows the effort that went into keeping it in the hands of the owner. The next example of this phrase is found on folio 3r of BnF MS Latin 14267 (Fig. 1.10). The hand is very similar to the second *ex-libris* in BnF MS Latin 14266 (Fig. 1.9), noting that the initial ‘I’ is the same and there are not any abbreviations. The only differences between these two examples is the abbreviation for *amen* in the first and the slight difference to the ‘U’ in *Victoris*. As the *ex-libris* in figure 1.5 looks earlier than those in figures 1.9 and 1.10 it may be that the latter two were added when the manuscript was divided.

On folio 2v of BnF MS Latin 14267 there is an *ex-libris* in a late medieval hand but it finishes differently to the ones already looked at: *Hic liber est sancti victoris parisiensis. Inueniens quis ei reddat amore dei* (Fig. 1.11). This statement is reminiscent of the anathema often stated in *ex-libris* from St. Victor as well. It acts as a way of pleading with a reader or borrower of the book to return it. On folio 158v *Quod placeat ante se p[er] ih[esu][christum] dominum n[ost]r[u]m cui est honor* is written in a hand which differs to the others already present in the manuscript (Fig. 1.12). There is an example of the idea of the scribe using the outside pages as practice space at the very end of BnF MS Latin 14267. On folio 158v there are seven penwork initials which may be evidence of someone trying to imitate the initials in the volume. Another example which proves that this manuscript was once used at the Abbey of St. Victor is the crest and the mention of the Augustinians found on folio 3v (Fig. 1.13). It is identical to the one on folio 4r of BnF MS Latin 14266 (Fig. 1.8).

All of this information regarding the multiple *ex-libris* included in BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 is consistent with it being an expensive gift. However, the *ex-libris* included in these two volumes do not imply that the manuscript was made in Paris, but rather that it was there at an early date, most likely the

---

42 Robert Branner, ‘Manuscript Painting in Paris around 1200’ (p. 174).
44 ‘This book is of Saint Victor of Paris. When he who finds (this book) he should return it for love of God.’
45 ‘Which is pleasing before itself through our master Jesus Christ to whom is honour.’
late twelfth century. Acknowledging the inscriptions is important given that the other manuscripts included in the Parisian group do not include this volume of inscriptions. Nevertheless, Branner’s stylistic analysis makes a Parisian origin plausible.

Mazarine MS 266

Mazarine MS 266 is the other manuscript with connections to the Abbey of St. Victor in Paris. Unlike BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 which are believed to have been made in the last twenty years of the twelfth century, Tischler suggests that Mazarine MS 266 was made in the second quarter of the thirteenth century. Tischler does not provide details as to his dating of Mazarine MS 266 but the evidence is set out in this section of the chapter. The ex-libris is again present along with the crest of St. Victor (Fig. 1.14). The fact that the crest and the phrase attributed to St. Victor are nearly identical in Mazarine MS 266 and BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267, reveals a standardised campaign to organise the contents of the library in the late thirteenth or fourteenth century. The other mention of St. Victor is found at the end of the manuscript on folio 315v (Fig. 1.15). This note at the bottom of the folio is interesting because it offers the first part, *Iste liber est sancti Victoris* as seen several times but it also offers a second phrase which is not present in the other St. Victor manuscript. The phrase is written in a thirteenth-century hand which means it may have been the scribe(s) who copied the manuscript. The Bibliothèque Mazarine also provides this information and it has the following transcription of the second phrase; *Quem dedit nobis magister Guerinus nepos fratris Girardi quondam decani Baluacensis, canonici nostri.* An initial search for the second phrase in the *Gallica* catalogue of the Bibliothèque nationale de France yields information crucial to understanding the provenance of Mazarine MS 266. The same phrase that appears in this manuscript also appears on folio 324r of a copy of Lombard’s commentary on the Psalms, made in the second quarter of the thirteenth century, BnF Latin MS 14241 (Fig. 1.16).

It is interesting that this phrase appears in copies of Lombard’s commentary on the Psalms and the Pauline Epistles as it reflects the probability that these two books of the Bible were being made as sets. The phrase in BnF Latin MS 14241 reads *Iste liber est sancti Victoris parisiensis. Quicumque eum furatus fuerit uel celauerit uel tytulum istum deleuerit anathema sit. Quem dedit nobis Magister guerinus nepos fratris girardi quondam decani beluacensis canonici nostri.* The Bibliothèque nationale de France provides a description for the phrase beginning *Quem dedit nobis; ‘This manuscript belonged to master Guérin, nephew of Gerard, a victorine canon, who donated it to the library of the Abbey of St. Victor in Paris.’* 

---

49 See also Tischler, ‘Die Auftraggeber, Vorbesitzer un schenker der Bibeln von Saint-Victor’, (p. 45).
50 Tischler, ‘Die Auftraggeber, Vorbesitzer un schenker der Bibeln von Saint-Victor’, (p. 45); ‘This book is from Saint Victor in Paris. Whichever [book], having been stolen, may have been or may have been hidden. The anathema may be that inscription that he may have erased. This manuscript belonged to master Guérin, nephew of Gerard, a victorine canon, who donated it to the library of the abbey.’
51 ‘Ce manuscrit a appartenu à maître Guérin, neveu de Gérard, un chanoine victorin, qui en fit don à la bibliothèque de l’Abbaye de Saint-Victor de Paris.’ Bibliothèque nationale de France, Archives et
This phrase is identically written in Mazarine MS 266 except for the fact that there are a few extra words, in a later hand, which do not appear in Mazarine MS 266; *qui obiit anno Christi 1281 sepultus in claustro sancti Victoris ante capitulum*. This phrase is in a sixteenth-century hand and refers to the death of Guérin in 1281.\(^52\) It is now understood that master Guérin was the nephew of Gérard (and that Guérin was a canon and he donated this manuscript to the abbey of St. Victor in Paris). Tischler identified this Guérin as the master and canon of Notre-Dame de Nesle and Saint-Pierre de Beauvais, both north of Paris, who died in 1281.\(^53\) This date of 1281 is found in the transcription in BnF Latin MS 14241, written in the sixteenth century as explained by Tischler.\(^54\) As Guérin was a master he presumably studied at a university. Therefore, his donation to the Abbey of St. Victor suggests that he had a connection to that house, and it provides circumstantial evidence that makes it likely that he would have obtained a manuscript made in Paris. Tischler notes that this autograph ownership entry of “Garin” on folio 315v (Fig. 1.15) is also in Mazarine MS 4310, which contains a collection of fragments: *Ist e epistole sunt magistri. Garin de grandievilla canonici de nigella precium. Xiiii librorum parisiensium*.\(^55\) All of this is evidence of the book trade in Paris during this time.

In terms of the style of script and artwork of Mazarine MS 266, the script is a Gothic book hand (Fig. 1.17). The manuscript does not include penwork initials but there are painted initials throughout to mark the start of the main biblical text as well as Lombard’s corresponding prologues and commentary. The painted initials depict scenes from Paul’s life which was a common theme in the thirteenth century.\(^56\) Each decorated initial is framed in blue and red inks, with design elements including small dots, circles and flourishes (Fig. 1.18). The scenes depicted use full-length figures. Figure 1.18 demonstrates that the feet of the figures are not contained within the initial. The drapery of the clothing is well defined. The figures are reminiscent of the Du Prat atelier described by Robert Branner, specifically the fact that the ‘strands of hair [are] carefully drawn to give an impression of combed or curled locks.’\(^57\) The inclusion of multiple *ex-libris* inscriptions and painted crests in BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 as well as that in Mazarine MS 266 demonstrates that these books were valuable objects belonging to St. Victor. It is striking that so many of these St. Victor manuscripts were made for individuals and then given to the community as gifts. This helps to explain why multiple copies of the same text were in the library.

### Other Parisian Manuscripts

The next manuscript which offers information relating to its provenance is Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine MS 264 which is believed to have been made in Paris in the middle or third quarter of the thirteenth century.

---

\(^57\) Branner, *Manuscript Painting in Paris during the Reign of Saint Louis*, p. 79.
due to its style of decoration. On folio 1r there is a note in a much later hand than that of the commentary, which references the Carmelites of Paris (Fig. 1.19). The note on folio 1r of Mazarine MS 264 was transcribed by Auguste Molinier, a nineteenth-century historian (who, among other historical works, created catalogues of the manuscripts belonging to the Bibliothèque Mazarine) as:

«Glosa ordinaria comunis, non tamen tot abundans partum authoritatibus quot recentiores, vel si tot abundet, non eo quo reperiantur ordine in recentioribus, sicuti ex collation librorum repperi ego frater Antho. Corrozet, custos hujus librarie. Scriptum anno Domini 1571.» - «De libraria conventus Carmelitarum Parisiensium.» Anciens 673 et I, 12.59

This note provides information on the manuscript’s later ownership and not its production and more importantly, it must be stressed that this text is prefaced with a statement saying that this note is incorrect; la note suivante, que est erronée. Molinier goes on to state that this manuscript belonged to the monastery, he presumably means the Carmelites of Paris, in the fourteenth century; ‘Appartenaient au couvent dès le XIVe siècle.’60 He does not provide further information to prove his claim that the manuscript belonged to the monastery in the fourteenth century but regardless, neither his statement nor the note at the bottom of folio 1r provide details about the manuscript’s place or date of production. The Carmelite monastery in Paris was established in 1259 by Saint Louis.61 Therefore, the monastery post-dates the production of this manuscript, however, as demonstrated with BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267, this manuscript could have been given to the community shortly after its establishment.

Other than this note the manuscript does not include any additional references to possibilities regarding its origin. Therefore we have to rely on the appearance of the manuscript to determine its origins. The initial at the start to I Timothy is included in the illustrations and it depicts Paul who is holding a sword in one hand and a long scroll with the other (Fig. 1.20). All of the decorated initials in this manuscript include a combination of this pose with either a sword, scroll or both. This style of portraying Paul was well established by this period.62 In the initial at the start of I Timothy Paul is shown in robes of red and blue, though the red is slightly more orange than the red tones used for the diapered background of the initial. The decoration in this manuscript bears a strong resemblance to a Bible made in Paris in the third or fourth quarter of the thirteenth century, Autun Bibliothèque municipale MS 146 A (Fig. 1.21). This manuscript has been identified as having Parisian origins due to the numbering of the chapters in blue and red pigments, the order of books and Parisian prefaces and the presentation of the Interpretationes nominum which is also believed to be Parisian.63 The decoration, dated to the years following 1270 is Parisian and the placement of historiated initials at the start of each biblical book and at the divisions of the Psalter has been described as

59 Molinier, Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Mazarine, I, 96.
60 Molinier, Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Mazarine, I, 96.
62 Branner, Manuscript Painting in Paris During the Reign of Saint Louis, p. 19
following the Parisian canon. This evidence for Autun MS 146 A having been made in Paris is important when comparing this manuscript to Mazarine MS 264. The initial to the start of Titus in Autun MS 146 A is included in the illustrations and it is immediately evident how similar the diaperwork and frame are to that in Mazarine MS 264 (Figs. 1.20 and 1.21). The other similarities are seen in the figure of Paul who is, in both initials, looking towards the right, sitting on a green seat, his head is surrounded by a green halo and the robes use a similar shade of orange as well as blue.

In addition to the painted initials Mazarine MS 264 includes fine examples of penwork initials marking the verses of biblical text (Fig. 1.22). The penwork appears to belong to the 1230-1250 category provided by Stirnemann. The penwork design includes the “œufs grenouille”, small rounds with a point in the middle that are often stacked on one another, which Stirnemann notes was an important construction of the 1240s. Therefore I would provide Mazarine MS 264 with a date of c. 1240 – c. 1250. The evidence suggests that Mazarine MS 264 may be a slightly earlier example of the same workshop which produced the Bible in Autun.

Troyes MS 175

The next manuscript is Troyes MS 175. On the inside cover of the manuscript there is a substantial number of notes in what appear to be two different hands. The notes are difficult to read thus it is not possible to prove whether they provide details of the manuscript’s provenance. On the inside of the back cover there are also notes in a very untidy hand and although the bulk of the writing is illegible there are a few phrases beginning with Nota as on the inside of the front cover. Lombard’s commentary begins on folio 1r but a small detail on the preceding folio provides a clue to the manuscript’s previous ownership. The note appears to be in a similar hand to the main text and it reads Liber Rollandi abbatis monasterii arremare(n)sis (Fig. 1.23). An abbot of Montiéramey, a small town roughly two hundred kilometres from Paris, by the name of Roland owned this book though no date of production is provided within the manuscript. Robert Branner identified Roland as the abbot from 1207 to 1225, and attributed the manuscript to the Parisian Alexander atelier, named after Master Alexander. Richard and Mary Rouse note that Troyes MS 175 was left to Clairvaux by Roland, the abbot of Montiéramey, who died in 1225. The Alexander atelier was named after an inscription found in an early Bible (Bibliothéque nationale de France MSS Latin 11930 and 11931) and Branner provided links between this atelier and the Almagest atelier, another shop working in Paris at the time, though he believed the former was less imaginative and skilled than the latter. Branner used the dates of Roland’s abbacy to argue that ‘the Alexander shop was active in the first quarter of the century.’ Branner provided the dates from which Roland was abbot but this does not confirm the date of production for Troyes MS 175 since we do not know when the manuscript belonged

---

64 Catalogue des manuscrits conservés à Autun, p. 336.
68 Rouse, Manuscripts and their Makers, II, p. 147.
69 Branner, Manuscript Painting in Paris during the Reign of Saint Louis, pp. 29-30.
70 Branner, Manuscript Painting in Paris during the Reign of Saint Louis, p. 29.
to him. Nevertheless, Branner’s identification of the work of the Alexander shop does suggest that this volume was made in Paris, most likely in the early thirteenth century, perhaps for abbot Roland.

Although the style of illumination in Troyes MS 175 has been associated with the Alexander atelier, it is interesting that the style is reminiscent of another atelier known as the Almagest. 71 This atelier was named after the Almagest Master whose hand, in the form of a colophon, is found in a copy of Ptolemy’s *Almagest*, BnF MS Latin 16200. 72 The colophon included in BnF MS Latin 16200 states that the manuscript was copied at the Abbey of St. Victor of Paris and it was completed in December 1213. 73 In terms of the style of decoration of the Almagest atelier, Branner refers to an initial on folio 1r (Fig. 1.24). 74 An example of the similarities between ateliers, as discussed by Branner, is found in the decorated initial on folio 1r of Troyes MS 175 (Fig. 1.25) which is very reminiscent of the style of the Almagest atelier from Paris as it has the ‘long, box-like appearance of the Almagest initial.’ 75 The other painted initial in Troyes MS 175 occurs on folio 2r at the start of Romans and it depicts the conversion of Paul. The rest of the initials throughout the manuscript are in penwork. Further evidence that Troyes MS 175 appears to be part of the Almagest atelier as described by Branner is the similarity in the style of penwork initials to those in BnF MS Latin 16200 (Figs. 1.26 and 1.27). Troyes MS 175 appears to reflect Branner’s comments regarding the fact that the Alexander shop shared some features with the Almagest shop. 76 The similarities between the workshops demonstrates the likelihood that some artists were employed in multiple workshops at different times. 77

**Dole MS 27**

The next manuscript in the Parisian group is Dole MS 27 which is thought to have been made in Paris in the second quarter of the thirteenth century. 78 It has a few additions which provide details as to its provenance though the connections are not as clear as those in the previous manuscripts. On the inside cover of the manuscript there is a short post-medieval paragraph written in French (Fig. 1.28). The paragraph provides a description of the manuscript; written in four columns (two for the commentary which is in a smaller hand and two for the main biblical text), on parchment, decorated initials of both ornaments and figures in coloured ink and enhanced with gilding detail. The note appears to finish with a signature, but it is not entirely legible. The note claims that the manuscript is from the fifteenth century, but this is a mistake as the manuscript is most certainly from the thirteenth century. The last line of the paragraph appears to read *ce volume provient des Cordeliers de Dole*. The term *provient* means “comes from” which suggests that at some point this manuscript belonged to the Cordeliers, but the phrase does not mean that it was made in

75 Branner, *Manuscript Painting in Paris during the Reign of Saint Louis*, p. 27.
Dole. On folio 242v there is a section of what appears to be medieval text towards the bottom of the page which has, at some point, been erased which has resulted in nearly all of it being illegible. A few words are still visible including anathema sit which appear to be the last two words in the sentence (Fig. 1.29). At the top of the following page there is a short, post-medieval, note reading de Conuentu dole again denoting the Dole Convent (Fig. 1.30). The hand appears to be different to that which wrote the paragraph on the inside of the front cover (Fig. 1.28).

Once again, therefore, the appearance of the book is the only evidence for its place of origin. The painted initials in Dole MS 27 all depict Paul with a sword, scroll, book or a combination of these items (Fig. 1.31). However, there is one exception found at the start to Romans where Paul’s conversion is communicated with the image of Paul falling off his horse (Fig. 1.32). The content of this image within the context of copies of Lombard’s text is discussed in chapters two and four. However, it is interesting to note that this image occurs in an otherwise standard copy of Lombard’s text. Branner notes that illustrations in the New Testament in the early thirteenth century was ‘often very dull and consisted in image after image of Paul with a Sword, or simply an anonymous apostle.’ Therefore, Dole MS 27 might be an example of the transition period between the twelfth and thirteenth centuries or it might have been the patron’s or artist’s way of communicating the cost and skill required for such artwork by placing a historiated initial at the start of the first book in the text (Fig. 1.32). A search for a similar style of illumination resulted in a Bible also associated with Paris c. 1220: Reims MS 36 (Fig. 1.33). Reims MS 36 measures 500 mm x 350 which is larger in comparison to Dole MS 27 which measures 374 mm x 267 mm. A comparison of the size of initials reveals that those in Reims MS 36 are slightly larger than those in Dole MS 27 (Figs. 1.34 and 1.35). Another similarity between these manuscripts is that they both include depictions of Paul’s conversion at the start to Romans which are included in the illustrations (Figs. 1.34 and 1.35). A closer look at the decoration in these two manuscripts reveals that the facial characteristics in the Reims manuscript are very similar to those in Dole MS 27 (Fig. 1.31). Paul is depicted with pronounced cheekbones, a long beard, slightly balding, with red lips and rosy cheeks. The portraits in both manuscripts use similar tones of red and blue for Paul’s robes. Branner associates Reims MS 36 with the “Blanche” atelier which was originally based in north-eastern France, but eventually some of the artists associated with this atelier migrated to Paris.

Branner does not provide a date for this move to Paris but he discusses this atelier within the context of the first quarter of the thirteenth century. Branner named this atelier after a well-known psalter (Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal MS 1186) which was believed to have been made for Blanche de Castile, who was Queen of France and married to Louis VIII. The psalter was made for her before she was queen, sometime between 1215 and 1220. Lindy Grant observes that the psalter includes an image of a woman praying demonstrating that it was made for a woman but not for a queen therefore demonstrating that the
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manuscript was made for Blanche de Castile before she was made Queen of France. 85 Blanche de Castile is known to have been well-read and proficient in Latin, she commissioned a large number of books for her own collection as well as to give as gifts. 86 Blanche de Castile and her psalter, Arsenal MS 1186, are evidence of manuscript production in thirteenth-century Paris. Returning to the style of decoration in the ateliers, Branner notes the difference between the “Blanche” and earlier “Almagest” workshops with the former including stiff figures and the heads ‘with their long noses, develop into the type with a prognathous jaw and beard that are familiar from Arsenal 1186.’ 87 An example of a figure from Arsenal MS 1186 is provided in the illustrations (Fig. 1.36). It is clear that all three figures of Paul include the long noses and projecting jaw which is a characteristic to the “Blanche” atelier, according to Branner (Figs. 1.31, 1.33 and 1.36).

Angers MS 69

The last manuscript included in the Parisian group is Angers MS 69 which is believed to have been made in Paris in the last quarter of the twelfth century. 88 Unlike the manuscripts already consulted, Angers MS 69 does not include any clues as to previous ownership or use via notes on the flyleaves. However, looking at the style of artwork and script provides a strong suggestion that it too was produced in Paris. Reflecting back on what was said about BnF MS Latin 14267 and BnF MS Latin 11565, the early copy of Lombard’s commentary on the Psalms, both of which Branner deduced were made in Paris, it is possible to argue that Angers MS 69 belongs to this group with regards to its artwork. An example of the decoration is included in the illustrations (Fig. 1.37). The face at the end of the stem is similar in style to the style used in BnF MS Latin 11565 (Fig. 1.2). The lions in figure 1.37 are very similar to those in the initial on folio 1r in BnF MS Latin 11565, an example of the ‘inhabited scroll in Parisian work – a thin, viny spiral with figures of animals or men climbing the tendrils.’ 89 Therefore it is possible to argue that Angers MS 69 was made in Paris in the last twenty years of the twelfth century. This manuscript also includes a large amount of penwork initials which mark the start to Lombard’s commentary to each epistle (Fig. 1.38). The style of the penwork is consistent with the category Patricia Stirnemann prescribes to the years 1160 to 1180. 90 The penwork in Angers MS 69 most resembles those in BnF MS Latin 17246, one of the earliest known copies of Lombard’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles which was made c. 1160 in Paris. This manuscript is looked at in much greater detail in chapter three and the link between this manuscript and Angers MS 69 will be examined more closely. The penwork in Angers MS 69 is also similar to the initials Stirnemann provides from BnF MS Latin 15500, a copy of Lombard’s commentary on the Psalms, and BnF MS Latin 13835, a copy of Suger’s De Administratione. Stirnemann argues that both of these manuscripts were made in Paris c. 1170. 91 Therefore, I believe that Angers MS 69 was made, if not before BnF MSS Latin 14266

85 Grant, Blanche of Castile, Queen of France, p. 236.
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and 14267, then around the same time. Although the evidence is largely circumstantial, on the basis of probability all these seem to have been made in Paris.

Looking over each manuscript carefully has revealed a number of references to various texts, places and people. Although it is important to take in all of this information, it is also crucial to differentiate between what is relevant with regard to the provenance of each manuscript. For example, BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 have direct ties to the Abbey of St. Victor including an ex-libris and the coat of arms. These inscriptions are extremely valuable for the study of not only these two volumes but to the study of Peter Lombard’s commentary overall as they are confirmed to have been at the Abbey of St. Victor. However, the other inscriptions which appear on the flyleaves do not provide additional information regarding the manuscripts’ provenance but they do provide insight into what individuals at the Abbey of St. Victor were reading and what they thought to be important enough to include in these two volumes of Lombard’s commentary. Attempting to trace the individual provenance of each manuscript may help to understand why they are laid out in a particular way. Tracing the history of each manuscript is not a simple process, but it is an important step in understanding how Peter Lombard’s commentary was used in Paris during a specific time period. The next chapter provides an overview of the manuscripts and their general appearance, layout and level of decoration.

Dole MS 27, Mazarine MS 266 and Mazarine MS 264 have a similar style in their decorated initials. Each epistle begins with a decorated initial and at the start of Lombard’s commentary to each epistle there is a smaller decorated initial. Although the styles of the figures are different, they all include similar styles of ornament which are characteristic of Parisian illumination in the thirteenth century. For example, their frames include the blue and pink tones which were dominant in the thirteenth century and they all use similar designs of dots and flourishes in the background of the initials. The initials at the start to Lombard’s commentary most often contain themes of foliage or small beasts. In addition, Angers MS 69 and Troyes MS 175 use penwork initials to mark the beginning to Lombard’s commentary to each epistle.

The penwork in BnF MS Latin 14267 and BnF MS Latin 11565 is quite similar. The decorated initials in Angers MS 69 and BnF MS Latin 11565 are very similar and use what appear to be the same colour combinations and gilding is used in these three manuscripts along the borders of the initials. These manuscripts appear to have been part of the northern migration seen in Paris in the early thirteenth century. The inhabited scroll also appears in Mazarine MS 266, see folio 2r for an example. In summary, the evidence in the style of script and artwork in these six manuscripts produces several findings. Firstly, BnF MS Latin 11565 shares similarities with BnF MS Latin 14267 and Angers MS 69. The penwork is very similar in all three as well as the script. However, the script for the commentary in Angers MS 69 is not in the same hand. Angers MS 69 is similar to BnF MS Latin 11565 in that penwork initials mark the start to Lombard’s commentary to each epistle while decorated initials, often with beasts and foliage, mark the start to each epistle in the main biblical text.
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Although none of these six manuscripts can be conclusively proven to have been made in Paris, the combination of stylistic and inscriptive evidence makes it likely that they were produced there between c. 1160 and c. 1250. They therefore provide examples of different engagements with the text in the leading centre for manuscript production and theological education of the period. At the same time, they draw attention to the roles of individuals as well as communities in the trade of books, and the diversity of religious communities in thirteenth-century Paris, all of whom were interested in the work of Peter Lombard.
Chapter Two: The Design of the Manuscripts

The manuscripts included in this study have all been identified as probably having been made in or around Paris.¹ The project aims to compare the different approaches taken by the makers of the various manuscripts as forms of response to the work. Establishing similarities in the style and layout of the manuscripts will contribute to understanding how Lombard’s text was used. The physical characteristics of the manuscripts are important as they provide a basis for general comparisons before the specific details of each manuscript are discussed thoroughly in the following chapters. The size of each manuscript is an important feature as it will help to establish any trends in size which may have emerged once Lombard’s text became standardised. Differences in the size of the manuscripts along with the level of artwork provide clues as to their cost and ownership. The previous chapter demonstrated that these books were often in the possession of individuals. The thirteenth century saw a shift in the production of large Bibles to much smaller Bibles which, combined with the fact that the Bible was being produced in great numbers, meant it was possible for individuals to own a copy.² The manuscripts included in this study range in date from shortly after the text’s completion c. 1160 to c. 1250. By looking at the physical form of the manuscripts, clues as to why there are differences in their layout and overall appearance will help to understand how Lombard’s text was used in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries by communities in Paris. The amount of text on a page and the level of decoration are indicators of expense due to the skill and time required which again provides clues as to who these manuscripts were intended for. Whether they include any marginal notation is also a matter of interest in this project as it will be useful to determine whether the marginal notes were contemporary with the commentary or whether they were added at a later date. This chapter will focus on introducing the six Parisian manuscripts in terms of their overall design and layout which will establish and explore the meaning behind the differences.

Standard copies of Lombard’s Collectanea include the main biblical text, the commentary which is most often in a smaller script, marginal rubrics, and decoration. However, as will be explored in chapter three, the earliest copies did not include the biblical text. The reason for placing the main biblical text in a larger script was to indicate its higher status and to enable readers to easily find the corresponding passage of Lombard’s commentary.³ Each manuscript had to be copied from an existing exemplar, which makes it possible to track patterns as changes were introduced.⁴ However, glossed texts were particularly difficult to copy and so changes in the layout and content can demonstrate attempts to make a book easier to copy and therefore easier to read. De Hamel discusses the fact that these complex elements of Lombard’s text would not only have been difficult for the scribe to copy, especially when copies of his commentary began to include the main biblical text, but they would also have been expensive to make given the fact that they

¹ With reference to BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 see page 33 of Christopher de Hamel’s Glossed books of the Bible and the origins of the Paris booktrade (Woodbridge, 1984).
⁴ De Hamel, Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Booktrade, p. 46.
often contained decorated initials in coloured inks. De Hamel observes the change from early copies of the Collectanea, which do not include the main biblical text, to the time when copies began incorporating the main biblical text which enabled for easy reference and reflects a change of readership to wealthier and perhaps less scholarly readers. Another explanation for the addition of the main biblical text was due to the fact that Lombard’s commentary on the Psalms and Pauline Epistles, in the second half of the twelfth century, circulated as part of a set of glossed books. De Hamel explains that when Lombard’s ‘books became part of such a set, the scriptural text had to be present so that the Psalter and Pauline Epistle volumes carried their respective shares of the text of all of the Bible. This change will become evident in the subsequent chapters of this study, with examples of the earliest copies of the text which do not contain the main biblical text, as well as several examples which include the full biblical text along with fine decoration. The manuscripts in the Parisian group are looked at first in order to understand their overall layout.

Angers MS 69

Angers MS 69 was made in the last twenty years of the twelfth century. It measures 374 x 270 mm and contains 246 folia. Titus is written on folios 213r to 215v, taking up five and half pages, while Philemon is written on folios 215v to 216v, covering three pages. There are 48 lines of commentary and 24 lines of the main biblical text on each folio. The page layout in this manuscript changes. It is initially in two equal columns in the prologue to Romans (Fig. 2.1) but it then changes to a layout where the biblical text is presented in a narrow column which is always adjacent to the spine of the book while Lombard’s commentary is in a wider column (Fig. 2.2). Figure 2.2 shows the end of the second letter to Timothy on folio 212v and the start of Titus on folio 213r. The main biblical text is in the larger script and, as mentioned, remains in the inner margin while Lombard’s commentary is in a wider column but in smaller script. This design element immediately places the emphasis on the commentary as it takes up most of the page and is therefore the focus for the reader. This way of organising the main biblical text and the commentary may have been favoured due to the practical advantages of organising the text this way. De Hamel explains that a scribe would have attempted to write the commentary opposite the text it explained in glossed books during this period. This relatively simple, two-column, layout facilitates that process, though the challenge is still evident in figure 2.2, where the commentary intrudes into the column of biblical text at the bottom of the page. The main biblical text was not usually included in early copies (for example Admont MS 52 and Vat. Lat. 144). Therefore, the layout in Angers MS 69 may be an example of one of the first copies of Lombard’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles to include the main biblical text as well as the commentary.
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There is evidence that the layout in Angers MS 69 may have been inspired by copies of the commentaries of Gilbert of Poitiers. As David Salomon has observed: ‘The cum textu format is present throughout the work of Gilbert of Poitiers. His commentary on the Epistles, for example, presents the Epistles text in a narrow column on the left side of the page with the commentary in a wider space on the right side of the page’ (Fig. 2.3). 12 Figure 2.3 provides an example of Gilbert of Poitiers’s commentary to Romans in a French manuscript from c. 1160: Vendôme, Bibliothèque municipale MS 23. The large decorated initial marks the start to the main biblical text while a penwork initial marks the start to Gilbert’s commentary much in the same way Lombard’s commentary is presented in Angers MS 69. This particular manuscript presents the text in a similar way to Angers MS 69 with the commentary in a wider margin, which demonstrates that this style was present in copies of commentaries on the Pauline Epistles in the second half of the twelfth century. There are folia in Vendôme, Bibliothèque municipale MS 23 which present the texts in equal-sized columns, but this appears to have been a trend in copies of Gilbert of Poitiers’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Another copy of Gilbert’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles, Amiens, Bibliothèque municipale MS 84 (c. 1160 – c. 1170) is similar to Vendôme Bibliothèque municipale MS 23 while Paris BnF MS Latin 14441 is a twelfth-century copy of Gilbert’s text which does not include the main biblical text but in which the commentary occurs in two narrow columns. Two copies of Gilbert’s text from the second half of the thirteenth century, Angers, Bibliothèque municipale MS 68 and Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale MS 626 do not stick to one particular style but both manuscripts place the commentary in a wider column as well as having the commentary and main biblical text in two equal-sized columns. This comparison has demonstrated that although Angers MS 69 is an apparently early style of presenting Lombard’s commentary, the layout of text in manuscripts containing Lombard’s commentary became standardised in the thirteenth century while those of Gilbert’s text did not. This will become clearer once the remaining five manuscripts at the core of the study are analysed for their design and layout.

The fact that Angers MS 69 presents the text in a slightly different way may be a clue as to how the manuscript was initially used. This early copy of Lombard’s commentary includes the main biblical text, an unusual feature in most early copies, and it also places the commentary in a wider column. These design elements may be evidence that Angers MS 69 is an example of an early attempt at adding the main biblical text to copies of Lombard’s commentary. With this in mind, it is important to look at Angers MS 69 as well as the others for evidence of how much the manuscript was used. The folia of Angers MS 69 are relatively bare aside from the marginal rubrics and the biblical cross-references. The rubrics appear to be contemporary with the manuscript, but the biblical cross-references appear to be in a later, thirteenth-century hand (Fig. 2.4). The amount of notes in the margins is significant when compared to the other manuscripts. Therefore, it may be that this manuscript is an example of a copy of Lombard’s text which was intended for detailed study. However, the fact that it has so much marginalia could mean that it was used by an instructor to teach students which would explain why it remained in such good condition. The manuscript does not include historiated initials which is another reason to think of the manuscript as primarily a study text; the focus is on the text, marginal rubrics and biblical cross-references. This

manuscript stands apart from other manuscripts containing Lombard’s text, as two equal-sized columns of text was the more standard layout for Lombard’s text, as seen in various other manuscripts mainly from the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{13}

In the Angers manuscript there are two types of decorated initials, those in penwork which mark the beginning of Lombard’s commentary on each epistle and decorated initials at the start to the main biblical text (Fig. 2.2). In total there are fourteen penwork initials, which use red and blue pigments, and fifteen decorated initials which illustrate themes of beasts and foliage in blue, red, and green pigments along with gilding. Fourteen of these decorated initials accompany the start of each of the epistles while the first decorated initial occurs at the very beginning of the commentary to Lombard’s prologue to Romans. The two styles of initials may have simply been to better differentiate between the main biblical text and Lombard’s commentary although it may have also been a way of emphasising the importance of the main biblical text.

Angers MS 69 is very similar to an earlier copy of Lombard’s commentary, BnF MS Latin 17246. BnF MS Latin 17246 was made c. 1160 and is believed to have been made in Paris due to the style of illumination.\textsuperscript{14} It is part of the discussion of the text in chapter three. The layout of the main biblical text and the commentary are very similar in BnF MS Latin 17246 and Angers MS 69 in that the main biblical text is in a slightly more narrow column which always stays closest to the binding and the commentary is in a wider column (Figs. 2.5 and 2.6). Other immediate similarities are the decorated and penwork initials which were discussed in detail earlier in this chapter. In terms of the scripts used in these manuscripts there are similar abbreviations used though the scripts are not identical. This is evident if we look at the commentary, in BnF MS Latin 17246 the letter ‘P’ is consistently written in the same way in that the descender has a foot whereas in Angers MS 69 the descenders of the ‘P’ do not. This is just one small detail, but if these manuscripts were written by the same scribe the scripts would most likely be identical. However, it is possible that these manuscripts were produced by the same workshop and simply had different scribes working on them. The similarity in their layout is the most significant similarity connecting them. It is plausible that Angers MS 69 was copied from BnF MS Latin 17246, or from another manuscript which had been copied from BnF MS Latin 17246, which would explain the similar layout.

\textbf{BnF MS Latin 14267}

The next manuscript in the study is significantly different to the others because it is contained within two volumes. BnF MS Latin 14267 is the second volume in a two-part manuscript of Lombard’s commentary. These two manuscripts were together at one point, but they are currently in two volumes. The first volume is BnF MS Latin 14266 which is made up of 190 folia while BnF MS Latin 14267 has 157 folia and measures 390 x 270 mm.\textsuperscript{15} The first volume contains Romans and finishes mid-sentence in the start of the argument preceding Galatians and the second volume picks up with Galatians and finishes with Hebrews

\textsuperscript{13} The following list of manuscripts provides examples of the common two-column layout: Troyes MS 175, Dole MS 27, BnF MS Latin 659, BnF MS Latin 670.
\textsuperscript{14} Stirnemann, ‘Fils de la vierge. L’initiale à filigranes parisiennes: 1140-1314’, (p. 72); Stirnemann, ‘Histoire tripartite: un inventaire des livres de Pierre Lombard’, (pp. 308-309).
\textsuperscript{15} Cahn, \textit{Romanesque Manuscripts}, II, p. 111.
which suggests that it was originally intended to be one volume. At the bottom of folio 189v on BnF MS Latin 14266 there is an initial in blue and red penwork along with a short block of text marking the start of the argument to Galatians (Fig. 2.7). This same section of text is repeated at the start of BnF MS Latin 14267 which was presumably added when the volumes were split (Fig. 2.8). Within these two blocks of text there are a few small differences in the text as it appears in the two volumes; these variations are mostly in how words are abbreviated. For example, the sunt after Galathe is written out in full in BnF MS Latin 14267 (fig. 2.8) but in BnF MS Latin 14266 it is abbreviated to s(un)t (Fig. 2.7). It seems very likely that the repeated section of text is done by a later scribe, on a leaf added to the manuscript when it was divided into two volumes. The rest of the argumentum in BnF MS Latin 14267 seems to be by the same scribe as that in BnF MS Latin 14266. The scribe who wrote on the added leaf may have been trying to imitate the style of the earlier scribe. In addition to these differences in the script, it is immediately clear that the decorated initials at the start of the phrase in the two manuscripts are of a different design, though they are similar in the theme of blue and red penwork. The section in BnF MS Latin 14267 (Fig. 2.8) appears to have been completed in the thirteenth century on the basis of the penwork which, when compared to the section in the first volume (Fig. 2.7), supports the assumption that the manuscript was divided in the thirteenth century. Separating the volumes was presumably done to make the manuscripts easier to handle.

There are penwork initials throughout both volumes but unlike some of the other manuscripts, these initials do not preface the start of Lombard’s text or the main biblical text. Instead, these manuscripts use the penwork initials to preface the capitula lists and it must be noted that this is the only manuscript out of the Parisian group to include capitula lists. No other manuscript looked at as part of this study has included these lists except for the lavish copies of Lombard’s commentary on the Psalms and the Pauline Epistles made by Herbert of Bosham. These volumes are discussed in greater detail in chapter five; they were made in the 1170s and it had been Herbert’s aim to produce a corrected version of Lombard’s text. The fact that BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 include capitula lists emphasises the fact that these volumes include prefatory material, much like the volumes produced by Herbert of Bosham. De Hamel explains that capitula lists exist in many large Carolingian and Romanesque Bibles but that there does not appear to be any consistency from one manuscript to another. In BnF MS Latin 14267 the capitula lists are prefaced with penwork initials. An example of the style of penwork belongs to the group Stirnemann classified as being used from 1160 to 1180, evidenced by the lack of long ascenders and descenders which became more popular later in the twelfth and into the thirteenth centuries (Fig. 2.9). Titus and Philemon are both included in the second volume, BnF MS Latin 14267. Titus occurs from folio 108r to folio 112v, covering ten pages, and Philemon from folio 112r to folio 114r, and covering five pages. Lombard’s commentary is written on 42 lines and the main biblical text is written on 21 lines. The main biblical text is provided in a narrow middle column while Lombard’s commentary is in two equal-sized columns on either side of the biblical text (Fig. 2.10). This manuscript is the only example included in the study to present the text this way. The lines on the page are visible and although the scribe would have used every line for a line of
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commentary, each line of the main biblical text is written over two lines. This style of layout reflects the change which occurred after Lombard’s death in 1160 when copies of his commentary on the Psalms and the Pauline Epistles were presented with the main biblical text being written in a middle column ‘on alternate ruled lines.’

De Hamel explains the reason for the change as ‘The new form of layout largely solved the difficulty of knowing which gloss related to which part of the scriptural text because, now, as many glosses as were required could be inset into any given part of the central text.’

The fact that the two volumes of Lombard’s use this layout further encourages the date of production to c. 1160 to c. 1180 proposed by Tischler and Ayres, as discussed in chapter one.

Another significant addition to the first volume of the two-part manuscript is the amount of prefatory material before the start to Lombard’s commentary. On folio 1v of BnF MS Latin 14266 there is a decorated initial which is prefaced with a rubric which reads *Incipit prologus in epistolas Beati Pauli apostoli que sunt numero quatuordeci* (Fig. 2.11). The prologue refers to the fourteen Pauline Epistles though there is debate whether they were all written by Paul, especially Hebrews. The prologue is often ascribed to Pelagius. This is the only manuscript out of the Parisian group of manuscripts to include this prologue. This may be an indication that Pelagius’ commentaries were in the library and thus available to the scribes working on this particular manuscript. The inclusion of Pelagius’ prologue fits with the *capitula* lists in suggesting that this was a copy with additional material, perhaps even going beyond Lombard’s original version. The prologue finishes on folio 2r and there is another decorated initial with a red title that reads *Incipit prologus in epistola ad romanos* (Fig. 2.12). This prologue finishes on folio 3v and on this folio there are two penwork initials, the first to mark the beginning to the *argumentum* and the second has a red introductory phrase in red which reads *aliud argumentum*. This text finishes on folio 3v and Lombard’s general preface to the epistles begins on folio 4r, marked with a fine initial and beginning *Principia rerum requirenda sunt* (Fig. 2.13). BnF MS Latin 14266 is the only manuscript in this selection to include all of this prefatory material. The five other manuscripts, Angers MS 69, Troyes MS 175, Dole MS 27, Mazarine MS 266, and Mazarine MS 264 all begin with *Principia rerum requirenda sunt* which, in BnF MS Latin 14266, begins on folio 4r. The fact that BnF MS Latin 14266 includes several introductions demonstrates that this copy of Lombard’s text was not only to show off the amount of decoration, but the textual material as well. The makers of this manuscript wanted it to be as thorough as possible.

As described in chapter one, this two-volume manuscript includes very fine painted initials as well as penwork ones. Each letter is prefaced by a large painted initial ‘P’ to mark the start of both the main biblical text and Lombard’s commentary. The full page of the start to Titus in BnF MS Latin 14267 is provided in the illustrations (Fig. 2.14). The decorated initials are discussed in detail in chapter four as part of the project’s discussion of the iconography included in these manuscripts. Another feature of the layout in BnF MS Latin 14267 is that the marginal rubrics are only in the outside margins. A look at figure 2.11 shows *Ambr* in the outside margin but the corresponding symbol is found in the inner column of text.

21 ‘[Here] begins the prologue to the letters of the Blessed Paul the apostle which [there] are fourteen.’
whereas the other manuscripts place the rubrics on either side of the columns of text. This emphasises the possibility that this manuscript may have been designed to be used by more than one person at a time. The writing is clear and quite legible and readers would have no difficulty in reading the marginal rubrics as they are never written in the inner margins. It is clear that this manuscript was designed to impress and instruct readers.

A running theme of both this volume as well as the first volume is the recurrence of penwork lines in red and blue ink in every margin. The lines often include decoration of various themes including foliage, animals, and bizarre scenes, all of which appear to be random (Fig. 2.15). Figure 2.15 shows a naked man who appears to have been eaten by the head of a creature which is quite grotesque. Another example shows a man behind a plough which is being pulled by oxen (Fig. 2.16). These lines occur on every folio, most of which have these interesting drawings. Cahn highlights how unusual these drawings are and notes that they ‘must count among the incunabula of the genre of Gothic marginal drolleries.’ These lines only appear on the outer edges of every folio. This decoration in Titus and Philemon includes scenes of foliage, animals, grotesque human heads, a key and various other designs. None of these are obviously related to the text, thus the decoration seems once again to have been designed to add to the visual appeal of the volume. None of the other manuscripts include this style of decoration. Therefore, BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 stand apart from the other manuscripts in this study on account of their intricate decoration and the fact that Lombard’s text is in two volumes.

In addition to the large amount of decoration in BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267, careful attention was also given to the layout of the text. The script in both volumes is clear and well-spaced which, along with the large size and the ornate decoration, supports the hypothesis of this study which suggests that this manuscript was meant to be an impressive and attractive volume. It would have been possible to read from further away and the decorated initials are large enough to see the scene from a distance. In terms of these decorated initials, they appear to have been to show off the work of an atelier of artists as there are different techniques used and no expense was spared in terms of the size, number of coloured inks used, and the fact that most of the initials include some level of gilding. This manuscript is the only one to place the main biblical text in one column in the middle of the page while two columns of the commentary are placed on either side. This copy is an efficient learning tool, as the complete biblical text, commentary and additional material are presented alongside decorated initials. The overall appearance of this manuscript demonstrates the desire for Lombard’s text to be celebrated and admired. Owning BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267, a valued copy of Lombard’s text, would have clearly demonstrated the owner’s status.

**Troyes MS 175**

Troyes MS 175 was made in the first quarter of the thirteenth century. The manuscript measures 378 x 255 mm, making it a similar size to Angers MS 69 and BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267, and has 217 folia. Titus is written from folio 180v to folio 183v and Philemon from folio 184r to folio 185r. The commentary and the main biblical text appear in two columns throughout the manuscript and there is a running title at
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the top of each folio denoting the books (Fig. 2.17). As in Angers MS 69 and BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267, Troyes MS 175 has the main biblical text in a larger script than the commentary. However, the layout is different to that presented in those two earlier manuscripts and it is an example of the new design of Lombard’s text where the main biblical text and the commentary were incorporated within two columns. The biblical text and the commentary remained in different sized scripts, which was an earlier style already seen in Angers MS 69 and BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267, but the biblical text and the commentary were written on the same ruling which was a completely new design. In Troyes MS 175 there is not a standard number of lines of text per page as it varies depending on the length of the main biblical text and the corresponding commentary but the first folio containing Titus, figure 2.15, has 54 lines of Lombard’s commentary and 26 lines of the main biblical text. The main biblical text is marked by a penwork initial and Lombard’s commentary is prefaced by a slightly smaller and less elaborate penwork initial.

The margins of Troyes MS 175 are bare except for a few marginal rubrics throughout the manuscript. The few rubrics which are included in the manuscript appear at the outer edge of the folia. The scans of the manuscript are in black and white and so it has not been determined whether these are in red ink. The fact that the rubrics are not closer to the text encourages the probability that the rubrics included in this manuscript were not overly emphasised for the reader as those in the three early manuscripts and the Parisian group are very close to the column of commentary. When comparing the rubrics in Troyes MS 175 to those in the other manuscripts in the Parisian group it is quite easy to miss the rubrics in Troyes MS 175 altogether. There is also some indication that the manuscript may have been cut down from its original size which has resulted in some of the marginal notes having been lost. Two examples taken from Titus demonstrate the evidence to support this theory. In both images there is a dark grey border on the right edge, this is a piece of paper which was used by the library when the manuscript was microfilmed. The first image is taken from folio 181r and it shows a note in the margin which may have been a rubric or instructions for a rubric but it is not legible (Fig. 2.20). The second image is found on folio 183r and an ag denoting Augustine is visible in the margin (Fig. 2.21). It is interesting that the marginal notes appear at the outermost edges of the folia which would not have been easy to do neatly. It is for this reason that it is thought the edges of the manuscript may have been trimmed at some point. These notes may have been instructions for a rubricator to then place the marginal rubrics closer to the text, but if so these were not completed, raising the possibility that they may also have been the actual rubrics. In this case, it may be possible that the wide margins were left either potentially for the addition of notes or for the appearance of the parchment. However, the remaining rubrics still occur at the outermost edge of the pages demonstrating that the rubrics were not a focal point in this particular copy of Lombard’s commentary.

Although the marginal rubrics in Troyes MS 175 occur at the edge of the folia, there is one exception to this. In the margins at the beginning of Hebrews on folio 185r there are notes in a different hand to that of the marginal rubrics which run throughout the manuscript. Another difference between these two sets of notes is the marginal rubrics are on the edge of the parchment where these notes in Hebrews are

26 De Hamel, Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Booktrade, p. 22.
right beside the column of text and at times, in between the lines on folio 185r (Fig. 2.18). Another example showing rubrics appears on folio 189v and it refers to Augustine (Fig. 2.19). The immediate differences are seen in the hand. The first one at the start of Hebrews is smaller and sharper whereas the second example shows rounder and thicker letters. Also, it is important to acknowledge the placement of the two types of notes. Throughout the manuscript the marginal rubrics are the same in that they are always placed at the very edge of the folia. The notes attached to Hebrews may be an example of notes added at a later time, as they do not follow the pattern of the marginal rubrics. The fact that these notes are contained within Hebrews indicates that a reader was particularly interested in Lombard’s commentary to this book.

There are two examples of initials in this manuscript which are decorated in a different style to the pattern in the rest of the manuscript of prefacing each epistle with a penwork initial in blue and red ink. At the start of Pelagius’ prologue on folio 1r there is one decorated initial with themes of foliage (Fig. 2.22). The head of a man is visible two thirds down the length of the stem. The other exception to the pattern of placing penwork initials at the start of the commentary and main biblical text is the historiated initial which prefaces Romans on folio 2r (Fig. 2.23). The initial shows a man on a horse who appears to be falling towards a castle or building which is part of the theme of Paul’s conversion. This iconography is discussed in detail in chapter four in order to compare it with the other manuscripts in this study as well as to similar manuscripts from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In comparison to the lavish decoration and details contained in BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267, the style of the penwork initials in Troyes MS 175 is reminiscent of those in Angers MS 69.

The two decorated initials on folia 1r and 2r (Figs. 2.22 and 2.23) demonstrate that this manuscript was afforded the cost and time of skilled artists. It was important for the patron of this manuscript to include painted initials and the placement of these initials demonstrates the significance of having a manuscript open with a beautifully decorated initial as the one to the start of Romans, the first and longest epistle, which would provide readers with a good first impression of the text. It was not uncommon for the first epistle to contain a decorated initial in twelfth-century Bibles. As the rest of the manuscript only contains penwork initials, the person who commissioned this manuscript could either only afford to have two painted initials or there was only a request for these two.

Dole MS 27

Dole MS 27 was made in the early thirteenth century and measures 374 x 267 mm and includes 242 folia. This manuscript is roughly the same size as the other copies. There are around 49 lines of the commentary on each page and 22 lines of the main biblical text in two equal-sized columns, a layout similar to Troyes MS 175. Titus is written over three pages from folio 200r to folio 203v and Philemon takes up one page from folio 204r to folio 205r. The margins are quite clean except for a few biblical cross-references throughout Romans along with a limited number of marginal rubrics. Dole MS 27 is similar to Troyes MS 175 in its overall design and layout. It has the commentary and main biblical text contained within two columns throughout, which again appears to have become the standard way of laying out the text in the
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27 Eleen, The Illustration of the Pauline Epistles, p. 44.
thirteenth century (Fig. 2.24). The start to Lombard’s commentary is included in Figure 2.24. There are several decorated initials; one to mark the start of the argument or prologue, *Titum commone facit...*, another to mark the start to Lombard’s commentary *Paulus seruus Christi hanc epistolam scribit...*, and a larger initial depicting Paul with a sword prefaces the start to the main biblical text. Another decorated initial is at a point in Lombard’s commentary where he comments on the first line of biblical text, *Paulus nomine seruus conditione*.

Dole MS 27 has painted initials throughout the manuscript but there is an immediate distinction between the initials attached to the start of the commentary as well as the main biblical text for each letter. There are fourteen decorated initials connected to the main biblical text, one at the start of each letter. These initials are quite similar in that most of them portray Paul either with a sword, book or both. There is one exception to this pattern and it is found on folio 2r at the start of Romans. The initial shows a man, presumed to be Paul, falling off a horse (Fig. 2.25). The theme of Paul’s conversion is present in three manuscripts included in this study and the importance of this will be looked at in chapter four. This manuscript includes small penwork initials throughout the commentary to mark the beginning to each biblical verse as well as smaller painted initials with themes of foliage and animals. Larger decorated initials mark the start to the main biblical text in each epistle which demonstrates a level of expense. This manuscript appears to be a standard thirteenth-century copy of Lombard’s text evidenced by the layout which incorporates the main biblical text and commentary into two equal-sized columns.

**Mazarine MS 266**

The next manuscript in the study is Mazarine MS 266 which measures 400 x 245 mm, includes 315 folia and dates to the first half of the thirteenth century (Fig. 2.26). Titus is written over five pages, from folio 267v to folio 272v and Philemon from folio 272v to folio 274v. Similar to the layout seen in Troyes MS 175 and Dole MS 27, where the two texts are incorporated to produce two separate columns, this manuscript does not have a standard number of lines per folia, but folio 267v, the start to Titus (Fig. 2.26), has 53 lines of commentary and 25 lines of the biblical text. This manuscript has the largest number of folia which is not surprising when you take note of how large the margins are. The size of the margins could have been designed to allow for the addition of notes, but it is perhaps more likely that it was an overt sign of the resources invested in the volume. The bottom corners of the parchment are clean which suggests a lack of use. The parchment is slightly warped throughout which may be from water or dampness though that is not surprising for a manuscript of this age.

This manuscript has fourteen historiated initials, one at the beginning of each letter. There are also decorated initials, most often with themes of foliage and beasts, at the start of Lombard’s commentary at the start of each letter. Mazarine MS 266 does not have much notation in the margins of Titus and Philemon. There are a few corrections to the commentary done in black ink. There are no marginal rubrics which is interesting as the other five manuscripts all have some marginal rubrics. Given the wide margins it is

29 Molinier, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque Mazarine*, I, p. 96. Note that Molinier counts 304 folia but that series of numbers in the manuscript has been crossed out and a new series has been written in the upper right corner of each page with a total of 315 folia.
possible that the rubrics should have been added but were never completed. However, the large blank margins could be another sign that this was a volume designed to look good rather than be used for in-depth study. The lack of marginal rubrics reflects the attitude to the rubrics in the later thirteenth century. De Hamel notes that part of the reason for rubrics not occurring in later thirteenth-century glossed books was due to the amount of work it took as well as the cost of writing the names in red ink. 30 However, the lack of rubrics also provides insight into the function of Mazarine MS 266. The fact that this particular manuscript has such detailed historiated initials may be that this manuscript was meant to instruct mainly through its decoration as opposed to the text.

Mazarine MS 264

Mazarine MS 264 is the manuscript with the latest date of production out of the group of six; the second half of the thirteenth century (Fig. 2.27). This manuscript measures 447 x 303 mm, has 282 folia and has two equal-sized columns of text throughout. 31 This manuscript is the largest one of the six Parisian manuscripts. Lombard’s commentary to Titus begins on folio 237r until folio 241r, covering nine pages, and Philemon covers four pages, from folio 241r to folio 242v. The commentary is written in 53 lines per page, except where decorated initials interrupt the flow of the text, and 27 lines of the main biblical text. The manuscript is in good condition, the bottom corners of the parchment are not stained which shows that it was either handled with care or perhaps it was not handled often. There does seem to be some water damage throughout the manuscript as the folia are slightly warped. Unlike Mazarine MS 266, this manuscript has marginal rubrics attached to each book as well as a running title which includes which particular authorities are quoted on each folio. There are also a significant number of biblical cross-references per page. There are roughly fifty attached to the Titus commentary and another thirty for Philemon. The fact that there are many biblical cross-references attached to the text supports the idea that this manuscript would have been perhaps more useful as a study tool than some others. The marginal notes run throughout the manuscript and do not focus solely on any one particular book. This in turn reflects how influential Lombard’s commentary was and the person who included these notes felt that there were significant sections of the text worthy of comment. The cross-references are in line with the marginal rubrics which would indicate both sets of notes were added at the same time.

All six manuscripts include small coloured initials throughout the main biblical text and the commentary at the start of new sentences and chapters which alternate in red and blue ink. The placement of these initials within the commentary to Titus and Philemon in the six manuscripts varies but they all paint the initials in red or blue. Those in Angers MS 69 do not include quite as much flourish as the others, but the fact that all six share this feature helps to further suggest that they were made in or around Paris as it demonstrates a common trend as well as the fact that red and blue pigments were very widely used to help structure text in thirteenth-century Paris. 32 In addition to all six manuscripts including these coloured initials, they also all include a running header in alternating red and blue letters with the exception of Angers MS 69 which is the only manuscript not to include the header. The header in the remaining five

30 De Hamel, Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Booktrade, p. 33.
32 Branner, Manuscript Painting in Paris During the Reign of Saint Louis, p. 79.
manuscripts provides details of the epistle and corresponding commentary, for example in Titus, *Ad Titum* is written at the top of the pages. Most often, *Ad* occurs on the verso side of the previous folio while *Titum* or the name of another epistle is on the recto side of the next folio so that when the manuscript is open, readers would easily be able to navigate their way through the manuscripts. This use of a running header was a standard feature in Bibles and glossed books of the Bible in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

This overview of the manuscripts reveals similarities in the general layout of the text. However, the one exception to this is Angers MS 69 which places the commentary in a wider column to the right of the page. The only two manuscripts which differ to the two-column layout are those with dates of production in the twelfth century; BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267. It is clear that the style of incorporating the main biblical text and commentary, both of which are in different sized scripts, became standard in the thirteenth century. Although the layout is similar in the manuscripts included in this study, there is much more variation found in the decoration. The manuscripts all follow a similar pattern in that a decorated initial appears at the start of each epistle with a less-detailed initial often preceding the main epistle in order to mark the beginning of the corresponding argument. It is immediately obvious that the production of some manuscripts, such as the two-volume BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267, was allocated more money and skill for their decoration than others. This introduces the idea of how the manuscripts were used by different audiences. Understanding what the manuscripts look like has set up the study and the more detailed sections of research will stem from these preliminary descriptions. It is clear that although these manuscripts all include Lombard’s *Collectanea*, they vary in the layout, level of decoration, and marginal notes. The next chapter on the textual elements and the marginal rubrics will provide a thorough analysis of Lombard’s text as well as the rubrics as they appear in this selection of manuscripts.

The layout of the text changed throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Angers MS 69 is an example of the early stage of the layout when the main biblical text was first being added to copies of Lombard’s text. Some of the earliest copies did not include the main biblical text so there must have been a desire by readers to have it included. The next stage in the development of the layout was to incorporate the main biblical text and the commentary into two equal-sized columns. This became the standard way of copying out Lombard’s text, evidenced by the number of thirteenth-century manuscripts, including Troyes MS 175, Dole MS 27, and Mazarine MSS 264 and 266. BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 appear to be a unique copy of Lombard’s text within this study in that the main biblical text remains in a very narrow column in between two equal-sized columns of Lombard’s text.

The six manuscripts are relatively equal in size and they all have between 217 to 315 folia, with the exception of BnF MS Latin 14267 which has 157 while the first volume, BnF MS Latin 14266 has 190 folia. If these two manuscripts were once one volume, it would have been an extremely heavy and awkward book to carry which is important as it would further encourage the idea that this manuscript was meant for display. The difference in the number of folia in the manuscripts is important to note as it may be evidence that further decoration or notes were intended for the margins. As mentioned with regard to Mazarine MS 266, this manuscript may be unfinished as it is the only one not to include any marginalia. Angers MS 69 uses the least folia for each letter, six for Titus and three for Philemon, which is fitting given the wider column used in writing out the commentary.
The six Parisian manuscripts all include prologues to each epistle. The inclusion of prologues encourages the idea that prologues were added to copies in order to provide the most thorough reading of the text. With the exception of Angers MS 69 which does not include a decorated initial at the start of the prologues, the remaining five manuscripts place decorated initials at the start of Lombard’s prologue, the start of his commentary to each epistle, as well as an initial at the start of his commentary on the first line of biblical text. In addition to these three decorated initials, there is one at the start to the main biblical text. This initial is always larger than the others and includes either more detailed decoration or, as seen in Mazarine MS 266, a historiated initial. Dole MS 27 includes small painted initials at the start to the prologues as well as larger initials to mark the start of each epistle. Angers MS 69 includes the prologues but does not preface them with a decorated initial. Angers MS 69 only places a decorated initial at the start to the main biblical text and to the start of Lombard’s commentary. BnF MS Latin 14267 includes an initial to the Lombard’s prologue, at the beginning of his commentary, but it does not place an initial at his first commentary on the first line of biblical text. Troyes MS 175 and Mazarine MS 264 also include initials at the start of the start to the prologue and start of the commentary but both manuscripts include a small coloured, penwork initial at the start of the first biblical quote.

These six manuscripts demonstrate the impact that the overall design had on readers. Angers MS 69 is clearly evidence of a manuscript used for study while BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 is a large manuscript meant to impress readers. The remaining four manuscripts made in the thirteenth century are examples of Lombard’s commentary which include the standard layout of text. The variations in the style of artwork which they include prove that there was a desire for different scenes to be highlighted with regard to the Pauline Epistles, and this will be explored further in chapter four. However, in the sequence of manuscript production the text was usually written out before decoration was added, and so the next chapter explores the text as it appears in these manuscripts.
Chapter Three: The Text

The next element of the manuscripts to be analysed in detail is Lombard’s text as a whole. This chapter will discuss the commentary, marginal rubrics, the relationship between Lombard’s work and the Gloss and Lombard’s use of other sources. The large number of existing copies of Lombard’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles demonstrates that although the text was copied again and again, the fact that there are differences in the layout and accompanying design elements emphasises different approaches to the text. It is necessary to look at the commentary as it appears in early copies of the text in order to trace changes to the text and layout throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Any marginal rubrics which are included in the earlier copies will be discussed while going through the most commonly borrowed quotes which are highlighted in the main manuscripts.

The Earliest Manuscripts

The manuscripts with early dates of production which will be looked at within this chapter have been chosen as they are some of the earliest known copies of the text. These early copies of Lombard’s commentary will provide insight into the precedents of the overall design and layout of the text which will then be compared to the group of Parisian manuscripts at the core of this study. Analysing these early copies will also help to understand whether the marginal rubrics can be traced back to Peter Lombard and will offer details of the style of the overall design and layout of text in the earliest copies of Lombard’s text. The four early manuscripts which are included in this study are as follows:

Admont, Benediktinerstift (subsequently Admont) MS 52, c. 1150, Germany.
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College (subsequently CCCC) MS 52, 12th century.
Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France (subsequently BnF) MS Latin 17246, c. 1160, Paris.
Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (subsequently Vat. Lat.) MS Lat. 144, 12th century.

Admont MS 52

Although Admont MS 52 was not made in France, its early date of production offers insight into the earliest copies of the Collectanea which offers the opportunity to compare it with the other manuscripts included in the study. The two earliest securely datable manuscripts of Lombard’s commentary on the Psalms and the Pauline Epistles are Admont MS 36 and Admont MS 52 respectively and these are dated to the middle of the twelfth century. Admont Abbey had many important Parisian texts during this time due to the political

atmosphere which included an ‘ecclesiastical liberty against the emperor’ along with the effects of the reforms started by William of Hirsaun. In the twelfth century, Germany did not produce any scholastic successes when compared to France, either in the vernacular or in Latin, which therefore provides insight into the interest at Admont in Parisian texts. One reason for this interest in Parisian works may be due to Eberhard I, who was elected archbishop of Salzburg in 1147, and who is believed to have studied in Paris in the twelfth century, though this is not definite. However, it is known that Eberhard I ‘had a personal interest in the spreading of Parisian theology’ due to the probability that he studied in Paris and the fact that at Salzburg he had access to *De sapientia animae Christi* and *De sacramentis*, works by Hugh of St. Victor. His connection to Admont was through Godefridus, abbot of Admont from 1138 to 1165, who backed Eberhard’s election to archbishop. Ralf Stammberger draws attention to the number of Romanesque stamped leather bindings at Admont which is further evidence as to the interest in books made in Paris. There are surviving manuscripts detailing the teachings by Bernard of Clairvaux, Hugh of St. Victor, Peter Abelard, Gilbert of Poitiers, Peter Lombard and others which were in Admont and other monasteries in Germany during the twelfth century, including an early edition of Gratian’s *Decretum*, all of which further demonstrates the interest that Admont had in Parisian texts in the twelfth century. The outcome of Admont obtaining copies of these texts was the fact that the library ‘benefited from new ideas and texts, circulating among both monks and secular clerics of the major cathedral cities of the region.’

On the inside of the back cover of Admont MS 36, the copy of Lombard’s commentary on the Psalms, there is an inscription in alternating red and black letters which notes that this manuscript was donated to Admont Abbey by Eberhard I, archbishop of Salzburg (Fig. 3.1). The same note is included in Admont MS 52, the copy of Lombard’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles (Fig. 3.2). De Hamel has observed that the manuscripts are not ‘French productions but were copied in a Germanic hand for St Eberhardt, archbishop of Salzburg, who died in 1164 and who presented them to Admont Abbey.’ Although Admont MS 36 and Admont MS 52 were copied in a Germanic hand, they were written in France and the illumination is believed to have been completed in the Salzburg region. This may be evidence that they were copied by a German scribe in Paris before being illuminated in Germany. These manuscripts are

11 *Iste liber est sancti blasii Admunti ex donation domni archiepiscopi Eberhardi.*
most likely examples of ‘books generated by the Paris schools had begun to be disseminated all over France and beyond…near mid-century one may still see wealthy patrons sending their scribes, over surprising distances, to copy Parisian books and bring them back home (unbound and unilluminated).’

Richard and Mary Rouse emphasise that, especially in the last quarter of the twelfth century, the book trade in Paris was not made up of mere scholars but rather that ‘such men constituted an assembly of wealthy, élite patrons, many of them representatives of rich and powerful families, and virtually all of them to power in their own right…They commissioned the large and costly manuscripts of the Decretum, glossed psalters, glossed epistles, and multi-volume glossed bibles made in Paris in the last quarter of the twelfth century and before.’

All of this information about the wealthy patrons in the twelfth century emphasises that Paris was the major centre for producing copies of Lombard’s texts. This chapter analyses the text and its various elements, the marginal rubrics for example, in order to understand any changes which occurred over this time period which will provide insight into the reception of Lombard’s Collectanea in the thirteenth century. Despite its German origins, Admont MS 52 is valuable as a very early copy of the work, as it provides evidence that can help in the reconstruction of the copies available to scribes in Paris. Admont MS 52 along with three other earlier copies, CCCC MS 52, BnF MS Latin 17246 and Vat. Lat. 144 are part of this discussion, along with the Parisian group of manuscripts, in order to trace the history of the text from the late twelfth century and into the thirteenth century in order to shed light on the reception of Lombard’s text in the later copies.

Admont MS 52 is immediately noticeably different to the manuscripts already analysed as part of this study due to the layout (Fig. 3.3). Although the size of the manuscript is roughly the same size as the examples within this study, at 374 x 225 mm, the reason that Admont MS 52 only contains 120 folia is due to the fact that the script is small and the biblical text is not included. Instead, the biblical text included in Lombard’s text is underlined in black ink. Overall the text does not differ from the collated versions of Titus and Philemon included in Appendixes II and III, which illustrates that the text remained standard over time. As this is a very early copy of Lombard’s text, it is fitting that the main biblical text was not included as this was not a part of Lombard’s text and the biblical text was added later. As Lombard includes all of the text within his commentary, having a separate column with just the biblical text, as seen in the Parisian group of manuscripts, may have been part of an enhanced learning experience, allowing readers to compare the commentary and its subject matter at a glance. The commentary is written in two equal-sized columns and the manuscript does not include much decoration. Titus begins on folio 107v and finishes on folio 109r while Philemon begins on folio 109r and finishes on folio 109v.

In Admont MS 52 neither Titus nor Philemon include decorated initials at the start of the commentary. There are blank spaces which were clearly left with the intention for a decorated ‘P’ to be added, but they never were (Fig. 3.3). Figure 3.3 shows the two empty spaces where two large initials were meant to go, one marking the start of Lombard’s commentary to Titus (Paulus seruus hanc epistolam

---

14 Rouse, Manuscripts and their Makers, I, p. 27.
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scribit apostolus Tyto) and the next marking the first biblical verse within Lombard’s commentary; *Paulus nomine seruus conditione*. The same pattern occurs in Philemon: the first initial would have marked the start of Lombard’s commentary *Paulus uinctus hanc epistolam scribit apostolus Phylemoni* and another the first biblical verse Lombard comments on *Paulus uinctus Ihesu Christi* (Fig. 3.4). This pattern is repeated throughout the manuscript with two initials for each letter. However, what does change is the decoration. The only letters which are left with either blank spaces or with preliminary outlines of the initials are I and II Thessalonians, I and II Timothy, Titus and Philemon. The earlier initials use penwork in red, blue and green ink, demonstrating that this copy of Lombard’s text was afforded some degree of artwork. Most of the initials are penwork except for those at the start of II Corinthians and Colossians where Paul is represented as scribe (Figs. 3.5 and 3.6). Figure 3.5 shows Paul, immediately identifiable by his full beard and halo, who holds a book and holds up two fingers with his other hand. There is a note in red ink adjacent to the historiated initial which reads *Crine tumens legis decaluatus cruce regis, Que risit saulas fert caluarie loca Paulus*. The first sentence refers to the ‘hair of the law’ as a metaphor for the Old Testament which ‘became bald’ through the cross of the king which refers to the crucifixion. The second sentence then refers to Paul’s conversion at Cavalry, the place of the crucifixion. Essentially, the two sentences link the fact that Paul is usually shown as bald with his conversion, and there is a monastic parallel in that monks were shaved on entering religious life. However, it is interesting that Paul is not depicted as bald in the image (Fig. 3.5). This initial occurs at the start of Lombard’s commentary to II Corinthians while at the start of his commentary to Colossians there is a penwork initial with a deer and the historiated initial to mark the first biblical reference to Colossians shows Paul as scribe (Fig. 3.6). Paul holds both a stylus and a knife as he writes on a long piece of parchment. His halo does not appear to be finished as it is missing the further detail as seen in the depiction of Paul at the start of II Corinthians. The decoration was not completed but it is clear that the initials which are complete were an important part of this particular manuscript.

These two historiated initials along with the fine penwork initials demonstrate that even this very early copy of Lombard’s commentary was considered to be worth a significant investment of resources. As mentioned above, the twelfth century saw an interest from Admont in texts produced in Paris. Admont MS 36 and Admont MS 52 are examples where the text was copied in France but the illumination was done elsewhere, in this case Salzburg. There are surviving copies of manuscripts containing images of Hugh of St. Victor, one of which is in the Admont library as Admont MS 672.17

Another early copy of Lombard’s text, Admont MS 233, is identified by de Hamel as including Lombard’s first version of his *Collectanea*, written before 1154.18 On folio 170v two sets of rubrics are visible, one set in black ink on the edge of the parchment and the second set of rubrics in red ink. It is possible that the scribe wrote the first set as he copied out the text and then the rubricator (who could in fact be the scribe) followed the instructions and wrote the ‘official’ set of rubrics in red ink (Fig. 3.7). However, it is interesting that not all of the red rubrics include these notes in black ink. Therefore it is possible that, if the scribe did write the initial set of rubrics in dark ink, the rubricator added any missing rubrics. Another possibility is that some rubrics have been lost in trimming.

---

CCCC MS 52

CCCC MS 52 is a twelfth-century copy of Lombard’s commentary and measures 340 x 230 mm and includes 203 folia of the text with an additional five folia of notes.\(^{19}\) Although its provenance is unknown, it has been dated to the twelfth century.\(^{20}\) Titus begins on folio 171r (Fig. 3.8). This manuscript presents the text in two equal-sized columns, but an obvious distinction in the layout of the text is that the main biblical text is in red ink while the commentary is in black ink. Lombard’s commentary and the main biblical text are written in the same size script which is unique when compared to the other manuscripts included in this study. This style of laying out the biblical text and Lombard’s commentary did not occur in copies made after the end of the twelfth century, most likely due to the high cost along with the fact that it was time-consuming for scribes.\(^{21}\) This information helps to date this manuscript to the second half of the twelfth century and it also provides a contrast to the design and layout of the manuscripts already discussed in this study. Since CCCC MS 52 keeps both texts in the same size script as well as in the same columns, there is only one decorated initial at the start of each book marking the start of the main biblical text. In contrast, the other manuscripts included in this study have one decorated initial at the start of the main biblical text, it is this initial which is most often historiated, and then a penwork initial marks the beginning of Lombard’s commentary.

In CCCC MS 52 the biblical text is underlined in red ink throughout the commentary which is a feature present in most manuscripts in the whole study thus far. In addition to the main biblical text in red ink as well as the fact that the biblical text in the commentary is underlined in red, this manuscript also places vertical red lines in the margins. These red lines in the margins which extend from the start of the rubrics until the end of the borrowed source or quote were a popular tool which de Hamel explains as follows; ‘these lines run down the margins from the name and they indicate clearly and successfully the length of each author’s text.’\(^{22}\) The four early manuscripts all include these lines, though those in Admont MS 52 are in black ink, and Angers MS 69 is the only manuscript from the Parisian group to include them. This is significant as it is another similarity which Angers MS 69 and BnF MS Latin 17246 share thus strengthening the connection between these two manuscripts. The fact that these lines only occur in twelfth-century copies is reflective of de Hamel’s comments about thirteenth-century copies containing fewer marginal rubrics.\(^{23}\) In terms of the marginal rubrics as they appear in CCCC MS 52, there is a lack of consistency in how the patristic sources are referenced. \textit{amb} or \textit{amb} are used to refer to Ambrose which in itself is interesting because if it had been copied by one scribe surely the way in which they started writing out the sources would be the way they continued throughout the text. Similarly, \textit{aug} and \textit{au} are used when a reference to Augustine is made.


BnF MS Latin 17246

The third example of an early copy of Lombard’s *Collectanea* is BnF MS Latin 17246 which was made around 1160 in Paris and was donated to the cathedral of Notre-Dame by the canon Claude Joly in 1680.²⁴ This is a copy which contains a first edition of Lombard’s text which was released for copying after the council of Rheims in 1148, as explained in the introduction.²⁵ The manuscript measures 325 × 245 mm with 161 folia and the layout of text is immediately different when compared to the standard style we have already seen in this text (Fig. 3.9). Titus begins on folio 126r and finishes on folio 129r while Philemon begins on folio 129r and finishes on folio 130r. There are two columns of text but unlike the later copies where the main biblical text and the commentary are combined to make two columns, this edition keeps the main biblical text at the margin closest to the spine of the book while the commentary is contained within a slightly wider column. The usual difference in the size of scripts is present with a larger script for the main text while the commentary is in a smaller size. This layout of the two texts is reminiscent of Angers MS 69 which also keeps the two columns completely separate. Another similarity between this manuscript and that of Angers MS 69 is the use of penwork initials at the beginning of Lombard’s commentary to each epistle and then a more detailed decorated initial at the start to the main biblical text. There are differences in the abbreviations used, but that is found in all of these manuscripts. The only thing to change within the text is the difference in how words are abbreviated. This can be seen in the initials at the start of Titus in BnF MS Latin 17246 and Angers MS 69 (Figs. 3.9 and 3.10). The way in which BnF MS Latin 17246 is laid out places the focus on the commentary as it takes up more of the page, but it also makes the distinction between the biblical text and the commentary apparent.

Vat. Lat. 144

The fourth manuscript, Vat. Lat. 144 was made in the twelfth century although a more precise date has not yet been established. Similar to BnF MS Latin 17246, this is one of the copies of the earliest edition of the text as identified by Brady.²⁶ This manuscript contains 263 folia and measures 260 x 174 mm which is slightly smaller than the other manuscripts seen so far.²⁷ The main biblical text is not included in this copy which is also a feature of Admont MS 52. The lines of the biblical text as they appear in the commentary are underlined in red as in the other manuscripts, however this is the only way in which Vat. Lat. 144 presents the main biblical text. The commentary is written in two equal-sized columns, though unlike Admont MS 52, the portions of the main biblical text which are in the commentary are underlined in red ink and not black ink, which is an example of cost as red ink was an additional expense (Fig. 3.11).²⁸ Titus begins at the bottom of folio 225v and there is no large or decorated initial, but there is a blank space beside

²⁶ *Magistri Petri Lombardi Parisiensis episcopi Sententiae in IV libris distinctae, Prolegomena*, ed. by Ignatius C. Brady, pp. 66*-68*.
aulus where the P would have gone (Fig. 3.12). This is evidence of an unfinished manuscript with regard to the decoration. Figure 3.12 illustrates the beginning of Lombard’s commentary to Titus on folio 225v with the rubricated Ep(is)(ol)a ad Titum prefacing the text. The biblical quotes underlined in red are visible. Titus finishes on folio 228r and Philemon begins like Titus did without an initial P. There are headers in red ink atop each folio which would have helped the reader find their place in the text. There are also the titles of the letters within the text which act as a title or introduction to the text. Philemon finishes on folio 229r.

The fact that these four early copies of Lombard’s text, Admont MS 52, CCCC MS 52, BnF MS Latin 17246, and Vat. Lat. 144, do not have a similar layout shows that there was considerable diversity in the appearance of copies from an early date. Later copyists therefore had a wide range of potential layouts to choose between. An example of two manuscripts with different dates of production but similar layouts is seen in BnF MS Latin 17246 and Angers MS 69. They are quite similar in their layout with the distinctive feature of having the commentary in a column which is wider than that containing the main biblical text. There are several decades between these manuscripts so it may be that they were made in the same area or at least were copied from the same exemplar. However, there are certainly stylistic details which were more or less popular depending on the period. An example of this is having the biblical text written in red ink as seen in CCCC MS 52, this technique is noted by de Hamel as having been ‘abandoned before the end of the century’ while he also notes that it would have been typically reserved for luxury manuscripts due to its cost. A comparison can be made between these four early copies and the thirteenth-century copies included in this study. Angers MS 69 is the only manuscript within the Parisian group to have a slightly different layout with the commentary appearing in a wider column than the main biblical text. The remaining manuscripts in the Parisian group are quite standard in that they all include the main biblical text and commentary combined in two columns demonstrating that a standardised layout clearly emerged in the thirteenth century. From looking at other copies of Lombard’s Collectanea which are not included in the study, this design of the layout appears to be true of the thirteenth-century copies. Mazarine MS 143, BnF MSS Latin 650, 662, 663, 665, 668, 669, 670 and Reims, Bibliothèque municipale MS 156 are a few examples taken from Appendix I, all of which incorporate the main biblical text and commentary into two equal-size columns. Further research might confirm whether this trend owes more to the region or origin or changing fashions over time.

The Parisian Group

The collation of Lombard’s commentary to Titus and Philemon as it appears in the six Parisian manuscripts is included in Appendices II and III. BnF MS Latin 14267 is used as the base manuscript due to its standard layout and because the script is the easiest to read out of the Parisian group. Overall, in both Titus and Philemon, the text does not change significantly in this selection of manuscripts. There are minor differences in the text but the majority of these are changes in spelling and variations in the abbreviations used, and are probably the result of scribal choices and occasional errors. It does not appear that any of the manuscripts were directly copied from any of the others. Another minor difference is how each manuscript presents the biblical text within Lombard’s commentary. The six manuscripts in the Parisian group
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underline the text in red ink though there are small differences in how much of the text is underlined. Overall though, this feature of the manuscripts appears to be the same.

Comparing the text in the Parisian group of manuscripts to the four earliest manuscripts, Admont MS 52, CCCC MS 52, BnF MS Latin 17246, and Vat. Lat. 144, reveals that the text was very standard from the start. However, one important difference is that the six Parisian manuscripts include a prologue at the start of Lombard’s commentary to each epistle while the four earliest manuscripts do not include these. These prologues are the same ones which are found in thirteenth-century Bibles and are usually attributed to Jerome. 30 Inserting the prologues into copies of Lombard’s Collectanea coincides with the addition of the main biblical text and the absence of both from the earliest copies suggests that this was a later stage in the development of the text. BnF MS Latin 14267 prefaces the prologues with the term Argumentum. Angers MS 69 places the prologue in the margin, giving it the appearance of an after-thought, but the hand appears to be the same scribe so this was clearly a stylistic choice. The prologues to Titus and Philemon are placed beside the decorated initial at the start of the main biblical text (Figs. 3.13 and 3.14).

BnF MS Latin 14267 is the only manuscript in both the Parisian group and the four earliest copies to include capitula lists. This is interesting as it was common for Bibles made before c. 1230 to include them, again suggesting that the makers of BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 were keen to include a full biblical text as well as the commentary. 31 Chapter two highlighted the fact that this copy of Lombard’s text includes the greatest amount of material before the start of Lombard’s commentary to Romans. This, in addition to the capitula lists, reinforces the hypothesis that this manuscript was meant to provide a very complete study guide, lavishly decorated as a sign of its importance. The capitula lists are also present in Herbert of Bosham’s edition of Lombard’s text, which also survives in extremely elaborate manuscripts with lots of decoration, and which will be discussed in greater detail in chapter five. Collating the text reveals that Lombard’s commentary was copied with a high degree of consistency from the last quarter of the twelfth century to the middle of the following century, but demonstrates the potential for it to be combined with additional material.

The Marginal Rubrics: Authors referenced

The consistency in the copying of Lombard’s commentary makes the variations in the treatments of the marginal rubrics particularly striking. The following analysis of the marginal rubrics occurring in Titus and Philemon will help to establish similarities and differences between the page layout and text. Acknowledging which portion of the main biblical text is associated with the patristic sources is crucial in order to appreciate what Lombard hoped to accomplish with his commentary. The main biblical text can be seen as the initial text, Lombard’s commentary as secondary and the patristic sources as tertiary. This is indicated by the page layout, with the biblical text in the centre, then Lombard’s commentary and the patristic sources in the margins. Of the manuscripts already consulted within this study which were made in Paris, there is only one which does not have any marginal rubrics; Mazarine MS 266. The fact that there are

differences in the presentation of marginal rubrics within this selection of manuscripts demonstrates the diversity in these manuscripts in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. An immediate possibility as to this difference in the content of the marginal rubrics may be due to how the manuscripts were initially intended to be used. Those without marginal rubrics may have been made for an audience already well-versed in Lombard’s commentary along with the authorities which he quotes. However, another possibility as to why certain copies of the text do not include marginal rubrics is the fact that the marginal rubrics provided particular challenges for scribes. They had to be located in the right place and were usually added in red ink. Moreover, adding them later would have required careful reading of the text, meaning that if the marginal rubrics were not present in the exemplar being copied it was unlikely that they would be added from another source. Once rubrics were omitted from a manuscript it would have been difficult to reinstate them. Therefore, if a scribe was copying from a manuscript without rubrics they would not know that the text was meant to include them. Similarly, if a scribe was copying from a manuscript which did include the rubrics it would be a challenge to add them in the correct place.

The variations in the marginal rubrics are not just in the number of rubrics included, but also in the attribution of text to different authorities. The rubrics as they appear in Titus will be looked at first followed by those in Philemon. The sources from which Lombard explicitly borrows quotes or ideas are Augustine, Ambrose and Jerome. It will be interesting to note which of the borrowed quotes isolated by the marginal rubrics are noted in the PL because this will highlight those references which are unusual to the manuscript and its maker. The editors would have used a selection of manuscripts of Lombard’s text when copying it out for the PL, therefore any variants in the marginal rubrics as found in that version compared to those in the manuscripts in this particular study may reveal patterns specific to Paris in the late twelfth and early thirteenth century. Selecting the quotes associated with these authors and how they are used within the text as well as the individual manuscripts is the next step in determining whether any patterns occur. In addition to isolating the quotes which are highlighted via marginal rubrics, it will be necessary to translate the quotes as well as attempt to find their original source in order to understand their connection to Lombard’s commentary. By associating a passage of text with one of the Church Fathers it provides the text with a certain degree of authority. A reader might have paid greater attention to those passages associated with a marginal rubric.

Tracing patterns in the marginal rubrics as they appear in manuscripts over time provides information regarding different uses for Lombard’s commentary. In general, the earliest four manuscripts, Admont MS 52, CCCC MS 52, BnF MS Latin 17246 and Vat. Lat. 144, as well as the Parisian group of manuscripts at the heart of this study, present the rubrics in a similar layout. The marginal rubrics are written in red ink, with the exception of Admont MS 52 which uses the same dark ink as the commentary, and are almost always abbreviations of the patristic authors. The most common forms of abbreviations are ag/aug for Augustine, am/amb/ab/ambr for Ambrose and jer for Jerome. Sometimes the titles of the sources are added, especially with regard to works by Augustine. The style of abbreviating the patristic sources was clearly standardised during the copying process as it does not change drastically in these nine manuscripts. Another standard system in the organisation of the rubrics is that all of the manuscripts utilise a system where symbols are placed within the commentary in order to direct the reader to the start of the borrowed
source. Symbols are placed above the abbreviated names of the patristic authors in the margins in all of the manuscripts but one. Vat. Lat. 144 only places the symbols within the text rather than above the name in the margin (Fig. 3.15). There are clear similarities in how all of these manuscripts notify the reader as to a borrowed section of the text. However, although the layout is standardised the content of the rubrics changes within the manuscripts. There are several instances where the same portion of commentary is associated with different authors across the manuscripts, but this will become more evident once the analysis of the content of the rubrics is completed later in this chapter.

There are general trends in the marginal annotations in the four early copies as well as the Parisian group of manuscripts. In compiling his Collectanea Lombard borrowed from several sources including the three Church Fathers, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome as well as John Chrysostom, Ambrosiaster, Alcuin, Haymo, Remigius, and Lanfranc and he was also influenced by contemporary authors, including Hugh of St. Victor, Walter of Mortagne, Peter Abelard, Gilbert of Poitiers, Robert Pullen and Gratian. However, Rosemann highlights the importance of acknowledging that these borrowed quotations were not all taken from original sources. Lombard took a substantial amount of his sources from the Gloss, a twelfth-century glossed Bible, which will be discussed in further detail once the content of the marginal rubrics has been discussed. Although Lombard borrowed from numerous sources, the system of marginal rubrics present in the manuscripts within this study only includes references to Augustine, Ambrose and Jerome. This is most likely due to it being these three sources from which Lombard borrowed the most or, another possibility is that he borrowed these sources together with the marginal notes directly from the copy of the Gloss he worked with. As the copies of Lombard’s commentary do not include references to the other authors from whom he borrowed it is most likely that it was left to readers to recognise quotes from other sources. This demonstrates that it clearly was not important for the manuscripts containing Lombard’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles to contain references to each source or author he elaborated on or quoted from directly.

Gathering information about the authors may help to understand the impact that they had on the medieval world and more specifically their connection to Peter Lombard. An interesting and key point to this study with relation to Lombard’s connection to Augustine is that Lombard appears to have only been familiar with four works by Augustine and his only other knowledge of this author was through the Gloss and Florus of Lyon’s compilation text. Similarly, Lombard’s choice of patristic authors is not unexpected as Jerome, Augustine and Ambrose were held to be authoritative in the twelfth century. Ambrose was ‘teacher and converter of Saint Augustine (354-430)’ and Augustine ‘knew and corresponded extensively with Jerome.’ Although Lombard may have gained knowledge of the patristic authors by either hearing sermons or by coming across them through reading and study, it must be stressed that it is not necessarily easy to trace quotations back to the original source. Using sources from patristic authors was one way in
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which medieval authors demonstrated that their work was authoritative and not heretical which became an issue with the *Sentences* after Lombard’s death.

The use of the patristic sources throughout Lombard’s commentary will have been a deliberate choice of Lombard’s and isolating the quotes is a first step in analysing his style of writing along with what purpose the borrowed quotes serve. The first group of quotes to be looked at in detail are those attributed to Augustine. His connection to Saint Paul and his works is great; ‘The influence of Paul’s teaching reaches to virtually all aspects of Augustine’s theology.’ This observation is mirrored in the large number of sources written by Augustine referring to Paul and his writings which are found in Peter Lombard’s manuscripts. However, as stated, it is believed that Lombard’s knowledge of Augustine’s works was limited to a few books and any passages included in the *Gloss*. Therefore, the question of authorship must be asked in order to understand how Lombard composed his commentary on the Pauline Epistles. Referring to patristic sources provides Lombard’s commentary with authority, but it is more than likely that mistakes were made in the attribution of borrowed material. This chapter’s analysis of the marginal rubrics in the manuscripts reveals several occurrences where the same passage is attributed to different sources.

Mistakes were bound to happen in the copying of these manuscripts, which may be a reason as to why certain portions of the commentary are associated with more than one source. It has been argued that Lombard was very well-versed in certain works of Augustine. Indeed Eric Saak went so far as to argue that ‘The Augustinian “renaissance” of the twelfth century reached its high point in Hugh [of St. Victor], only to be matched by one of Hugh’s pupils, Peter Lombard.’ Lombard’s connection to Augustine was partly formed through his relationship with the Abbey of St. Victor which was an Augustinian house. It is known that Lombard attended lectures by Hugh of St. Victor as his *De sacramentis christianae fidei* was one of the main sources for Lombard’s *Sentences*. This would have undoubtedly had an effect on Lombard and is seen in his commentary as his use of Augustine is significant. Lombard’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles is not his only work with ties to Augustine as in his *Sentences* he also borrows substantially from the author, here explained by Jacqueline Turcheck: ‘The most frequently cited by far is Augustine. […] it may also reflect Victorine influence because the writings of Augustine were especially revered in the house of the Augustinian canons.’ Given the time that Lombard spent at the Abbey of St. Victor he will have undoubtedly been in contact with works by Augustine. With his main sources understood it is now important to acknowledge how many rubrics occur in the manuscripts and what the differences may mean.

**Number of Rubrics**

Augustine, Jerome and Ambrose are the only authors to be cited in marginal rubrics in Lombard’s commentary and tracking these rubrics within the Parisian group of manuscripts as well as in three of the four early copies, BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52 and Vat. Lat. 144, is important as it will help to

---
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establish whether any changes were made. Unfortunately, images of Admont MS 52 were obtained too late in the project to incorporate them in the analysis. Tracking the rubrics will also provide information as to when and if the commentary became standardised with regards to the references used. It may be that the marginal rubrics can be tied to the earliest copies, making it likely that they were the work of Peter Lombard. If the earliest copies have the same set of marginal rubrics as the later copies it will indicate that the text was standard when it was first being copied. Cataloguing the marginal rubrics as they appear in the selected manuscripts also allows for the most commonly used quotations to be isolated, which then provides the opportunity to attempt an explanation of how Peter Lombard’s commentary was used and formatted according to its place of production. Acknowledging the similarities and the differences in how the marginal notes appear in a set of manuscripts will allow for connections within their respective provenances to be better understood.

The tables in Appendix IV present the findings from the study of the marginal rubrics as they appear in the five main manuscripts and the three earliest copies. As Mazarine MS 266 does not include any marginal rubrics, the remaining five manuscripts in the Parisian group are included in this analysis. The manuscripts have been assigned a letter and are listed by their dates of production, starting with the earliest.

Manuscripts:

A: BnF MS Latin 17246  
B: CCCC MS 52  
C: Vat. Lat. 144  
D: Angers MS 69  
E: BnF Latin MS 14267  
F: Troyes MS 175  
G: Dole MS 27  
H: Mazarine MS 264

There are four tables; two for Titus and two for Philemon. The first table for each book presents the marginalia found in the text. The numbers refer to the placement within Titus and Philemon which gives an idea as to which authorities were used by Lombard in his commentary on each verse. The second and fourth tables focus on the content of the rubrics. These detailed tables provide an overview of the marginal rubrics as they appear in these particular manuscripts. A look at the tables of quotes summarises the findings of the analysis of the marginal rubrics. By listing the sections of text each time they are attached to a marginal note, those which were most often rubricated on are identified. This may act to highlight important or key sections of the commentary and therefore the patristic sources attached to them. The total number of marginal rubrics in each manuscript is found in the last row of tables one and three. With the exception of Mazarine MS 264, there is a clear pattern emerging where the number of marginal rubrics in the manuscripts decreases throughout the thirteenth century. It is immediately clear that BnF MS Latin
17246, the earliest confirmed copy within this study, has the greatest number of marginal rubrics and it is interesting that the number continues to drop consistently over time, with the exception of Angers MS 69, which again, highlights the likely connection it shares with BnF MS Latin 17246. This further encourages the possibility that they were ultimately derived from the same exemplar which would also explain the similarities in their layout and decoration. It is possible that Lombard’s ‘original’ version probably included all of these rubrics as it would have been easier to omit them than to add them. This corresponds to what de Hamel says about the rubrics being omitted over time.\(^{40}\) In terms of how the rubrics are presented in the three early manuscripts and the Parisian group, BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52 and Angers MS 69 are the most similar out of the eight manuscripts in terms of their marginalia.

The first and third tables demonstrate the number of marginal rubrics within all eight manuscripts while the second and fourth tables present the pattern of acknowledged borrowed sources as they appear in Lombard’s commentary and shows which manuscripts include the particular rubrics. These tables effectively demonstrate that although the text is the same in these eight manuscripts, the marginalia differ greatly. The placement of the rubrics throughout the commentary is not the same in every manuscript and there are examples where the association of an author with a particular section of text changes. The existence of these differences demonstrates that although the commentary was standard by the thirteenth century, the way in which it was studied and interpreted was not. This is evident in the variation of references appearing in the margins of the manuscripts. A selection of rubrics, especially those which occur in several manuscripts, will be looked at in greater detail in order to understand why certain authorities and their respective texts were constantly referenced and others less so.

Out of the three early manuscripts, BnF MS Latin 17246 and CCCC MS 52 share many of the same rubrics. They also contain most of the rubrics found in Admont MS 52 and Admont MS 233, the two examples of the earliest known copies. It is likely that the rubrics in these early copies were part of Lombard’s work given their respective dates of production and relative consistency. Admont MS 233 includes fifty-five rubrics in Titus and twenty-four in Philemon which is very similar to BnF MS Latin 17246 which includes fifty-four rubrics in Titus and twenty-three in Philemon. Although Admont MS 52 only includes twenty-eight marginal rubrics in Titus and eleven in Philemon none of these are new or not included in those manuscripts included in this study. An interesting difference between these two manuscripts is the fact that Admont MS 52 uses vertical lines, as already seen in other manuscripts, to demonstrate the length of a borrowed quote. However, Admont MS 52, at times, adds a different symbol along the lines to demonstrate another quote by the same author (fig. 3.16). This example is taken from Titus on folio 108r, an abbreviation for Ambrose, \textit{ambr}, is in the margin accompanied by a symbol denoting a medieval quotation mark. This directs the reader to \textit{nemo iustificatur apud deum...} before another symbol, this time without another abbreviation for Ambrose, begins at \textit{enim aduersum veritatem opponitur...} before another symbol starts at \textit{mandata hominum et fabulas}. In other manuscripts each one of these symbols would be accompanied by an abbreviation of Ambrose’s name but this system of using the line clearly informs the reader that all three quotations belong to Ambrose. With these taken into consideration as being additional rubrics, the total number in Titus would, in fact, be thirty-five. This further emphasises the point

that leaving things out could be a scribal choice, even in an early copy, and that this is a more likely scenario than additional rubrics being added into the other copies.

The fact that there are early copies which do not include the same rubrics demonstrates flexibility in altering Lombard’s text. Vat. Lat. 144 is an example of an early copy which does not include a large number of the rubrics included in the other earliest manuscripts (CCCC MS 52 and BnF MS Latin 17246), which demonstrates the desire to alter Lombard’s original content in the twelfth century. If it was indeed more common for the earliest manuscripts containing Lombard’s commentary to include a large number of marginal rubrics, it is interesting that Vat. Lat. 144 has so few. This reinforces the hypothesis that copies of Lombard’s text were altered depending on the audience. As established, Angers MS 69 appears to have been a high-powered study text due to the large number of marginal rubrics and biblical cross-references. Therefore, Vat. Lat. 144 may have been a request for a basic version of Lombard’s text, for someone who simply wanted a copy of the commentary without the study guide. However, the tables in Appendix IV clearly show that whilst each copy is unique there is a general trend towards omitting rubrics over time.

Many of Augustine’s well-known works are used by Lombard in his commentary and it is interesting to see how they appear in this selection of manuscripts. The first most commonly borrowed phrase attributed to Augustine begins ‘How did he promise, when they were not yet men’ and it is used in the commentary associated with Titus 1:2.41 This quote is attached to a marginal rubric in two of the early copies, BnF MS Latin 17246 and CCCC MS 52, as well as in all of the manuscripts in the Parisian group except for Dole MS 27. The fact that this quote is attached to a marginal rubric in nearly all of the manuscripts clearly demonstrates the importance of this particular quote and that it was most likely very common and well known in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52 and Angers MS 69 are the only manuscripts to provide the title of the work which this quote is derived from; Augustine’s De Ciuitate Dei or the City of God. It was not uncommon for marginal rubrics denoting the title of the borrowed work to be included in copies of Lombard’s works, mostly in terms of Augustine’s works.42 On folio 213r in Angers MS 69 there is a note in red ink in the margin which reads ag – de ci di. On folio 126r in BnF MS Latin 17246 the reference appears as ag – de ciiuit(ate) d(e)i and on folio 171v in CCCC MS 52 as au – de ci dei. It was not easy to locate this particular quote as there is no reference in the margin as to which part of Augustine’s large work the quote is from. This particular quote is found within chapter 16 of book 12 of The City of God; ‘But then, how did He promise; for the promise was made to men, and yet they had no existence before eternal times? Does this not mean that, in His own eternity, and in His coeternal word, that which was to be in its own time was already predestined and fixed?’43 The placement of this quote within the commentary is appropriate as it mirrors what Lombard already expressed in his comments related to Titus 1:2. The quote from Augustine’s text begins by asking a question; Quomodo? autem promisit. Lombard’s commentary immediately preceding this, sets up Augustine’s

---

41 PL 192:384D Quomodo? Promisit, cum nondum essent homines; Douay-Rheims Bible, Titus 1:2: Unto the hope of life everlasting, which God, who lieth not, hath promised before the times of the world.
42 Smith, The Glossa Ordinaria, p. 133.
analysis with ‘Which, eternal life, God before the times of the world.’ This example demonstrates how Lombard’s commentary on Titus 1:2 and related to everlasting life draws from Augustine in order to make the biblical text as clear as possible and with additional authority.

This example of Lombard borrowing from Augustine’s *The City of God* demonstrates the different ways in which the manuscripts present the marginal rubrics. The *PL* also provides the title of Augustine’s text *De Civitate Dei*, but why is it that the title is not given in the other three manuscripts? One possibility may be due to their respective dates of production. Angers MS 69 is believed to have been made in Paris in the last quarter of the twelfth century and we have already established that both BnF MS Latin 17246 and CCCC MS 52 were produced in the second half of the twelfth century. The fact that the title of the text only appears in twelfth-century manuscripts mirrors what was said earlier about the first and third tables of rubrics and the fact that the earlier copies include the largest number of rubrics. The earliest copies provide the reader with the most amount of information regarding the text. It may be that the thirteenth-century copies were intended for an audience which was already well-versed with Lombard and the authorities from whom he borrows material or simply that the effort in copying prompted things to be omitted over time.

Moving away from the end of the twelfth century and towards the thirteenth century provides further insight into the different styles as well as the different ways of presenting marginal rubrics. Troyes MS 175 was made in the first quarter of the thirteenth century while Mazarine MS 264 was made in either the middle of the thirteenth century or towards the last quarter of the century. As Angers MS 69 has the earliest date of production out of the Parisian group of manuscripts it may be that having the titles of the borrowed works in the margins was more common in the twelfth century. Another possible reason for the difference in how the marginalia are presented is how the manuscripts were used. Angers MS 69 may be an example of a manuscript used to teach members of the church about not only Peter Lombard, but Augustine and the significant number of texts associated with his name. The audiences for the other three manuscripts may have already been so well-versed in Augustine’s work that they did not require the title of each borrowed quote to be written in the margins. However, as Augustine was such an influential figure and author, having his name attached to a certain section of the text may have been the most important thing and attaching his name to a particular text secondary.

The next example of a quote by Augustine also demonstrates the pattern emerging in Angers MS 69; the title of the work is given in the margin. The quote refers to Titus 1:2 and it begins ‘Hence, we cannot say that there was a time when God had not yet made anything.’ This quote is attached to a marginal rubric in BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52, Angers MS 69 and Mazarine MS 264. On folio 213r in Angers MS 69 the marginal rubric associated with this quote reads Ag. Cc manich which refers to a particular text of Augustine’s entitled *Contra Manicheos* but an initial search reveals several different texts.

---

44 PL 192:384D *Quam, vitam aeternam, Deus ante tempora saecularia.*
with titles containing these terms. A closer look through the works reveals that the original source of the quote is in book 1 chapter 2 of Augustine’s *De Genesi Contra Manichaeos*. The same quote is referenced on folio 237v in Mazarine MS 264 and the marginal rubrics also include a variation of the title of Augustine’s text, *ag c(ontra) manicheos*. The title of the work is also present in the two earlier manuscripts; on folio 126v of BnF MS Latin 17246 it reads *ag (con)tr(a) manicheos* and on folio 171v of CCCC MS 52 it reads *au c(ontra) manicheos*. Lombard used this quote from Augustine about God’s creation in order to reinforce what Paul says at Titus 1:2. Colish explains that this work by Augustine was the main source for Lombard’s discussion of creation in Book 2 of his *Sentences* and was available through the compilation of Florus of Lyon. This example is evidence of how Lombard used a compilation of Augustine’s works in order to provide his commentary with more authority.

The next quote by Augustine relates to Titus 1:3 and is found in BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52, Vat. Lat. 144, Angers MS 69 and Troyes MS 175. The quote begins ‘that is to say in due times, what else is this than His word? For this is life eternal’ and is from book 12 chapter 16 of Augustine’s *The City of God*. Thus far, two of the references to Augustine have been to this text demonstrating Lombard’s familiarity with it along with Augustine’s work in general. The next quote is attached to a marginal rubric in BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52, Vat. Lat. 144, Angers MS 69, BnF MS Latin 14267 and Mazarine MS 264 and it begins ‘If he had spoken without sin, none could rightly be ordained a minister in the Church’ and it is isolated as belonging to Augustine’s *Ad Bonifacium*. This quote relates to Titus 1:6. On folio 213v in Angers MS 69, *(l)iber ad bonifaciu(m) p(a)p(am)* is clearly written and it refers to one of Augustine’s sermons or a letter to Pope Boniface I. Directly after the quote, in the *PL* version, the title of the text is given as *[Id.] ad Bonifac.* The reference as it appears in the two earlier manuscripts is also important to note. On folio 171v in CCCC MS 52 the marginal rubric references Augustine and the source as *au(gustinus) ad bonefaciu(m)*. On folio 126v of BnF MS Latin 17246 the marginal rubric reads *am(brosius) in li<brum> bonefaciu(m) papa(m)* which clearly notes Ambrose instead of Augustine as the source. As the text is associated with Augustine in the other manuscripts, this may be an example of a simple mistake on account of the scribe. Other examples where manuscripts provide different sources for the same portion of text will be discussed shortly. The reference is given as *(l)iber ad bonifaciu(m)* on folio 226r of Vat. Lat. 144. A search for the source turns up Augustine’s *Against Two Letters of the Pelagians (Book I)*. In chapter 28, the reference to Titus 1:6 is quoted as ‘But none could rightly be

47 In the expanded notes of *PL* 192 Augustine’s name as well as the title of the text associated with this quote are provided.
48 Douay-Rheims Bible, Titus 1:2: Unto the hope of life everlasting, which God, who lieth not, hath promised before the times of the world.
50 Douay-Rheims Bible, Titus 1:3: But hath in due times manifested his word in preaching, which is committed to me according to the commandment of God our Saviour.
53 Douay-Rheims Bible, Titus 1:6: If any be without crime, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot, or unruly.
ordained a minister in the Church if the apostle had said, “if any is without sin,” where he says “if any is without crime.” Evidently, Lombard must have had access to this source written by Augustine or another source in which it was quoted with attribution to Augustine. Although there are a few small differences in how the reference is listed, this particular example demonstrates the standard use of Lombard’s marginal rubrics in these earlier manuscripts.

The next quote attributed to Augustine is also connected to Titus 1:6. It only appears in Angers MS 69 and Mazarine MS 264 of the Parisian group of manuscripts, though it also appears in all three of the earliest copies. It refers to Titus 1:6 and begins ‘You may examine any man whatsoever, exceedingly just in this life; however worthy he may now be of the term just, still he is not without sin. Hear holy John himself, whose Gospel this also is, speaking in his epistle: “If we say” he says, “that we do not have sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us.” The manuscripts which attach a rubric to this passage of text provide the source of this quote in virtually the same way, Aug(st)e joh(anne)m appears in the margins of Angers MS 69 and Mazarine MS 264 beside the appropriate reference. It must be noted that on folio 237v in Mazarine MS 264 there is no h at the end of the reference opposed to how it is written in Angers MS 69 on folio 213v. Although the title is not provided in Vat. Lat. 144 it is in the other two early copies. On folio 171v of CCCC MS 52 it is presented as ag (u)sper joh(anne)m and on folio 126v of BnF MS Latin 17246 the reference reads ag sup(e)r joh(me). The PL notes this particular quote by adding August. super Joannem just before it. The fact that these four manuscripts present the rubrics very similarly may mean that they are traceable to a very early copy of Lombard’s commentary. A search for the quote reveals that the source is Tractate 41 on the Gospel of John, verse 9. Although some of the manuscripts include the title of Augustine’s work in the marginal rubrics, a reader would be directed to the Gospel of John given that Lombard’s commentary mentions him by name, as taken from Augustine’s work. The reference to John is found in I John, 1:8.

In BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52, Vat. Lat. 144, Angers MS 69 and Troyes MS 175 there is a marginal rubric associated with Augustine at ‘To speak against truth, or to live badly’ at Titus 1:9. In BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52 and Angers MS 69 there is a marginal rubric with Augustine’s initials and then another separate marginal rubric starting at contradicentes. Troyes MS 175 provides a bit of confusion in that there are symbols above veritati and contradicentes, but only one marginal rubric referring to Augustine. The rubric starting at contradicentes, quote ‘Contradicting, for, they are not to be

56 Douay-Rheims Bible, Titus 1:6: If any be without crime, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot, or unruly.
59 Douay-Rheims Bible, I John 1:8: If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.
60 PL 192:387A veritati obloquendo, uel male uiuendo; Douay-Rheims Bible, Titus 1:9: Embracing that faithful word which is according to doctrine, that he may be able to exhort in sound doctrine, and to convince the gainsayers.
understood one way,’ also by Augustine, refers to Titus 1:9 and is attached to marginal rubrics in BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52, Angers MS 69 and Troyes MS 17.61 In BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52 and Angers MS 69 the abbreviated title of the text is given in the margin; *De Uerbi Apostoli or On the Words of the Apostles*. The quote appears to have derived from sermon 178 attributed to Augustine.62

The next quote relates to Titus 1:12 and is another example where several manuscripts provide the title of Augustine’s text.63 The quote begins ‘This was Epimenides of Crete, in whose books it is found.’64 The quote is associated with a marginal rubric in BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52, Vat. Lat. 144, Angers MS 69, BnF MS Latin 14267 and Mazarine MS 264. The title of Augustine’s work appears in BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52 or Angers MS 69 and reads *Au(gustinus) c(ontra) inimicu(m) leg(is) p(ro)p(h)e(t)arum*. In Paul’s letter to Titus at 1:12 he says ‘One of them a prophet of their own, said, the Cretians are always liars, evil beasts, slothful bellies.’65 Therefore, Lombard’s commentary communicates with the reader that the prophet who said this about the Cretans was Epimenides of Crete. The reference to Epimenides in this context is known as the “Liar Paradox.”66 Augustine mentions it at 4.13 of the second book of his work, *Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum* which is communicated with the marginal rubrics except for the fact that the rubrics do not note where exactly this passage occurs within the text.67 This is another example that demonstrates Lombard’s access to works by Augustine.

Every quote by Augustine which appears in the manuscripts is present in Angers MS 69 while the other manuscripts differ. This suggests that Angers MS 69 was copied from an early exemplar, but it is also significant as it provides information about how Angers MS 69 may have been made. It is presumed, as it contains such a significant amount of marginalia, that this manuscript was intended for readers without a solid background in the authorities. Nearly every quote by Augustine that is singled out by way of marginal rubrics is provided along with the title of the source which would have provided readers with additional information about the authorities and the vast amount of borrowed material Lombard drew inspiration from. It is interesting that in Angers MS 69 it is only the sources associated with Augustine which provide the title of the work. The titles of Ambrose and Jerome’s works are not given in Angers MS 69 or in the other manuscripts.

Jerome is the next author to be analysed and the two examples provided are quotes which are associated with marginal rubrics in several manuscripts. None of the rubrics provide clues as to the titles of the works in question, making it very difficult to trace their origins. The first quote refers to Titus 1:6 and

61 PL 192:387A Contradicentes enim non uno modo intelligendi sunt.
63 Douay-Rheims Bible, Titus 1:12: One of them a prophet of their own, said, The Cretians are always liars, evil beasts, slothful bellies.
64 PL 192:387D Iste fuit pigmenides Cretensis in cujus libris hoc invenitur.
65 Douay-Rheims Bible, Titus 1:2: Dixit quidam ex illis, proprius ipsorum propheta: Cretenses semper mendaces, malae bestiae, ventres pigri.
begins ‘After baptism, when a new human […]’. It is associated with Jerome in BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52, Vat. Lat. 144, Angers MS 69, BnF MS Latin 14267 and Troyes MS 175 though the title of the text is not given. This particular marginal rubric on folio 181r in Troyes MS 175 cannot be confirmed to be associated with Jerome, though it has been presumed to be, as the folio has been cut and so only the very start of the initial is visible.

The second quote associated with Jerome relates to Titus 2:3 and is attached to a marginal rubric in BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52, Vat. Lat. 144, Angers MS 69, BnF MS Latin 14267 and Mazarine MS 264 which is interesting as it is not the same group of manuscripts associated with the first quote except for the new clear pattern seen in the earliest four manuscripts. BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52 and Mazarine MS 264 include two separate marginal rubrics associated with Jerome at Titus 2:3. The quote begins ‘so that their very gait and movements, countenance, speech, silence, should present a certain dignity of holy elegance.’ This passage derives from Jerome’s commentary on Titus which Jerome completed after his arrival in Bethlehem c. 386–388. Although he never completed the commentary on all of the Pauline epistles, Jerome did complete those to Galatians, Titus and Philemon and he was heavily dependent on Origen. This example demonstrates the complexity of the tradition of biblical commentary because although this particular passage is associated with Jerome via the marginal rubrics there is no indication that the material was influenced by Origen.

A look at these two quotes associated with Jerome and how they appear in the manuscripts reveals that the four earliest manuscripts include references to both quotes, and both quotes are referenced in BnF MS Latin 14267 and the second one appears in Mazarine MS 264. The first quote is the only one to be referenced in Troyes MS 175. This further illustrates the trend in the earliest manuscripts including a greater number of marginal rubrics than those produced in the thirteenth century.

Ambrose is the last author to be associated with marginalia in Lombard’s commentary. The first quote attached to a marginal rubric which appears in more than one manuscript begins ‘he created an overseer, reminding him to be worried in ecclesiastical instruction’ and in the copy of Lombard’s text as it appears in the PL Ambrose’s name is in brackets before this phrase. This phrase is the first sentence of Lombard’s commentary to Titus, referring to Titus 1:1 and it is attached to a marginal rubric in CCCC MS 52, Angers 69 and BnF MS Latin 14267. The next quote refers to Titus 1:2 and begins ‘who is truthful, a promise of life is shown through a certain way.’ The manuscripts which include a marginal rubric to this quote are BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52, Vat. Lat. 144, Angers MS 69 and Mazarine MS 264.

68 PL 192:386B post baptismum, quando novo homini.
69 Douay-Rheims Bible, Titus 2:3: The aged women, in like manner, in holy attire, not false accusers, not given to much wine, teaching well.
71 Saint Jerome, St. Jerome’s Commentaries on Galatians, Titus and Philemon, trans. by Thomas P. Scheck, pp. 308.
73 PL 192:383C quem creauit episcopum, commonens eum fore sollicitum in ecclesiastica disciplina.
74 PL 192:385A qui uerax est: per quod certa ostenditur promissio uitae.
third quote refers to the end of Titus 1:4 and the start of Titus 1:5, it begins ‘They manifest here, of this matter. At first he said someone may withhold to lead.’ The quote is attached to a marginal rubric in the five earliest manuscripts: BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52, Vat. Lat. 144, Angers MS 69 and BnF MS Latin 14267. The next quote to appear in several of the manuscripts refers to Titus 1:10 and the quote begins ‘they were learning to live in the Jewish manner from the Jews who are under the name of Christ.’ It is associated with a marginal rubric in BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52, Angers MS 69 and BnF MS Latin 14267. The PL does not provide any additional information regarding the author of this particular quote. The next quote begins ‘For instance, whatever enemy is set against the truth is the human intent’ and in the PL the sentence which comes after it is prefaced by Ambrose’s name in brackets.

The next quote refers to Titus 2:10 and begins ‘he says to be honoured with good works and learning faith belonging to a master’ and attributed to Ambrose in BnF MS Latin 17246, Angers MS 69 and BnF MS Latin 14267. The next quote refers to Titus 2:14 and it is attributed to Ambrose in marginal rubrics in BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52, Angers MS 69 and Troyes MS 175 which is important given that Troyes MS 175 has so few marginal rubrics. The quote begins ‘here, that he may redeem us through blood from all iniquity.’ The next quote refers to Titus 3:9 and again, is attributed to Ambrose, and it begins ‘of origin enumerations and disputes which they make from law.’ It is associated with marginal rubrics in BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52, Vat. Lat. 144, Angers MS 69 and Troyes MS 175. The repetition of these quotes in nearly all the manuscripts in the Parisian group as well as the early copies suggests that they were held to be particularly important by copyists. The fact that certain manuscripts contain more rubrics associated with Augustine may be a reflection of the interest in that particular author by the respective patrons or makers of the manuscripts. It is evident that although Lombard included a large number of sources in his commentary on Titus, it was up to the scribe and those commissioning the manuscripts to decide how much to communicate to the reader.

Like the tables presented within the analysis of Titus, those associated with Philemon present the same general results in that the earlier manuscripts contain the largest number of marginal rubrics. The number of rubrics as well as the content are found in tables three and four in Appendix IV. Another clear distinction is found in the overall number of marginal rubrics found in Titus compared to those in Philemon; this is simply due to Titus being a longer text. Although there are fewer marginal notations in

---

75 PL 192:385B-385C Manifesta sunt haec. Hujus rei. Primo dicit quid agere debeat ; Douay-Rheims Bible, Titus 1:4 – 1:5: To Titus my beloved son, according to the common faith, grace and peace from God the Father, and from Christ Jesus our Saviour. For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and shouldest ordain priests in every city, as I also appointed thee.

76 PL 192:387C de Iudaeis qui sub nomine Christi iudaizare docebant; Douay-Rheims Bible, Titus 1:10: For there are also many disobedient, vain talkers, and seducers: especially they who are of the circumcision.

77 PL 192:388C Qui quid enim aduersus ueritatem opponitur, humana intentio est.

78 PL 192:391B bonis operibus et fide doctrinam dicii ornari Dominican; Douay-Rheims Bible, Titus 2:10: Not defrauding, but in all things shewing good fidelity, that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things.

79 Douay-Rheims Bible, Titus 2:14: Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and might cleanse to himself a people acceptable, a pursuer of good works.

80 PL 192:391D hoc, ut redimeret nos per sanguinem ab omni iniquitate.

81 PL 192:393C originum enumerationes, et contentiones, quas de lege faciunt; Douay-Rheims Bible, Titus 3:9: But avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law. For they are unprofitable and vain.
Philemon, it is interesting that most of the marginal rubrics in the manuscripts are associated with Ambrose. In Titus, the rubrics are much more divided between Augustine and Ambrose while only a few are associated with Jerome.

In Philemon there is only one reference to Jerome and it occurs at Philemon 1:1. BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52, Angers MS 69 and BnF MS Latin 14267 include a marginal rubric for this quote. The quote begins ‘Or as in Greek, (it) is supported, those loved, who it is certain is worthy to be loved’ and in the PL Jerome is associated with this phrase.

In terms of Lombard’s use of Ambrose in his commentary on Philemon there are several rubrics which stand out due to their presence in more than one manuscript. The first most commonly referenced quote occurs at Philemon 1:6 and it begins ‘It is a work of faith why you are enslaved to Christ and sanctity.’ BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52, Vat. Lat. 144, Angers MS 69, BnF MS Latin 14267 and Dole MS 27 all attach a marginal rubric to verse 1:6. In Angers MS 69 the rubric is attached to two different symbols which notify the reader where the borrowed material begins and finishes within the commentary and a look at the table reveals that the two earliest manuscripts include more than one rubric to this phrase which has already been seen within the analysis and is most likely to signify the beginning and end of the borrowed material. Six out of the eight manuscripts include a marginal rubric to verse ten at ‘A man is great and praiseworthy, (and is) not from a low man.’ Vat. Lat. 144 and BnF MS Latin 14267 are the only manuscripts not to include a marginal rubric denoting Ambrose at this point in the text. Going over the marginalia identifies which portions of the commentary were the most important to the readers. These quotes attributed to Ambrose are a bit of a mystery due to the lack of information provided in the manuscripts, but this fact alone is a pattern. Unlike the quotes attributed to Augustine which at times provided the title of the source material, none of the quotes associated with Ambrose provide a title. This may mean that having the title of the text was not as important as simply listing the author. The fact that these particular sections of the commentary are attached to marginal rubrics proves that they were obviously important to the scribes who wrote out the text in the manuscript as well as the people who commissioned the books to be made.

Creating a catalogue of the marginal rubrics offers an opportunity not only to notice the similarities, but also the differences, which are equally important. In particular, different attributions suggest the introduction of scribal errors or different opinions about which author to associate with a given source. These changes in how the commentary appears in a set of manuscripts may provide further information into the reader response of Lombard’s text during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The fact that the same portions of a text are associated with different authors reveals a lack of continuity in the Middle Ages, but this was most likely a pattern which had progressed from the time when the patristic

82 Douay-Rheims Bible, Philemon 1:1: Paul, a prisoner of Christ Jesus, and Timothy, a brother: to Philemon, our beloved and fellow labourer.
83 PL 192:395C Uel sicut in Graeco habetur, diligibili, qui scilicet diligi meretur; see Saint Jerome, St. Jerome’s Commentaries on Galatians, Titus and Philemon, trans. by Thomas P. Scheck, pp. 361-362.
84 PL 192:396A-396B id est operatio fidei qua servis Christo et sanctis; Douay-Rheims Bible, Philemon 1:6: That the communication of thy faith may be made evident in the acknowledgment of every good work, that is in you in Christ Jesus.
85 PL 192:397B Magnum est et laudabile, non de humili uiro.
authors finished the texts from which Lombard quotes. The time between when the Church Fathers and Peter Lombard wrote is substantial enough for mistakes to occur in the misattribution of authors to texts. The history of copying manuscripts is important to acknowledge as if one scribe made an error in associating Augustine instead of Ambrose for a certain passage of text, if that manuscript was used as an exemplar a domino effect would occur and after some time, the true source of a text could be lost. A look at the quotes which differ in their affiliation to various authors provides the opportunity to understand the specific audiences of each manuscript.

There are five examples of quotes which are attributed to different authors in this selection of manuscripts. The first quote is one which has already been looked at, in regard to the commentary at Titus 1:6, ‘If he had spoken without mistakes, no subordinate in the assembly may be able to be directly ordered’ and it is isolated as belonging to Augustine’s Ad bonifacio.86 BnF MS Latin 17246 associates this portion of text with Ambrose while the other five manuscripts to include this marginal rubric provide Augustine as the author. The second example is a quote beginning ‘However, God wished to be understood not according to the nature that he created, but according to the signs [which he created]’ which occurs at Titus 1:15.87 This quote is used by Lombard to emphasise what has been said in Paul’s letter to Titus at 1:15; ‘All things are clean to the clean: but to them that are defiled, and to unbelievers, nothing is clean: but both their mind and their conscience are defiled.’88 Manuscripts A, B and E place the rubric over hoc autem but manuscripts D, F and H place the rubric over the immaculatus which occurs just before at immaculatus mundus discreetit hoc autem. Manuscript F, Troyes MS 175, appears to place a reference to Ambrose beside this quote while the others all list Augustine as the source. BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52 and Angers MS 69 include the title of Augustine’s work; Contra Faustum. A search for the exact quote reveals that it occurs in chapter 4 of book 33 of Augustine’s Contra Faustum Manichaeum.89

The third quote relates to Titus 2:5 and begins ‘[lest perhaps they do not remember] the riches and nobility of God’s pronouncement that has been wafted in, through which they have been subjected to their husbands.’90 This quote is attributed to Ambrose in Dole MS 27, but in BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52, Vat. Lat. 144, Angers MS 69 and Mazarine MS 264 it is Jerome who is given as the source. Jerome is the correct source as this quote is found in his commentary to Titus 2:5.91 The fourth quote which is associated with two different authorities relates to Titus 3:5 and begins id est illuxit hominibus, salvos nos fecit, jam spe futurae salutis. Table one includes two different rubrics, one at id est illuxit... for Ambrose

86 PL 192:385D Si dixisset sine peccato, nullus in Ecclesia recte posset ordinari minister; Douay-Rheims Bible, Titus 1:6: If any be without crime, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot, or unruly.
87 PL 192:388D hoc autem non secundum naturas quas Deus creavit intelligi uoluit, sed secundum significationes.
90 PL 192:390B ut non diuittis vel nobilitate perfliatae, uiris suis imperare desiderent; English translation taken from Saint Jerome, St. Jerome’s Commentaries on Galatians, Titus and Philemon, trans. by Thomas P. Scheck, pp. 320; Douay-Rheims Bible, Titus 2:5: To be discreet, chaste, sober, having a care of the house, gentle, obedient to their husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed.
91 Saint Jerome, St. Jerome’s Commentaries on Galatians, Titus and Philemon, trans. by Thomas P. Scheck, pp. 320.
and another rubric at *iam spe future salutis* for Augustine. BnF MS Latin 17246 and Angers MS 69 include a rubric denoting Ambrose at *illuxit homines* and another for Augustine at *iam spe futurae*. Manuscripts Vat. Lat. 144, BnF MS Latin 14267, Troyes MS 175 and Mazarine MS 264 only include a rubric for Augustine at *iam spe* while an interesting phenomenon occurs in CCCC MS 52. The marginal rubric at *illuxit* reads *amb (et) aug* therefore associating the quote with both authors. This particular example of two different marginal rubrics referencing different authors illustrates the issue of opinion of sources. If a manuscript was intended for an Augustinian house, like the Abbey of St. Victor, then it is plausible that Augustine and any associated rubrics would be emphasised. The *PL* does not offer a reference but Augustine’s name does appear in brackets at the start of the next phrase beginning ‘because we have made no good [things].’

The last quote to offer a difference in the assignment of an author relates to Titus 3:15 and it begins ‘on account of the profit he, at once, expresses every…’ The quote is credited to Augustine in Troyes MS 175 and to Ambrose in Vat. Lat. 144 and Angers MS 69. A search for these keywords in the *PL* provides a source credited to the fifteenth verse of the third chapter in Ambrosiaster’s quote on Titus. This finding is important as Ambrosiaster is not to be confused with Ambrose, though the two were conflated in the Middle Ages. De Hamel explains that ‘a well-known commentary on the letters of Saint Paul, also attributed to Ambrose throughout the Middle Ages, was later shown by Erasmus to have been the work of an unidentifiable contemporary of Ambrose instead. Its author is now inelegantly referred to “Ambrosiaster”’. It is known that the sources used most often in the *Gloss* are Augustine and Ambrosiaster, with the text being particularly reliant ‘on Ambrosiaster, a fourth-century exegete whose commentary on the Pauline Epistles (the first full commentary in Latin) was thought, in the Middle Ages, to be genuine Ambrose.’ Smith explains that the amount that the sources are used depends on the epistle as some epistles were interpreted more often than others.

These examples of works being attributed to several authors may be errors, but they might also be examples where one author was favoured over another. Given that, for the most part, the manuscripts in this study use similar abbreviations of the patristic sources, a scribe could easily make a mistake in copying Ambrose and Augustine if the abbreviations are not clear. However, another explanation of these discrepancies in the marginal rubrics, as mentioned in the previous paragraph, may be evidence of one authority being given preference depending on the intended audience for a given manuscript. For example, if a copy of Lombard’s commentary was intended for the Abbey of St. Victor, it may be that if the exemplar used in copying out the text was not explicit in its presentation of a borrowed source, the scribe could have chosen Augustine as the source given the author’s importance to the abbey which would imply a highly educated copyist. The existence of these differences demonstrates that although the commentary was
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92 PL 192:393B *quia nulla bona feceramus.*
93 PL 192:394C *propter compendium simul omnes consalutatores significat*; Douay-Rheims Bible, Titus 3:15: All that are with me salute thee: salute them that love us in the faith. The grace of God be with you all. Amen.
95 Smith, *The Glossa Ordinaria*, p. 54.
standard by the thirteenth century, readers would have had different experiences with Lombard’s text depending on the amount of marginal rubrics.

One conclusion drawn from looking at the marginal rubrics within these manuscripts is that the earliest ones, dated within the twelfth century, undeniably share the greatest number of similarities. Going through the commentary in detail reveals how standard the text is in this selection of manuscripts, which is interesting as they span almost a century. As the rubrics included in the Parisian group of manuscripts do not change drastically, with the exception of the ascription of text to different sources, it may mean that this selection of manuscripts is simply evidence of a copying tradition. The examples of different authors being associated with the same text may also be simple mistakes, especially as the examples provided refer to Augustine and Ambrose. It would be easy for a scribe to mistake an abbreviation for Augustine, _aug_, for that of Ambrose, _amb_. The major change in the rubrics is the number of marginal rubrics in the manuscripts. Angers MS 69, for example, has the largest number of marginal rubrics out of the Parisian group of manuscripts which may be due to it being more of a study text. Quite the opposite is seen in Mazarine MS 266 which is without any marginal rubrics in Titus and Philemon. The text as it appears in the _PL_ further demonstrates this point regarding the standardisation of the text as there are not any significant differences. Placing the data in tables presents the marginal rubrics as they differ according when the manuscript was produced which quickly makes clear the similarities that the earliest manuscripts share; a larger number of marginal rubrics. An interesting phenomenon occurs especially in BnF MS Latin 17246 and Angers MS 69, further strengthening the hypothesis that these two manuscripts are related to the same exemplar. A look at the tables demonstrates the point; these two manuscripts contain a large number of rubrics which are often placed within the same passage of text. This appears simply to remind readers that a particular portion of the text continues to be a part of the first marginal rubric. In addition to adding these multiples of the same rubric these manuscripts also use the phrase _in eodem_ in order to note that the same text previously cited is being used again. These additional rubrics work in tandem with the red lines which run vertically in the margins in order to demonstrate the length of borrowed material.

The evidence contained within this analysis of the marginal rubrics further highlights the connection between BnF MS Latin 17246 and Angers MS 69 on top of the stylistic features they share. It is possible that they were produced in the same location and it may be that Angers MS 69 was copied from BnF MS Latin 17246 given that they share a similar style of presenting Lombard’s text. With an understanding of the various components of this group of manuscripts; their layout, decoration, and marginal rubrics, it is necessary to place these elements within the context of medieval scholarship in order to fully appreciate Lombard’s _Collectanea_ and its reception in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. It is clear that Lombard borrowed from three main authorities, Augustine, Ambrose and Jerome in his marginal rubrics. The next step in the textual analysis is to understand how much of this borrowed material Lombard drew from familiar sources or from the _Gloss._

### The Glossa Ordinaria

As Lesley Smith and Beryl Smalley have demonstrated, Peter Lombard’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles is entwined within the history of the _Glossa Ordinaria_ (subsequently _Gloss_) as he took most of his
The origins of the *Gloss* are tied to Anselm of Laon and his brother Ralph during the late eleventh and early twelfth century. Lombard’s *Collectanea* was initially written between 1139 and 1141 and was known as the *Magna glossatura*, and it quickly became more popular than the *Gloss* and Gilbert of Poitiers’s *Media glossatura*. The text was revised in the 1150s by Lombard and it was this second edition which became the successful study text. Smalley notes that every word from the interlinear and marginal *Gloss* is found in Lombard’s *Collectanea*, a claim Smith confirms though she does point out that Lombard did not copy everything verbatim. However, although all of the *Gloss* appears in Lombard’s commentary, a significant amount of his text does not occur in the *Gloss*.

Therefore, this section will deconstruct Lombard’s commentary to Titus and Philemon in order to better understand how he compiled his text. As Lombard was influenced so greatly by the *Gloss* text, looking at his commentary and comparing it to a copy of the *Gloss* will attempt to reveal how much he took from that text, how much of his commentary is original material, and why students might have wanted a copy of Lombard’s text rather than the *Gloss* in the thirteenth century. As there are portions of his text which do not appear in the *Gloss*, the following questions emerge; what is the additional text in Lombard’s commentary? What were his sources? And why did Lombard draw from this selection of authors? Attempting to answer these questions will provide insight into Lombard, his text and how his text remained popular alongside the *Gloss*, which continued to circulate in the thirteenth century. Establishing a timeline of the composition of Lombard’s text is crucial to understanding the complexities of this composite text because it is clear that Lombard borrowed from several sources including the *Gloss*.

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France (subsequently BnF) MS Latin 14409 is a twelfth-century copy of the *Gloss* on the Pauline Epistles and Matthew which was once in the library at St. Victor. Matthias Tischler dates this manuscript to c. 1135 to c. 1140 and believes it was made in Laon while Stirnemann believes it was made in Paris. This copy of the *Gloss* has the biblical text in one column in the centre of the page along with the marginal and interlinear glosses (Fig. 3.17). This layout reflects the popular style of placing the column containing the main biblical text in the centre of the page which
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100 Matthew Doyle, *Peter Lombard and His Students* (Toronto, 2016) p. 90.
therefore helped to organise the layout of the page. Although this layout was standard for copies of the Gloss it differs from the standard layout of Lombard’s commentary where the biblical text and commentary are contained within two equal-sized columns. In addition to having one column of biblical text running down the centre of the page, BnF MS Latin 14409 has interlinear and marginal glosses in a smaller hand. The Lombard manuscripts included in this study do not contain interlinear glosses and so the fact that BnF MS Latin 14409 includes them is a feature of the Gloss. A transcription of Titus and Philemon as they appear in BnF MS Latin 14409 is included in Appendix V. De Hamel explains that the reason the interlinear gloss did not appear in copies of the Collectanea was due to the introduction of the alternate line method which had been implemented to allow for the main biblical text to be written in a larger script. As interlinear glosses were awkward to copy it makes sense that the marginal and interlinear material from the Gloss was all incorporated into Lombard’s commentary.

Another copy of the Gloss, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France (subsequently BnF) MS Latin 14785, is used as a comparison in order to see what standard copies of the Gloss are like. This copy of the glossed Pauline Epistles is from Northern France and was made in the second quarter of the twelfth century. It is interesting that BnF MS Latin 14785 includes prologues to each letter. The one to Titus (Fig. 3.18) is the same as the prologue in the second volume of the two-volume copy of Lombard’s commentary, BnF MS Latin 14267 (Fig. 3.19). The only difference is that BnF MS Latin 14785 does not include scripta de laodicia which are the last three words in the prologue in BnF MS Latin 14267. The copy of the Gloss used in this comparison, BnF MS Latin 14409, does not include these prologues suggesting that the makers of the copies of Lombard’s commentary were part of a broader tradition of adapting glossed texts to suit particular patrons.

BnF MS Latin 14267 will be used in comparison to the twelfth-century copy of the Gloss on the Pauline Epistles, BnF MS Latin 14409, in order to better understand if Lombard took everything directly from the Gloss or whether he also consulted other sources. The fact that the Gloss has yet to be fully edited has deterred scholarship on it. As there is no appropriate edition of the text, a manuscript from the Abbey of St. Victor has been added to the study. As throughout the research project, Titus and Philemon will be looked at in detail to provide insight into both manuscripts. BnF MS Latin 14267 and BnF MS Latin 14409 have been chosen as a case study as they were both at the Abbey of St. Victor in Paris. Important questions to keep in mind are whether Lombard took everything from the Gloss and, given that the Gloss was still being used in the early thirteenth century, why were people looking at Peter Lombard?

Differentiating between the main biblical text and the glosses by having them in different sizes is something that BnF MS Latin 14409 has in common with BnF MS Latin 14267 along with the other Lombard manuscripts in this study and it was extremely standard to differentiate between the texts in this way. Smalley provided a simple explanation for the difference in placement for the marginal and interlinear glosses when she stated ‘the Gloss on the Bible exactly resembles that on the Corpus Iuris in this matter;

105 De Hamel, Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Booktrade, p. 18; Smith, The Glossa Ordinaria, pp. 94-100.
106 De Hamel, Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Booktrade, p. 25.
107 De Hamel, Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Booktrade, p. 25.
the shorter glosses were put between the lines for convenience and for no other reason." With this in mind it confirms that neither set of glosses holds a higher importance due to their placement on the page. However, it is important to note that ‘the relationship of the marginal and interlinear glosses to one another seems to differ from book to book.’ This will need to be remembered when comparing this particular copy of the Gloss to BnF MS Latin 14267 as it is only one example of a twelfth-century copy of the Gloss and differences between the layout or quotations included in this copy demonstrates that the content of the Gloss was never fully standardised. Furthermore, if Lombard had indeed copied directly from a copy of the Gloss he may have copied notes that were particular to one specific copy of the text and therefore not representative of the Gloss as a whole. Similarly, when copies of Lombard’s text were being copied in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, scribes may have referred to the Gloss given its popularity at the time, raising the possibility of cross-contamination.

There are five examples of portions of text which Lombard borrowed from the Gloss and which are associated with marginal rubrics. The first quote relates to Titus 2:5; ‘If they have unfaithful men by which on account of fear of God they must comply more eagerly.’ BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52, Angers MS 69, BnF MS Latin 14267 and Dole MS 27 all provide a corresponding marginal rubric attributed to Ambrose. This quote appears in the interlinear gloss on folio 145v of BnF MS Latin 14409, as seen in Appendix V.

The next quote by Augustine is related to Titus 2:7 and begins ‘In another manner a shepherd strikes down sheep, as much as in him lies.’ This quote is credited to Augustine in BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52, Angers MS 69, BnF MS Latin 14267 and Troyes MS 175 though none of the manuscripts provide the source of the work which this quote is from. This particular quote appears in the interlinear gloss on folio 145v of BnF MS Latin 14409 (see Appendix V). Augustine wrote about shepherds in a few works including sermons 14, 96 and 97 as well as in his homilies on the Gospel of John, and therefore it is possible that Anselm of Laon and the others who compiled the Gloss drew from these works for this particular quote written by Augustine.

The next quote refers to Titus 2:15 and is attributed to Ambrose; ‘now it is not cruel to be received here.’ The exact beginning of the borrowed phrase is not immediately obvious as the marginal rubric in Mazarine MS 264 indicates that it starts at asperae but in Angers MS 69 the start is at iam non asperae. The quote as it appears in the marginal gloss of BnF MS Latin 14409 on folio 146r reads Argue iam non asperae hoc accipitur cum pro salute fieri sciat.
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111 PL 192:390B si habent uiros infideles quibus propensius propter timorem Dei obsequi debent; Douay-Rheims Bible, Titus 2:5: To be discreet, chaste, sober, having a care of the house, gentle, obedient to their husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed.
112 PL 192:390C Aliter pastor occidit oves quantum in se est; Douay-Rheims Bible, Titus 2:7: In all things shew thyself an example of good works, in doctrine, in integrity, in gravity.
113 PL 192:392A iam non asperae hoc accipitur.
The next portion of Lombard’s commentary which appears in the *Gloss* relates to Titus 3:5. It begins ‘already with hope of future health.’ The underlined portion of text is a direct quote from scripture. The *PL* affixes Augustine’s name to this portion of commentary and an abbreviated form of his name is present in every manuscript except for Dole MS 27. Lombard took this portion of text from the *Gloss* (see Appendix V at Titus 3:3 to 3:9).

A look at the marginal rubrics associated with Augustine in Philemon reveals that there is one particular reference that is present in all eight manuscripts. This is the only occurrence throughout Titus and Philemon where every manuscript attaches a marginal rubric to one particular quote. This quote refers to Philemon 1:14 and begins ‘Nevertheless, God may wish to make.’ The *PL* notes that this passage belongs to Augustine’s text entitled *De perfectione justitiae hominis*. The title of the text is found in BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52, Vat. Lat. 144 and Angers MS 69 all of which are the four earliest manuscripts in this study. Including the title of Augustine’s work was evidently an important feature of the earlier manuscripts and another reason may have been dependent on the intended audiences of these manuscripts. An audience already well-versed in Augustine may not have needed a note informing them of this particular source. This quote is also included in the interlinear *Gloss*, on folio 148r of BnF MS Latin 14409. Nevertheless, as this quote within Lombard’s commentary is attached to a marginal rubric in all eight manuscripts it demonstrates that this source was evidently important to the copyists. These five examples of marginal rubrics which appear in the eight manuscripts included in this study illustrate how Lombard used the *Gloss*.

Although Lombard does take all of the *Gloss* text, this material only makes up roughly twenty-five percent of his commentary, meaning seventy-five percent of Lombard’s commentary to both Titus and Philemon is not present in the *Gloss*. For the most part, the non-*Gloss* borrowings are concentrated on particular verses and most of these portions are quite long. An example is found at the start of both Titus and Philemon where a substantial amount of the text, roughly two hundred words, is borrowed directly from another commentary on the Pauline Epistles. In the *PL* the commentary is listed as belonging to Hugh of St. Victor, but more detail will be provided later on in this chapter, as the true authorship of the text is not clear. However, regardless of the authorship, a comparison with the *PL* edition illustrates how Lombard used this particular text. He did not simply borrow a few key words but essentially copied a lengthy section verbatim and placed it at the start of his commentary to Titus and Philemon. This may have been his way of adding authority immediately to his commentary. While the non-*Gloss* sources appear to focus on certain points in that Lombard borrows more than a sentence at a time, the portions of the *Gloss* which he integrates into his text seem to be more scattered throughout his commentary. It seems plausible that Lombard added bits from the interlinear and marginal *Gloss* as he went and added the non-*Gloss* sources to emphasise and explain certain points, but he would have had to consult multiple works in the creation of his commentary. The marginal and interlinear glosses in the second copy of the *Gloss*, BnF MS Latin 14785, are only about one quarter of the contents of Lombard’s text which corresponds to the findings made in BnF
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114 Douay-Rheims Bible, Titus 3:5: Not by the works of justice, which we have done, but according to his mercy, he saved us, by the laver of regeneration, and renovation of the Holy Ghost.

115 PL 192:393A *iam spe futurae salutis*.

116 PL 192:397C *ut tamen uelit Deus factis*; Douay-Rheims Bible, Philemon 1:14: But without thy counsel I would do nothing: that thy good deed might not be as it were of necessity, but voluntary.
MS Latin 14409. Although there are a few words or phrases included in the interlinear or marginal glosses which do not occur in BnF MS Latin 14409, for the most part the material is the same.

It has already been established both in this study and in previous scholarship that when compiling his *Collectanea* Lombard borrowed from several sources including Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, John Chrysostom, Ambrosiaster, Alcuin, Haymo, Remigius, and Lanfranc as well as borrowing from contemporary authors, including Hugh of St. Victor and Walter of Mortagne, Peter Abelard, Gilbert of Poitiers, Robert Pullen and Gratian. Rosemann highlights the importance of acknowledging that these borrowed quotations were not all taken from original sources. Although Lombard borrowed from numerous sources, the system of marginal rubrics present in the manuscripts within this study only includes references to Augustine, Ambrose and Jerome. This is most likely due to it being these three sources from which Lombard borrowed the most or, another possibility is that he borrowed these sources together with the marginal notes directly from the copy of the *Gloss* he worked with. Also, Augustine, Ambrose and Jerome were considered authorities, unlike the twelfth-century authors. As the copies of Lombard’s commentary do not include references to the other authors from whom he borrowed it is most likely that it was left to readers to recognise quotes from other sources. This demonstrates that it clearly was not important for the manuscripts containing Lombard’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles to contain references to each source or author he elaborated on or quoted from directly.

It is important to acknowledge the correlation between the passages referenced in the marginal rubrics and the material taken from the *Gloss* to get a better idea of how Lombard used the *Gloss*. BnF MS Latin 17246 is the copy of the *Collectanea* used as the comparison as it includes the largest number of marginal rubrics. In this manuscript, twelve out of the fifty-four marginal rubrics associated with Titus appear in BnF MS Latin 14409, the copy of the *Gloss* used, while out of the twenty-three rubrics associated with Philemon, there are five which appear in the *Gloss*. Out of these seventeen rubrics there is only one example, in this particular copy of the *Gloss*, to include the name of the source. This particular phrase, beginning *Acutius intelligunt qui nec eum* is prefaced by *Augustinus. Unius uxoris uir*. This is visible in Appendix V on folio 144r of BnF MS Latin 14409. This example demonstrates that, depending on the copy of the *Gloss* that Lombard used while compiling the *Collectanea*, he may have been provided with the name of the authorities. Similarly, the lack of the names of authorities in the *Gloss* emphasises the fact that he had access to individual sources as well as to the *Gloss*.

Understanding the attitudes to earlier sources will help to shed light on Lombard’s approach to writing his *Collectanea* and other works. Colish provides a hierarchical list of sources which were considered as authorities by medieval scholastics; ‘classical authors, biblical authors, patristic authors including early popes and canonical rulings, and contemporary religious experience.’ Applying this
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118 Rosemann, *Peter Lombard*, p. 45.
explanation to the sources used by Lombard creates a clear idea of the reason why he drew from the patristic sources as they were considered to be the most authoritative when compared to his contemporaries.

In terms of the material that occurs in BnF MS Latin 14409 and Lombard’s text, it is interesting that he does not copy the passages verbatim with regard to the order of words or phrases. In her analysis of Lombard’s use of the Gloss, Smith also notes that he does not copy everything word for word (as Beryl Smalley had claimed). On folio 143v of BnF MS Latin 14409 the first marginal gloss occurs at the start of the letter to Titus. The gloss reads Tito reliquo creto episcopo ex simplicitate et humilitate nimis patienti (rae)sc(r)ipta et sua auctoritate utili, scribit de episcopali officio imp(erator)iose et potestatiue tractando a nicopoli. All of this text occurs in Lombard’s commentary though in a different order seen here: Tito (enim) reliquo creto episcopo ex humilitate (et) ex simplicitate nimis patienti. a nichopoli scribit de episcopali officio imp(erator)iose (et) potestatiue tractando (rae)sc(ript)ae et sua auctoritate utili. These small changes demonstrate a desire to add more to his text rather than simply copying from the Gloss. These changes also suggest that Lombard was not using BnF MS Latin 14409 as his source. It must be reiterated that there is no complete edition of the Gloss and therefore, we cannot be sure what Lombard had in front of him when he wrote his commentary, but it seems likely that he made changes.

A search for several quotes in the PL yields Walafrid Strabo as the author. We now know from various scholars that he was not the author of the Gloss but in fact, Anselm of Laon was responsible for the text. These associations to Strabo are reflective of the scholarship during the time that Jacques-Paul Migne published the PL. In the nineteenth century Migne followed a fifteenth-century suggestion by Johannes Trithemius that Walafrid Strabo was the author of the Gloss; ‘this suggestion led J. P. Migne […] to put the Glossa ordinaria under the name of Walafrid Strabo in his influential Patrologia Latina.’ At the time of Migne’s work, Strabo was still considered to be the main contributor of the Gloss. Another error in the PL is seen in Lombard’s commentary to Titus 1.6. The phrase beginning with Acutius intelligunt qui nec eum qui catechumenus vel is associated with Augustine’s De Bono Coniugali (On the Good of Marriage). When you search for this phrase in the PL the first result is Gratian’s Concordia Discordantium Canonum and the second result is Peter Lombard’s commentary. However, upon closer examination it is clear that the reference to Gratian is actually a correction and Augustine and the Gloss are the true sources of this quote. This example further demonstrates the unreliability of the PL but it also emphasises how
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121 Translations of Gloss and of Lombard’s commentary are my own: Titus having been abandoned in Crete as an overseer, out of simplicity and humility, too much suffering having been written before from his own useful authority, he writes from the episcopal powerful duty about to be dragged from Nicopolis.
122 For, Titus having been abandoned in Crete as an overseer, out of humility and simplicity with too much suffering. He writes from Nicopolis from the powerful episcopal duty and about to be dragged powerfully with his useful authority having been written.
126 Migne, Patrologia Latina, <http://pld.chadwyck.co.uk.elib.tcd.ie/all/search> [accessed December 2017].
intricate Lombard’s commentary is in that it is compiled of quotations from the Gloss in addition to other sources.

There are instances where the marginal gloss of BnF MS Latin 14409 is preceded by the name of the patristic source. It was less common for interlinear glosses to include the name of the author when compared to marginal glosses.\textsuperscript{127} Brady argued that the fact that Lombard was ‘responsible for the marginal patristic citations can be derived from the manner in which brief quotations are marked.’\textsuperscript{128} On folio 144r there is a large block of marginal gloss beginning with Aug denoting Augustine and the text beginning \textit{Unius uxor is uir. Acutius intelligunt} (Fig. 3.20).\textsuperscript{129} Lombard uses most of this text, and although he does not copy it word for word, he does add a significant amount to it. This particular quote by Augustine is indicated by a marginal rubric in BnF MS Latin 17246, CCCC MS 52, Vat. Lat. 144 and Angers MS 69 which are the four earliest copies of Lombard’s commentary to be included in this study. All four manuscripts provide the title of Augustine’s work in the rubric; \textit{In libro de bono conuigali} or \textit{On the Good of Marriage}. This quote is found in book 21 of Augustine’s work.\textsuperscript{130} BnF MS Latin 14409 does not include the title of Augustine’s work but as this is only one copy of the Gloss it does not mean Lombard referred to this particular manuscript. The fact that these early twelfth-century copies of Lombard’s commentary include marginal rubrics is most likely evidence of an earlier style which de Hamel confirms as to have stopped by the early thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{131} However, BnF MS Latin 14409 provides insight into what many copies of the text would look like.

Although Lombard takes all of the interlinear and marginal gloss from the Gloss, readers would have had a different experience with these two manuscripts; BnF MS Latin 14267 and BnF MS Latin 14409. In the copy of Lombard’s commentary the format of underlining the biblical text in red ink enables students to quickly differentiate between Lombard’s commentary and the main biblical text. Either manuscript would have provided students with roughly the same analysis of the Pauline Epistles (given that Lombard took all of the Gloss material). Smith plainly states ‘Almost all the Gloss text, interlinear as well as marginal, is included in Peter’s version, which is on the whole a clarification and enlargement of the Gloss, rather than a departure from it.’\textsuperscript{132} In Titus this is proven to be true. Only a few words within the marginal and interlinear gloss appear in Lombard’s commentary and most of it appears in the same order that it is found in the Gloss demonstrating how much he relied on it. However, although Lombard takes almost all of the text of the Gloss, there is a substantial amount of his text that is not found in the Gloss. Therefore, it is evident that he had access to additional sources and took material from them in order to complete his commentary.

Comparing the collated text in Appendices II and III with the portions from the Gloss highlights which patristic sources or quotes Lombard took directly from the Gloss. If the Gloss manuscripts which he used contained marginal rubrics denoting patristic authors it would have been easy for him to take the

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{127} Smith, \textit{The Glossa Ordinaria}, p. 60, pp. 102-103.
\item\textsuperscript{128} Ignatius Brady, "The Rubrics of Peter Lombard's Sentences" \textit{Pier Lombardo} 6 (1962): 5-25, p. 21.
\item\textsuperscript{129} "They understand a man of one wife. "
\item\textsuperscript{130} \textit{New Advent}, Augustine, <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/1309.htm> [accessed July 2018].
\item\textsuperscript{131} De Hamel, \textit{Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Booktrade}, p. 33
\item\textsuperscript{132} Smith, \textit{The Glossa Ordinaria}, p. 203.
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source from there. However, this analysis also demonstrates that Lombard took most of the patristic sources from books which he had access to. The table of marginal rubrics as they appear in Titus from the previous chapter is used here to locate the rubrics throughout the Gloss text and whether those portions of text were used by Lombard. Out of the forty-nine rubrics noted in Titus in the selected manuscripts, there are seventeen patristic sources contained within the marginal and interlinear glosses of the Gloss. These particular sources which Lombard included in his text may have been taken straight from the Gloss. However, there are several other patristic sources that were not included in Lombard’s commentary. Overall, there are more references to sources in Lombard’s text than in the Gloss.

Although this research focuses on the commentary on Titus and Philemon it is important to acknowledge the material that Lombard used while compiling his other texts, the commentary on the Psalms, which predates the Collectanea, and the Sentences, as his use of authorities in the commentary on the Psalms will have influenced his later writings. According to Colish, in the preface to Psalm 1, ‘he draws on most of the same sources used by the Glossa ordinaria and Gilbert, adding only Alcuin to the citations from Jerome, Cassiodorus, Augustine, Bede, and Remigius on which they call.’ This demonstrates Lombard’s knowledge of a range of texts and encourages the idea that he did not take all of the sources found in his rubrics from the Gloss. On folio 11r of Cambridge, Trinity College, MS B.5.4, Herbert of Bosham’s copy of Lombard’s commentary on the Psalms, there are marginal rubrics denoting Augustine, Cassiodorus and Jerome.

In terms of borrowings within the Sentences, Jacques-Guy Bougerol has completed a thorough analysis of the authorities as they appear in Lombard’s Sentences and he has noted, in decreasing order, how many quotations Lombard used from each source; Augustine (680), Ambrose (66), Hilary of Poitiers (63), Jerome (48), Gregory the Great (41), Ambrosiaster (34), Fulgentius (34), John of Damascus (26), Bede (21), John of Chrysostom (14), Origen (10), Isidore (6), Leo the Great (6), Gennadius (5). The list demonstrates firstly, how heavily Lombard relied on Augustine and secondly, the list illustrates his knowledge of a wide range of sources. These authors are reflective of the twelfth-century attitude towards these authors who were seen as ‘authoritative thinkers whose interpretations of the Bible and Christian tradition could be cited as orthodox statements or used to bolster principles of argument.’ In addition to these sources, Lombard also drew on his earlier Collectanea when writing his Sentences. An important name included in the list (compiled by Bougerol) is John Damascene. Lombard only encountered his works in 1154, with Colish noting that this encounter enables scholars to date the final edition of the Sentences to 1155-1157. This is important as it demonstrates the ability to trace certain texts which were used by Lombard, since we know he was teaching at Notre-Dame during this time we can place works by John Damascene at the cathedral school. As explained in the introduction, the Collectanea went through two

135 Smith, Masters of the Sacred Page, p. 13.
137 Colish, Peter Lombard, I, p. 25, p. 215.
revisions. In his first edition of the commentary, according to Rosemann, Lombard ‘frequently takes off’ from the text... portions of the commentary which were removed from the first edition were later used in his *Sentences*. Rosemann has demonstrated that in addition to borrowing from the *Gloss*, ‘Peter often availed himself of collections of excerpts; in the case of Augustine, in particular, he relied heavily upon a Carolingian compilation, Florus of Lyon’s *Exposito epistolorum beati Pauli*. Colish agrees with Rosemann when she states ‘Along with other scholastic theologians of the day, Peter sometimes made use of the *catenae* or chains of patristic citations assembled by earlier writers, such as the Augustinian *catena* put together by the Carolingian Florus of Lyon.’ A thorough search of Lombard’s commentary on Titus and Philemon does not reveal a particular quote from this compilation of Florus of Lyon’s text but Lombard may not have quoted directly from this text and it may simply have been a source of inspiration for him. This example of a compilation from which Lombard borrowed is further evidence of the different sorts of material he read and used.

Another author from whom Lombard borrowed is Gratian, and although Lombard did not use direct quotes from Gratian’s *Decretum* in his commentary to Titus and Philemon he did draw on this text for his *Sentences*. Gratian is most famous for writing the first glossed law book in c. 1142 called the *Concordia discordantium canonum*, or the *Decreta (Decretum)* Gratiani. Lombard borrowed from Gratian for his work on marriage and penance which occur in Book 4 of the *Sentences*.

With the knowledge of the range of materials Lombard was familiar with and that he used in his other works, it is possible to continue with the analysis of his *Collectanea*. At the start of Lombard’s commentary to Titus there is a portion of text beginning *Debet enim pontifex habere maternam pietatem et patris severitatem* and finishing with *Praemittit autem salutationem* which is also found in a text entitled *Quaestiones et Decisiones in Epistolas de Pauli*. Smalley explained that this anonymous text was ‘wrongly attributed to Hugh of St. Victor’ which is confirmed as it appears under his name in the *PL*, marking another mistake in the edition by Migne. The portion of text as it appears in Lombard’s text and as it appears in the *PL* is in Appendix VI. Excerpt *a* is taken from Lombard’s text and excerpt *b* from the anonymous *Quaestiones*. It is clear that the texts are nearly identical with only a few changes which are in bold in order to highlight the few words that Lombard changes in his version. The only other difference between the two texts is that Lombard omits one phrase that is included in the *Quaestiones* occurring after *ita tamen ut ad propriam conscientiam sui consideratione redeat, si forte in se habeat quae aliis*.

---

139 Rosemann, *Peter Lombard*, p. 45; see also G.R. Evans, *Fifty Key Medieval Thinkers* (London, 2002), p. 102. Gillian Evans also confirms Rosemann’s statement in regards to Lombard’s use of Florus of Lyon’s text when she explains how ‘it had already brought conveniently together most of Augustine’s significant remarks on the Pauline Epistles in a ready-made collection.’
140 Colish, *Peter Lombard*, I, p. 86.
141 Turcheck, ‘A Neglected Manuscript of Peter Lombard’s “Liber Sententiarum” and Parisian Illumination of the Late Twelfth Century’, (p. 49).
143 Colish, *Peter Lombard*, I, p. 82.
144 For a pontiff must have maternal devotion and the severity of a father. However, he sends a greeting.
146 Refer to items *a* and *b* in Appendix IV.
The phrase that he omits is *Forma itaque baculi hoc figurat, quod pontifex rebelles pungere, et mites ad se trahere debeat, unde quidam air.*\(^{148}\) Colish notes that this anonymous text is dated to the years 1155 to 1156 and that it was written by a Victorine.\(^{149}\) This date coincides with the second redaction of Lombard’s *Collectanea* but is too early for that of Herbert of Bosham, which means it will have been Lombard who added it to the *Collectanea*. More recent scholarship has tied this *Quaestiones* text to Robert Melun, an English theologian who taught in Paris around the same time as Lombard and who was one of his competitors; ‘the *Questiones* attributed to Hugh of St. Victor are now considered to belong to one of Robert [of Melun]’s followers.’\(^{150}\) Smalley also connects the anonymous text to Robert of Melun when she states ‘The quaestiones were excerpted from the commentary of Robert of Melun and circulated separately as Quaestiones de Epistolis Pauli; and another, anonymous, set of Quaestiones on the Apostle seems to have been collected on this model.’\(^{151}\)

This text may have been added to Lombard’s commentary if it was available at the Abbey of St. Victor in Paris in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries when several copies of Lombard’s commentary were being made. A search in Léopold Delisle’s catalogue of manuscripts from the Abbey of St. Victor reveals a thirteenth-century manuscript, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France MS Latin 14807, which includes several different texts the first of which is listed as ‘*Questiones super epistolas Pauli. — Questiones theologice.*’\(^{152}\) The first ninety-nine folia are dedicated to the *Quaestiones* on the Pauline Epistles, which were copied in the twelfth century, and the rest of the manuscript is from the thirteenth century and includes material by Isidore of Seville, Bonaventure and Augustine which was added in the fourteenth century. It is possible that the later folia were salvaged from another manuscript. It is interesting to note that all of the incipits and explicits to the questions on the Pauline Epistles have, at some point, been crossed out with a pen as if someone doubted the content of the text. The questions to Titus begin on folio 87r, the incipit is legible though a clearly intentional line through the script is visible; *Explicunt quaestiones super epistolam Paulam ad Timothaeum.* The text then begins with *Paulus servus dei*, the beginning of Lombard’s commentary to Titus, and the anonymous *Quaestiones* text begins at *Debet enim pontifex* and runs without any changes to *aliis annuntiat*. The last bit of text from Lombard’s commentary beginning with *Est igitur intentio Apostoli instruere Titum* and ending with *Postea monet eum de vitandis haereticis. Praemittit autem salutationem* is not included in BnF MS Latin 14807. However, it is clear that this passage which Lombard places at the start of his commentary was in circulation during the twelfth century and it was probably available at the Abbey of St. Victor.

Another manuscript which has ties to St. Victor and appears to be a copy of the anonymous *Quaestiones* is Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France MS Latin 14589: a copy of a compilation of various

\(^{147}\) So nevertheless, just as he might return himself to a particular knowledge with consideration.
\(^{148}\) Therefore how does a high-priest shape the form of a walking stick to puncture the rebellious and mild (men), he says that he ought to draw to himself a certain from a certain thing/someone.
sermons and texts, including notes on the Pauline Epistles. The manuscript was made c. 1175 – c. 1200 and it was in the library at the Abbey of St. Victor.153 On the reverse side of the inside cover page there is a later contents list in an eighteenth-century hand (Fig. 3.21). Sermons by Augustine, Hugh of St. Victor and notes on the Pauline Epistles are the bulk of the contents. The manuscript opens on folio 1r with a rubric prefacing the text which describes the contents as sermons from various authors. The rubric reads Sermo de divina laudis laudatoribus. At the bottom of folio 1r there is an ex-libris from the Abbey of St. Victor; Iste liber est sancti uictoris parisiensis quicumq(u)e eum furatus fuerit uel celauerit uel titulum istum deleuerit anathema sit amen.154 This phrase is included in copies of manuscripts which were either made or resided in the library at the Abbey of St. Victor as demonstrated in the chapter on the manuscripts and their provenance. On folio 1v there is further evidence of this manuscript’s ties to St. Victor in the form of the coat of arms and a note referring to St. Victor and the Augustinians. Léopold Delisle notes that the first 103 folia include various sermons from different people from St. Victor and that the text beginning at folio 104r belongs to Hugh of St. Victor.155 There is a rubric prefacing the text on folio 104r, it reads cap(itu)la de expositione(s)upe(r) ecclesiasten s(ancti) m(agi)stri h(uognis). This note refers to Hugh of St. Victor which would make sense given its ties to the Abbey of St. Victor. This note may be how this text came to be attributed to him. These notes finish on folio 111v and a commentary on the Pauline Epistles begins on folio 112r. However, it is not clear who wrote the commentary on the Pauline Epistles as the rubricated heading which prefaces the text on folio 112r reads Incipiunt q(ue)estiones super ep(isto)las pauli (et) solutiones. Titus begins on folio 181v although the start of the letter is not obvious.

In BnF MS Latin 14589 the previous Pauline Epistles are all clearly marked with an initial and an introductory phrase in a lighter ink, presumably in red though it is not possible to tell as the scanned images provided by the Bibliothèque nationale de France are in black and white. However, Titus appears to be the only letter which does not follow this pattern though this may have simply been a scribal error. In the second column on folio 181v, about three-quarters down from the top of the column, there is an initial ‘P’ which marks the start to the start of the commentary to Titus; Paul(us) seruus d(e)i. The sentence which precedes it reads Incipi(it) de illa que ad titus(m) marking the start of Titus (Fig. 3.22). Starting with Debet (enim) in the anonymous text is where Lombard borrowed from for his commentary to Titus. BnF MS Latin 14589 is evidence that Lombard included this section of text from the anonymous text. This portion of text is present in three of the earliest copies of Lombard’s text which are included in this study: CCCC MS 52, BnF MS Latin 17246 and Vat. Lat. 144. The fact that the text appears in the earliest copies demonstrates that Lombard included it himself and it was not Herbert of Bosham who added this portion of text when he revised Lombard’s commentary. BnF MSS Latin 14807 and 14589 both appear to include the anonymous commentary on the Pauline Epistles which Lombard clearly uses in his Collectanea.

154 See Tischler, ‘Die Auftraggeber, Vorbesitzer un schenker der Bibeln von Saint-Victor’, (p. 45) for the similar anathema as it appears in Mazarine MS 266; ‘This book is from Saint Victor in Paris. Whichever [book], having been stolen, may have been or may have been hidden. The anathema may be that inscription that he may have erased.’
Another portion of text clearly adapted from this anonymous commentary on the Pauline Epistles occurs at Titus 1.13. Excerpt c is from Lombard’s text and excerpt d is taken from the anonymous commentary on the Pauline Epistles. It is clear that Lombard has changed the order of words from the anonymous text. It is interesting to note that the main phrase borrowed from the anonymous text is also included in the Gloss. The marginal gloss from the Gloss reads *Licet divinae auctoritati un(de) uolu(er)it quod u(er)um inuen(er)it testimonium sumere sicut (et) paulus athenis s(ed) no(n) i(de)o o(mn)ia que ibi sunt confirmat*, as illustrated on folio 144v of BnF MS Latin 14409 (Fig. 3.23). It is not immediately clear whether the anonymous author borrowed this section of text from the Gloss and Lombard then copied it or if Lombard copied directly from the Gloss. It is most likely that Lombard borrowed this particular passage directly from the Gloss as his commentary retains a more similar word-order than if he had borrowed directly from the anonymous text. However, the fact that both Lombard and the anonymous author include a portion of text from the Gloss demonstrates the impact that the Gloss had at the Abbey of St. Victor. This portion of text is included in BnF MS Latin 14589, the copy of the anonymous author’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles discussed earlier (Fig. 3.24).

Lombard uses the anonymous *Quaestiones* throughout his commentary on the Pauline Epistles. The material is integrated across the whole text, most often at the very beginning of each letter, as seen in his commentary on Titus and Philemon. I and II Thessalonians, I and II Timothy and Hebrews have the most amount of uninterrupted borrowed text from the anonymous *Quaestiones*. The amount Lombard integrates into the beginning of the commentary to these letters is similar to the amount he uses in Titus and Philemon. Romans, I and II Corinthians do not include any uninterrupted passages but more so only a few words. Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians include a large amount of the anonymous text though more so in longer passages rather than just a few words. Lombard’s commentary to Ephesians clearly shows a connection to the anonymous text in that a large amount of the first section of text associated with verses one to four is found in the anonymous text, like Titus and Philemon. It is clear that Lombard integrated this anonymous text across his whole text and it is interesting that in all of the letters it is at the very beginning of each text suggesting that he considered it extremely important.

Lombard’s commentary to Philemon follows a similar pattern seen in Titus in that the first block of uninterrupted text is attributed to the anonymous *Quaestiones et Decisiones in Epistolas de Pauli*. Excerpt e appears to be original to Peter Lombard and excerpt f from the anonymous text. It appears that Lombard borrowed this portion of text and did not change much from it; the few words in bold in the anonymous passage demonstrate the lack of changes Lombard made. In BnF MS Latin 14409, the copy of the Gloss looked at earlier on in the chapter, a portion of this text appears in the left margin at the start of Philemon on folio 147v (Fig. 3.25). It reads *Philemoni familiares litteras mittit pro Onesimo servo qui cum damno eius fugaret sed ab apostolo audito evangeli; baptizatus est, cui et veniam deprecatur apostolus.*

---

156 Both excerpts are copied from the *Patrologia Latina.*
157 Refer to items e and f in Appendix VI.
scribens a Roma de carcere. Similar to the comparison made earlier using Titus as an example, it is clear that Lombard borrowed from this text as he does not change much from it.

In addition to borrowing large portions of text from the anonymous Quaestiones et Decisiones in Epistolae de Pauli, ‘Peter was provided other source material by the Summa sententiarum (attributed to Hugh of St. Victor), by Hugh’s De sacramentis, and above all by Abelard’s Sic et non. Lombard first used the sic et non method in his commentaries on the Psalms and the Pauline Epistles before its use became well-known in his Sentences. There is a twelfth-century copy of Hugh of St. Victor’s Summa sententiarum which was, at some point, in the library at the Abbey of St. Victor. Mews and Monagle note that the Summa sententiarum is a compilation of Hugh of St. Victor’s works as well as other patristic sources, but that the true author is actually Otto of Lucca. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France MS Latin 14297 contains works by Augustine and on folio 95r the start to the Summa sententiarum begins. On folio 1r there is the ex-libris from the abbey of St. Victor and on folio 1v the crest. At the start of the Summa sententiarum on folio 95r there is another ex-libris. Given its date of production it is possible that this manuscript was at the abbey when copies of Lombard’s text were being copied.

In addition to works written by Hugh of St. Victor, Lombard would have had access to other authors such as Haimo of Auxerre. Haimo of Auxerre lived in the ninth century with his commentaries written c. 840 – c. 860. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France MS Latin 14440 is a copy of the second part of Haimo of Auxerre’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles and it also includes Bede’s commentary on Acts. There is no reference to Haimo in the manuscripts containing Lombard’s commentary included in this study. BnF MS Latin 14440 was made in the twelfth century and has ties to the Abbey of St. Victor as seen by the note on the inside of the front cover (Fig. 3.26) as well as the crest and ex-libris on folio 1r (Fig. 3.27). Folio 1r marks the start of Haimo’s commentary on the first letter to the Thessalonians and there is a historiated initial depicting Paul writing. The text is contained within two equal-sized columns and the script appears to be in a twelfth-century hand. Unlike copies of Lombard’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles, this copy of Haimo’s commentary does not underline the main biblical text in red ink. However, s-shaped symbols (medieval quotation marks) are placed in the margins indicating to the reader that a particular line belongs to the main biblical text (Fig. 3.28). Figure 3.28 illustrates the double s-shaped symbol beside et timotheus frater on folio 84r of BnF MS Latin 14440 which is taken directly from Philemon 1:1. BnF MS Latin 14440 places the commentary to Titus after that of Philemon. The prologue to Philemon begins on folio 83v with the main text beginning on folio 84r, marked by a penwork initial. There are clear instances where Lombard appears to borrow from Haimo’s commentary in that much of the vocabulary is the same, but it is only ever a few words and not an entire passage as seen in how Lombard borrowed from Hugh of St. Victor. The clearest example relates to Philemon 1:5 audiens caritatem tuam, et
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158 He sends private letters to Philemon for the slave Onesimus who had fled with harm; but from the apostle, having heard the good news that he was baptised, and the apostle, writing from Rome from prison, is prayed to for forgiveness.
159 Turcheck, ‘A Neglected Manuscript of Peter Lombard’s “Liber Sententiarum” and Parisian Illumination of the Late Twelfth Century’, (p. 49).
162 Smalley, The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages, p.39.
In the illustrations, the related passages from BnF MS Latin 14267 and BnF MS Latin 14440 are provided with Lombard’s commentary occurring first, followed by Haimo’s (Figs. 3.29 and 3.30). The phrase which occurs in both texts is in bold text in order to demonstrate the likelihood that Lombard borrowed this phrase or idea from Haimo. Although the two phrases are not identical, the content is very much the same and similar vocabulary is used. Lombard’s phrase reads *quasi dicat fidem habes et caritatem in christo et in sanctis* and translates to ‘As if he were saying you have faith and charity in Christ and in the saints.’ Haimo’s phrase reads *enim fidem et caritatem habet in deum et in omnes sanctos* and translates to ‘For he has faith and charity in God and in all the saints.’ These translations demonstrate the possibility that Lombard may have paraphrased this particular idea from Haimo. In addition to the similar content of the phrases, both phrases occur at the same point in each text, between Philemon 1:5 and 1:6 encouraging the idea that Lombard borrowed this passage from Haimo.

Haimo’s commentary on Titus as it appears in BnF MS Latin 14440 begins with a prologue on folio 87r and the main text on folio 87v. The commentary on Titus is marked with a large penwork initial in red and green ink. This commentary is noticeably shorter than that on Philemon which is interesting given that Paul’s letter to Titus is much longer than his letter to Philemon and Lombard’s commentary to Titus is much longer as well. Haimo evidently had more input on Philemon than Titus. There do not appear to be similarities between Haimo’s commentary and that of Lombard. Although Rosemann lists the authors from whom Lombard apparently borrows, the manuscripts in this particular study only list the main three authorities occurring in the form of marginal rubrics. Therefore, how would students know that Lombard borrowed from the *Gloss* let alone Haimo, Rabanus, Hugh of St. Victor and others? Lombard’s text would not have taught students about these authors nor do they in any way encourage students to read these sources in order to learn further material. What do these authors add and why is it important to acknowledge the breadth of material from which Lombard borrows? Although the *PL* is not always accurate in that there have been more recent discoveries in the research related to Lombard and his commentary on the Pauline Epistles, by searching the *PL* for quotes in Lombard’s commentary it is possible to acknowledge which sections of the text are unaccounted for. Although it is not possible to confirm every source from which Lombard borrowed, this detailed analysis of the additional commentary in the text reveals how knowledgeable Lombard was.

This chapter has illustrated how complex Lombard’s commentary is. The main biblical text, the commentary, and marginal rubrics along with any other marginalia are laid out on the page to offer the reader a comprehensive study tool for the Pauline Epistles. The tables included in Appendix IV demonstrate the differences in the presentation of marginal rubrics in the eight manuscripts. The differences in the marginalia provide insight into how readers would have read Lombard’s commentary as the copies of his text with fewer marginal rubrics may have been intended for readers who were already well educated on the Pauline Epistles as well as works by the Church Fathers. This analysis of the marginal rubrics associated with Titus and Philemon demonstrates that Lombard utilised individual works by the Church Fathers as

---

163 Douay-Rheims Bible, Philemon 1:5: Hearing of thy charity and faith, which thou hast in the Lord Jesus, and towards all the saints.
164 Both transcriptions are taken from Migne’s *Patrologia Latina*. 
well as the *Glossa Ordinaria* when composing his commentary. This chapter has unravelled Lombard’s commentary to Titus and Philemon in order to understand its composition. The relationship between the *Collectanea* and the *Glossa Ordinaria* is emphasised through the comparison of BnF MS Latin 14409, a twelfth-century copy of the *Gloss* on the Pauline Epistles. It is clear that a significant amount of the *Gloss* is included in Lombard’s text, but it has also been established that a substantial amount of Lombard’s commentary is made up of other sources. For a reader of the manuscripts in the Parisian group only a tiny portion of the source texts were identified. An uninformed reader could reasonably assume that Lombard was working with a small number of early authors though well-educated readers would have found most of the text familiar. The main biblical text, commentary, marginal rubrics and biblical cross-references work alongside the decoration in the manuscripts in order to provide readers with different forms of engagement with Lombard’s commentary.
Chapter Four: Iconographic Choices

The previous chapters have demonstrated that although Lombard’s commentary is very similar in the six Parisian manuscripts, as well as in the earlier copies brought in to the study in chapter three, the amount of marginal annotation and the type of decoration varies significantly in each copy. These differences prove that Lombard’s text was not read or interpreted in the same way depending on the manuscript used. The manuscripts which include historiated initials provide the reader with another medium to engage with. Manuscripts with any sort of decoration, whether historiated initials or penwork designs, provide insight into the intended use of each copy of Lombard’s commentary. Decoration by skilled artists was not necessary in order for readers to read Lombard’s text, therefore, why do some manuscripts include a large amount of detailed decoration? This chapter will discuss the broad themes of artwork used in the six main manuscripts while other manuscripts from this period will be used as comparison in order to attempt to shed further light on reading practices in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The manuscripts with historiated initials provide readers with a different reading of Lombard’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles when compared to those copies with less substantial decoration as there is more material for the reader to consider alongside the text.

Of the six manuscripts in the Parisian group, the two volumes BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 stand out for their decoration. This two-volume manuscript is unique among the other volumes due to the number of large historiated initials. This manuscript includes large painted initials prefacing the commentary as well as the main biblical text. Most of these initials include a significant amount of gilding illustrating that no expense was spared in the making of this book. This further emphasises the point made in chapter two about this copy of Lombard’s text clearly being a way to present Lombard’s text in an impressive volume. As mentioned in chapter two, this two-volume manuscript is the work of three artists; the main artist is responsible for the decorated initials in the first volume as well as those initials on folia 3r, 3v and 86r in volume two, the second artist is responsible for most of the decoration in volume two and the third artist completed the initials to II Timothy, Philemon and Hebrews. Although there are decorated initials at the start to Lombard’s commentary, those marking the start to each biblical text are historiated and will be of particular interest in this discussion of iconography as they are unique when compared to the other five Parisian manuscripts. These examples of artwork form part of the unique reading experience provided by this copy of Lombard’s commentary.

Beginning with BnF MS Latin 14266, there are five historiated initials and the first one is on folio 4r at the start of Lombard’s prologue to Romans (Fig. 4.1). The initial shows two male figures who are sitting beside one another. The male figure on the right is presumed to be Paul as he is most often depicted as being ‘small in stature, misshapen and bald, with a long beard and a domed forehead bald with a long beard.’ He is also given a halo. The man on the left is identified as Peter Lombard as he holds a scroll which reads petrus lumbardus. This immediately communicates to the reader that the text included in the manuscript was written by Peter Lombard as well as Paul. Turcheck identifies this initial as the “author as scribe” formula which was popular throughout the Middle Ages and she also observes that this particular

\[\text{Cahn, Romanesque Manuscripts, II, p. 112.}\]
style of artwork is found in a large number of Lombard’s *Sentences* as well as in manuscripts containing his commentaries.\(^3\) The two initials looked at in Admont MS 52 in chapter three also present Paul in this way, the first initial depicts Paul holding a book (Fig. 3.5) while the second initial shows Paul sitting down, holding a pen and knife as he writes on a long scroll (Fig. 3.6). This further demonstrates the popularity of this trend in manuscripts produced in the late twelfth century.

Laura Cleaver provides insight into the production of manuscripts containing Lombard’s work in the period after he completed his *Sentences* in 1158 to after the Fourth Lateran council in 1215.\(^4\) Her article compares copies of Lombard’s works, mostly his *Sentences*, which include images of him as author, teacher, and bishop, all of which worked towards communicating his authority as a theologian during a time when his *Sentences* was being criticised for being heretical.\(^5\) The initial at the start of Lombard’s prologue to Romans in BnF MS Latin 14266 which shows Paul and Peter Lombard (Fig. 4.1) belongs to this category of images as it depicts Peter, who wears a bishop’s mitre, and is being inspired by the ‘presence of the Holy spirit in the form of a dove.’\(^6\) In her discussion of other manuscripts containing author portraits of Peter, Cleaver identifies other examples where Peter is illustrated as a master and teacher and others, such as that in BnF MS Latin 14266 (Fig. 4.1), where Peter’s role as an ‘inheritor of Paul’s work’ is emphasised by presenting him ‘as a channel through which God’s ideas may be known.’\(^7\) As the other manuscripts within the Parisian group do not include decoration depicting Peter Lombard, this copy of his commentary was clearly meant to encourage readers to view him as an author inspired by God as he commented on Paul’s words.

Halfway down the stem of the ‘P’ initial in BnF MS Latin 14266 there is a small framed image of robed men looking up towards Paul and Peter Lombard who holds the scroll reading *petrus lumbardus* (Fig. 4.1). The men below appear to have their arms outstretched. It is obvious that the larger, much more ornate image of the two men is more important than the smaller one which also reflects the importance of Paul the Apostle and Peter Lombard. The importance which the two men have within the context of the manuscript is added to with the clearly visible *petrus lumbardus* written on the scroll. It is also interesting to note that at the very bottom of the stem of the initial ‘P’ there is foliage as well as a monkey (Fig. 4.2). It may be that this initial serves as a hierarchical structure meant to illustrate the importance of men like Paul and Peter Lombard versus regular people and finally animals. This is reiterated by de Hamel who explains the power that the church held during the middle ages: ‘It all presupposed that God created the universe according to an absolute pattern of hierarchy […] In artistic terms, an artist would often express gradations of rank by size and by splendour of colour.’\(^8\) He goes on to illustrate this idea of rank; ‘In a New Testament scene, for

\(^3\) Turcheck, ‘A Neglected Manuscript of Peter Lombard’s “Liber Sententiarum” and Parisian Illumination of the Late Twelfth Century’, (p. 54).
\(^6\) Cleaver, ‘The Many Faces of Peter Lombard’, pp. 43-44.
\(^7\) Cleaver, ‘The Many Faces of Peter Lombard’, p. 44.
example, Christ would be shown larger than an apostle, who would be bigger than a mere bystander in the picture…

The next historiated initial in BnF MS Latin 14266 is found at the start of Romans on folio 6r (Fig. 4.3). This initial is very much like the ornate initial at the beginning of the prologue on folio 4r. Paul sits on a throne like stool with a book in one hand and a long quill in the other. There is a large amount of gilding used as well as bright colours and the bottom half of the stem of the initial has a small circle framed image of a man who is swinging a weapon at two animals. The green animal is attacking the other one which has horns, like a sheep. Again, therefore, the artist seems to be playing with an idea of a hierarchy, with Paul lifted above the earthly struggles in the lower part of the initial. This provides a comment on the value of theological study, allowing man to move from earthly concerns to approach God. However, the image of the man rescuing the sheep also finds parallels in contemporary images of David saving sheep from lions or bears, for example in the Souvigny Bible, based on I Samuel 17, especially I Samuel 17:34-37 (Fig. 4.4). This was interpreted as a metaphor for the rescue of Israel, and resonates with the early chapters of Romans, in which Paul discusses the value of being Jewish. In this context, the hierarchy may suggest an emphasis on the New Testament over the Old. By prompting the reader to think in these terms, the imagery may also have been intended to prepare the reader to engage with the text.

The next decorated initial in BnF MS Latin 14266 is found at the opening to the argument prefacing I Corinthians on folio 94r (Fig. 4.5). Here Paul stands with a book in one arm and a group of men look up at him. Within the group there are three men who have beards, which may be a way of depicting a group of both men and younger boys. Paul is probably preaching, and the image resonates with the description of the letter as being addressed to the church in Corinth. The next initial is at the start of Peter Lombard’s commentary to I Corinthians on folio 94v (Fig. 4.6). The decoration is an example of the inhabited scroll work discussed in chapter two. The term ‘inhabited scroll’ is used by Robert Branner. A closer look at the initial reveals quite a dramatic scene, there are two male figures each holding swords along with two winged beasts, but it is unclear whether the men are fighting one another or solely the beasts. The men’s robes appear to be part of the foliage, the folds of the fabric mimicking the folds of the leaves. The male figure in the upper portion of the initial has red tights and green robes while the figure in the bottom portion of the initial is wearing the opposite, green tights and red robes. The imagery might be read in conjunction with the first chapter of I Corinthians in which Paul calls for the church to be united, but it is less explicitly related to the biblical text than the previous initial.
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11 Douay-Rheims Bible, I Samuel 17:34-37: And David said to Saul: Thy servant kept his father's sheep, and there came a lion, or a bear, and took a ram out of the midst of the flock: And I pursued after them, and struck them, and delivered it out of their mouth: and they rose up against me, and I caught them by the throat, and I strangled and killed them. For I thy servant have killed both a lion and a bear: and this uncircumcised Philistine shall be also as one of them. I will go now, and take away the reproach of the people: for who is this uncircumcised Philistine, who hath dared to curse the army of the living God? And David said: The Lord who delivered me out of the paw of the lion, and out of the paw of the bear, he will deliver me out of the hand of this Philistine. And Saul said to David: Go, and the Lord be with thee.
The historiated initial at the start of the main biblical text of I Corinthians is on folio 95r (Fig. 4.7). There are two figures: the man on the left sits and writes in a book while the figure above him is an angel, signifying the inspiration Paul received from God. The angel seems to be presenting Paul with a book to copy, which is extremely interesting within the context of these manuscripts being copies of Lombard’s text. In this context, the image provides a comparison between Paul who is inspired by the word of God, to scribes who make copies of Lombard’s work. There is also a small bird visible on Paul’s shoulder, speaking into his ear. This must represent the Holy Spirit, which was often shown inspiring authors, notably in images of Gregory the Great.14 Halfway down the stem of the initial there is a medallion framing a group of robed people looking up towards the two figures in the main frame of the initial and their arms are outstretched. Once again Paul and the word of the scripture appear to be placed at a level higher than men. This scene is very similar to figure 4.1 which depicts the influence of God and his word. In this case, figure 4.7 illustrates Paul as the author receiving inspiration while figure 4.1 places Peter in the same position, again suggesting a similarity between the men in their roles as divinely inspired authors.

The next historiated initial is at the start of both Paul’s text as well as Lombard’s commentary to II Corinthians on folio 158v (Fig. 4.8). A man presumed to be Paul sits at the right of the image and he is writing on a scroll held by a young man. The scroll reads Paulus et Timotheus Paulus apostolus Ihesu per voluntatem. These words are taken from the beginning of the main biblical text at II Corinthians.15 This image succeeds in directly connecting Paul to his text and it also associates him with the act of writing. Timothy’s presence is explained by the first verse of the biblical text in which Timothy is explicitly referred to. Another detail of this initial is found halfway down the stem where a small medallion shows a group of young men with a scroll of parchment between them which reads et corinthii. The scroll provides a connection between the two scenes, and represents the letter written by Paul above and delivered to the Corinthians below. This provides an important reminder of the potential for text to transmit ideas even in the absence of the author.

BnF MS Latin 14266 finishes on folio 189v with the beginning of the argument to Galatians. This first volume of the manuscript is clearly communicating the importance of Paul and his works with the readers of Lombard’s commentary. When compared to the other manuscripts in the Parisian group, these examples of historiated initials in their depictions of Paul are unique as no other manuscripts include such large lavish initials. Overall, the six manuscripts in the Parisian group include some degree of gilding as part of their decorated initials. The gilding is usually found in the frame of each initial though, in the case of Troyes 175 which only has two painted initials, there is very little gilding. However, BnF MS Latin 14266 demonstrates that no expense was spared in the making of this copy of Lombard’s text as it uses a significant amount of gilding as well as green, red and blue pigments. Given the detail in its historiated initials, BnF MS Latin 14266 is an example of the Collectanea which communicates through its decoration as much as its textual content.

15 Douay-Rheims Bible, II Corinthians 1:1: Paulus, Apostolus Jesu Christi per voluntatem Dei, et Timotheus frater / Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, and Timothy our brother.
BnF MS Latin 14267 continues with the argument to Galatians on folio 3r with inhabited scrollwork and beasts. The historiated initial on folio 3v is a scene of a bearded man, presumed to be Paul, handing a book to another man (Fig. 4.9). The recipient of the book could be thought of as Peter Lombard as he in a way receives Paul’s writings in order to comment on them, but it could also be thought of as a Galatian, to whom the book is written or even simply a messenger who will deliver the book. A messenger is most likely as the figure is not wearing shoes which differs from the earlier representation of Peter (Fig. 4.1).

The decorated initial for Ephesians as well as that for the commentary is on folio 28v. It is an interesting departure from the style seen in the other decorated initials and appears to be the work of the second main artist Cahn spoke of (Fig. 4.10). The previous artwork found at the beginning of each letter in this manuscript as well as in BnF MS Latin 14266 show figures in some sort of interaction, for example communicating with books or scrolls. The artwork in this initial is quite different as it is mostly foliage and animal imagery and the colours used are quite dark. The next decorated initial is very similar to that of Ephesians which increases the possibility that these initials are the beginning of a new style by a separate artist. This next initial is at the start of Philippians on folio 46v (Fig. 4.11). The decorated initial at the start of Colossians is similar to the last two initials, however it is quite diverse in its imagery. Found on folio 59v, the intricate initial has small animals throughout, but the main focus is on the figures in the centre; a half-man wrestling with a brown bear (Fig. 4.12). Although not immediately clear, this scene may be meant to demonstrate the connection between man and animal and the idea of a hierarchy between the two as discussed earlier. At the bottom of the stem of the initial there is a dark creature which has horns like the figure in the centre of the bow of the initial (Fig. 4.13). The figure sticks its tongue out and appears to be mocking the penwork drawing of an animal in the margin. Both figures in the top part of the initial as well as in the stem are a combination of man and animal. This similar style of artwork is also found in the initials of I Thessalonians and II Thessalonians. A change then occurs with the initial of I Timothy on folio 86r which does not have any animal imagery but rather very intricate foliage in soft hues of the same colours used throughout the two-volume manuscript (Fig. 4.14).

A common theme found in the last few decorated initials is images of beasts. This then changes on folio 86r with I Timothy when the theme of beasts disappears. However, this only lasts until folio 108r when the decoration with Titus returns to include animals. This analysis of the artwork included in BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 demonstrates a clear shift in the style of artwork which reflects the fact that three separate artists worked on this copy of Lombard’s text, as explained in chapter one. Ephesians marks the beginning of a change from the historiated initial to one with foliage and beasts. There are also noticeable changes to how much gilding is used in each initial. These volumes were evidently made to impress readers. The text is written clearly and is well-spaced and there is plenty of decoration. This communicates the idea that this copy of Lombard’s text was made by skilled artists and was meant for someone who appreciated Lombard and his commentary. The images included in these two volumes tell us
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16 Cahn, Romanesque Manuscripts, II, p. 112.
17 Cahn, Romanesque Manuscripts, II, p. 112.
that the maker of this manuscript wanted to showcase Lombard’s commentary while also emphasising the importance of Paul’s text.

In terms of the other twelfth-century manuscript included in the Parisian group, Angers MS 69 does not include historiated initials, but it does place a painted initial at the start of the main biblical text as well as penwork initials at the start of Lombard’s commentary. The fact that two twelfth-century copies of Lombard’s text, BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 and Angers MS 69, differ in the level of decoration as well as the style of decoration highlights two important points. The change of imagery is partly a result of trends in artistic practice but it also shows how the text was received. As BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 include historiated initials, including a representation of Peter Lombard, further emphasises the idea that decoration can be a form of commentary. The initials in BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 were meant to both impress the reader and communicate themes related to Paul and Lombard’s writings. In contrast, Angers MS 69 does not include historiated initials but the decoration is fine and would have been an added expense. Therefore, these two manuscripts demonstrate how Lombard’s text may have been read differently in the twelfth century.

There are patterns of more typical decoration seen in the remaining manuscripts. The thirteenth century saw a departure from the large Bibles of the twelfth century which often included full page illuminations.18 The introduction of these smaller Bibles meant space for decoration was limited. An example of this smaller size is seen with an early thirteenth-century Bible, Troyes MS 577.19 The initial at the start to Titus, which depicts Paul giving his letter to Titus, is provided in the illustrations (Fig. 4.15). Although smaller thirteenth-century Bibles, like Troyes MS 577, had limited space for decoration, copies of the Collectanea remained large enough to include more decoration if desired. The fact that the Parisian group of manuscripts in this study all include small decorated initials, with the exception of BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267, may be evidence of the impact that the design of the new, smaller Bibles had on copies of the Collectanea.

The most common theme in manuscripts containing the Pauline Epistles is the depiction of Paul with a sword or book which was extremely popular in the thirteenth century.20 Dole MS 27 and Mazarine MS 264 are two examples where each of Paul’s letters is prefaced by a decorated initial of Paul with a sword, scroll or book. The initials prefacing Titus in Dole MS 27 (Fig. 4.16) and in Mazarine MS 264 (Fig. 4.17) demonstrate the classic depiction of Paul. One of the consequences of this imagery is to create an impression of unity and consistency across the Pauline Epistles. However, both manuscripts include an exception to this pattern of depicting Paul with a sword or book. At the start to Hebrews on folio 243r in Mazarine MS 264 there is an initial which shows Paul with a sword while he talks to two people who sit on the right side of the initial (Fig. 4.18). The hats which the men wear communicate with the reader that this image shows Paul talking with two Jewish men. Given that this initial occurs at the start of Hebrews, the depiction of the Jews is not surprising. Luba Eleen explains that Hebrews is almost never provided with a scene depicting the writing of a letter, and that the ‘epistolary theme’ is reserved for the first thirteen letters.

18 Branner, Manuscript Painting in Paris During the Reign of Saint Louis, p. 17.
20 Branner, Manuscript Painting in Paris During the Reign of Saint Louis, p. 19.
which are ‘truly letters.’ This is important as it demonstrates that the makers of Mazarine MS 264 wished to visually separate Hebrews from the other epistles. If we take into consideration what Eileen said about the practice of decorated initials at the start of Hebrews in Bibles, the makers of Mazarine MS 264 may have been working in the same tradition.

Similarly, Dole MS 27 follows this pattern as it also includes one historiated initial while the remaining initials depict Paul with a sword, all of which appear to have been completed by two artists. Examples of two initials by seemingly different artists are provided in the illustrations (Figs. 4.19 and 4.20). Figure 4.19 includes the initial at the start to Galatians which depicts Paul, who is balding, though the hair he does have is brown. The figure of Paul has a white beard, rosy cheeks and red lips. The second example occurs at the start to Ephesians and is not finished to the same quality as the initial to Galatians (Fig. 4.20). The face is not as long as the first example and the eyes are larger, the lines of the hair are different and are not coloured brown. When comparing the two frames, the first frame includes a more delicate design in the bow of the initial and the leaf at the top of the initial is sharp while the frame used in the second initial is not as neat or polished. In the bow of the initial there are circles, and the same idea of placing a leaf at the top of the ascender of the initial is not the same. There is one initial in the manuscript which does not depict Paul holding a sword or scroll and it occurs at the start to Romans on folio 2r. The initial presents a scene wherein a man, presumed to be Paul, is falling off a horse (Fig. 4.21). The details of this initial appear to be more like figure 4.19 and therefore this initial may be by the same artist. This image depicts Paul’s conversion, as it is the first initial in Dole MS 27 it fits with the much broader tradition of investing the most in the first initial as part of the immediate impression made on the viewer. Eileen confirms that this particular imagery was associated with Paul’s conversion and was popular during this period; ‘One of the major innovations of the High Middle Ages is in the new interpretation of the Conversion: Paul is depicted as a rider, falling or having fallen from his mount.’ In the context of the Pauline Epistles the initial on folio 2r of Dole MS 27 would have been instantly recognisable as Paul.

At the start to Romans on folio 2r in Troyes MS 175, Paul’s conversion is also depicted (Fig. 4.22). There is a man on a horse who is falling towards Damascus. The other manuscript to include a similar scene is Mazarine MS 266. In the initial at the start to Galatians on folio 164r there is a depiction of a man falling off of a horse and a hand is in the clouds reaching down (Fig. 4.23). This decorated initial along with those in Dole MS 27 and Troyes MS 175 (Figs. 4.21 and 4.22) are similar in communicating the main theme of Paul’s conversion, but there are minor differences which demonstrate what each manuscript is attempting to do with this particular initial, as well as their location within the Epistles.

The initial in the Troyes manuscript emphasises Paul’s fall from the horse in that only the head of the horse is visible while Paul falls forward towards what appears to be a tower which is presumably a symbol for a town. Paul’s eyes are closed, indicating that he has been struck blind, and the hand of God is visible emerging from the sky above. The initial in Dole MS 27 shows the entire body of the horse and Paul is falling backwards opposed to forwards. There is no hand of God but three rays of power descend from
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21 Eileen, *The Illustration of the Pauline Epistles*, p. 54
the heavens signifying God’s presence. The initial in Mazarine MS 266 is most similar to that of the Dole manuscript in that the entire horse is shown, however the hand of God is visible, Paul is falling forward this time and his eyes are open. These variations demonstrate different elements of the image which could be emphasised in order to communicate aspects of Paul’s conversion to the readers, and the importance of the artists’ contribution to these manuscripts in interpreting the same subject matter.

Aside from the differences in how Paul’s conversion is depicted in these three initials, it is important to note that the initial in Mazarine MS 266 appears at the start of Galatians and the initials in Troyes MS 175 and Dole MS 27 appear at the start of Romans. The initial to Romans in Mazarine MS 266 depicts the Stoning of Stephen which is an earlier moment in Paul’s story. The imagery of Paul’s conversion only appears in these three manuscripts out of the Parisian group and it is interesting that they occur at different places in Lombard’s text and the details of each initial vary slightly. The positioning of an image depicting Paul’s conversion is most appropriate for Romans as it provides the first major event in his life as a Christian. Eileen draws attention to Romans 1:5 and Romans 11:13 which both refer to his conversion before stating that ‘the scene of the Conversion of Paul, the moment at which he was made an apostle by Christ – a subject taken from the iconography of Acts – finds its logical place as a visual expression of the words of the letter to the Romans.’ This demonstrates that the placement of decorated initials was usually carefully planned which then highlights the fact that the makers of Troyes MS 175 and Dole MS 27 were aware of the implications of placing a scene of Paul’s conversion at the start to Romans. It may also be a possibility that the makers of these manuscripts were copying from exemplars or else received inspiration from similar manuscripts.

It was common in the twelfth century for Romans to be the only epistle to include a figural scene which derived from an older tradition to treat the Pauline Epistles as one item. This then changed in the thirteenth century when all fourteen Pauline Epistles were provided with decorated initials. This is clearly what has happened in Mazarine MS 266 and it may be that thirteenth-century Bibles were part of the inspiration for this manuscript as each of Paul’s letters is prefaced with a scene from Paul’s life. In addition to the historiated initials there are also smaller decorated initials, most often with themes of foliage and beasts, at the start of Lombard’s commentary to each letter. The fact that this particular manuscript has such detailed historiated initials may be that this manuscript was meant to instruct mainly through its decoration opposed to the text. The decoration in this manuscript is interesting because it communicates a narrative of events from Paul’s life.

The first initial in Mazarine MS 266 is on folio 2r at the start of Romans and depicts three men (Fig. 4.24). One man is kneeling and two other men are behind him, one appears to be holding an object.
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25 Eileen, *The Illustration of the Pauline Epistles*, p. 86; Douay-Rheims Bible, Romans 1:5: By whom we have received grace and apostleship for obedience to the faith, in all nations, for his name. Romans 11:13: For I say to you, Gentiles: as long indeed as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I will honour my ministry.
26 Eileen, *The Illustration of the Pauline Epistles*, p. 44.
27 Eileen, *The Illustration of the Pauline Epistles*, p. 44.
above his head as if to strike it down upon the man kneeling. The scene is the Stoning of Stephen.\textsuperscript{28} The Stoning of Stephen occurs in the Acts of Apostles which is why it is curious that this scene is depicted at the start of Romans.\textsuperscript{29} One possible reason of having it at the start of Romans is to remind readers of what occurred in Acts, which is not included in the manuscript. However, Eleen observed that it was common for medieval Bibles and copies of the Pauline Epistles to be illustrated with scenes from Acts and that it was popular for designers of the iconography to juxtapose the Epistles, which are a non-narrative text with images from Acts which are a narrative source.\textsuperscript{30} This helps to explain why there are examples of scenes from Acts in the initials of Mazarine MS 266. The next image is at the start of I Corinthians on folio 75r and it shows a man holding a cross up to a group of men (Fig. 4.25). The man with the cross is bald with a beard and may be Paul while the other men are wearing pointed hats. The \textit{Initiale} database suggests that this is Paul converting the Jews and they also note that there is evidence of a sketch in the margins which was presumably a note to the artist, suggesting a professional workshop produced these sorts of images.\textsuperscript{31} Whilst the image of Paul converting the Jews in Mazarine MS 266 resonates with the first chapter of I Corinthians, it breaks the chronological sequence in Paul’s story, as his conversion is only depicted at the start of Galatians.

At the start of II Corinthians on folio 132v there is a decorated initial which shows a man, presumed to be a king or a man of importance due to his crown and the fact that he is sitting in what appears to be a throne, and a man who kneels before him presenting a text (Fig. 4.26). This image is provided with the following description by the \textit{Initiale} database; ‘\textit{Saint Paul (Saul) n’est pas auréolé avant sa conversion.}’\textsuperscript{32} If the kneeling figure is Paul, unusually, he is not bearded, though this is also true of the figures in the conversion and the stoning scenes, and supports the suggestion that this is a young Paul before his conversion. If so, this image is most likely Paul before Nero which is an image found in contemporary Bibles.\textsuperscript{33} This is followed by the scene of Paul falling from his horse at the start of Galatians.

The initial at the start of Ephesians on folio 190r shows two men in front of a tower which may be meant to symbolise the gateway to a city (Fig. 4.27). The foremost man has a bandage around his head, and appears to be supported by the other. His eyes are open, but this resonates with Acts 9:8, which declares that Paul could see nothing with his eyes open.\textsuperscript{34} The \textit{Initiale} database describes this initial ‘\textit{Saint Paul aveugle conduit à Damas}’ and it is likely that this is the blind Paul on his way to Damascus.\textsuperscript{35} The \textit{Initiale} database mentions another small preparatory sketch in the margins which refers to a small cross which is

\textsuperscript{29} See pages 44 to 46 of Eleen’s \textit{The Illustration of the Pauline Epistles: in French and English Bibles of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries} for an overview of how the Epistles were often laid out in twelfth and thirteenth century Bibles. She explains that the decoration did not always correspond to the particular book with which it was associated.
\textsuperscript{30} Eleen, \textit{The Illustration of the Pauline Epistles}, p. 73.
\textsuperscript{31} \textit{Initiale, IRHT}, <http://initiale.irht.cnrs.fr/codex/6366/8834> [accessed April 2018].
\textsuperscript{32} \textit{Initiale, IRHT}, <http://initiale.irht.cnrs.fr/codex/6366/8834> [accessed April 2018].
\textsuperscript{33} Eleen, \textit{The Illustration of the Pauline Epistles}, p. 102.
\textsuperscript{34} Douay-Rheims Bible, Acts 9:8: And Saul arose from the ground; and when his eyes were opened, he saw nothing. But they leading him by the hands, brought him to Damascus.
\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Initiale, IRHT}, <http://initiale.irht.cnrs.fr/codex/6366/8834> [accessed April 2018].
visible on the roof beside the gateway. Although the *Initiale* database refers to these sketches in the margins as preparatory, as mentioned earlier, they were presumably notes for the artists. However, it is clear that the artist followed the instructions from the sketch as there is a small cross visible on the roof beside the gateway in the main image but it is only noticeable upon closer examination. The addition of the cross suggests an intention to propose that Paul is being guided into the church as well as into Damascus. The initial at the start of Philippians on folio 208r shows two men. One is in bed and the other appears to be helping him. This is probably a continuation of the sequence, with Ananias caring for Paul, as described in Acts 9 (Fig. 4.28). Colossians begins on folio 220v (Fig. 4.29). The image shows the baptism of Saint Paul, concluding the narrative of Paul’s conversion. In this context, the initial at the start of I Corinthians (Fig. 4.25) is remarkable for breaking the chronological sequence, apparently including a scene of Paul converting Jews at the point where the biblical narrative describes him persecuting Christians. Since the rest of the imagery does not align with the content of the text, this might suggest a particular interest in the subject of conversion or, it may perhaps be a simple mistake in the planning and execution of the decorated initials.

On folio 232r there is a decorated initial to mark the beginning to I Thessalonians, which continues Paul’s story, moving into the period of his ministry, suffering and martyrdom. The initial depicts a solemn looking Paul who sits on the edge of a building while a man with a weapon of some sort stands behind (Fig. 4.30). The *Initiale* database provides a description for this initial which also gives some background information about Paul and his time in prison; ‘Le bourreau armé d’une massue qui conduit saint Paul en prison est peut-être celui qui l’a battu à Philippi. Paul passe le mur de l’enceinte de la prison.’ It should be noted that the decorated initial for the argument preceding this letter on folio 231v shows a centaur carrying an instrument or weapon of some sort which is interesting as it nearly mirrors figure 4.30 and acts as foreshadowing for the reader as to what will happen in the decorated initials attached to Lombard’s commentary to I Thessalonians.

The initial at the start of II Thessalonians is on folio 240v and is reminiscent of the initial at the start of I Corinthians (Fig. 4.25) as it shows a man holding a cross and there are men in hats in front of him (Fig. 4.31). In this position the imagery makes sense as Paul’s attempts to convert the Jews, as described in Acts 9:20. On folio 246r I Timothy begins and the decorated initial shows a man in what appears to be a basket and a figure in red robes who is in a tower or chimney beside the basket (Fig. 4.32). This again continues the narrative of Acts, as Paul escaped Damascus by being lowered down the wall in a basket. II Timothy begins on folio 259v and shows three men. The one in the middle is presumed to be Paul on account of his beard and bald head and the man on the left is an aide or squire while the man on the right appears to be the king as he sits on a throne and wears a crown (Fig. 4.33). The *Initiale* database identifies
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36 *Initiale, IRHT*, [http://initiale.irht.cnrs.fr/codex/6366/8834] [accessed April 2018].
37 *Initiale, IRHT*, [http://initiale.irht.cnrs.fr/codex/6366/8834] [accessed April 2018].
38 *Initiale, IRHT*, [http://initiale.irht.cnrs.fr/codex/6366/8834] [accessed April 2018].
40 Douay-Rheims Bible, Acts 9:20: And immediately he preached Jesus in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God.
41 *Initiale, IRHT*, [http://initiale.irht.cnrs.fr/codex/6366/8834] [accessed April 2018].
this scene as Paul who is brought before Nero.\textsuperscript{43} This image appears to be a representation of the condemnation as it is similar to a decorated initial at the start to II Corinthians in an early-thirteenth-century Bible which Eleen discusses in detail.\textsuperscript{44} The Bible, Avranches, Bibliothèque municipale, MSS 2 and 3, was made c. 1210 and it will be used as a comparison shortly.\textsuperscript{45} This image at the start to II Timothy in Mazarine MS 266 resonates with the earlier scene of Paul appearing before a ruler, underlining the reversal in his behaviour and beliefs.

The first eleven initials in Mazarine MS 266 are unique when compared to the decoration included in the other manuscripts because they provide imagery related to important events which Paul experienced. The decorated initials have so much detail that readers already familiar with Paul would recognise the events. This demonstrates the emphasis placed on the decoration in this particular manuscript which brings up the question of its original use. The pattern of these initials and their portrayal of Paul changes with the last three initials as they are based on apocryphal literature. The last three historiated initials reveal a narrative within the artwork occurring in the initials at the start of Titus on folio 268r, Philemon on folio 272v and Hebrews 274v (Figs. 4.34, 4.35 and 4.36). These three initials allude to the myth of Plautilla and Paul. A summary of the actions contained within these three decorated initials is as follows; Paul borrowing Plautilla’s veil, Paul being beheaded with Plautilla’s veil covering his eyes, and Paul returning Plautilla’s veil. This myth derived from apocryphal literature, notably the Passio Sancti Pauli Apostoli.\textsuperscript{46} This text was wrongly ascribed to Pope Linus, but it is this text which includes the story of a heroine called Plautilla.\textsuperscript{47} According to the legend of Paul’s death, before he is beheaded he meets Plautilla who is a Roman matron and convert of St. Peter.\textsuperscript{48} At seeing Paul, Plautilla asked for his blessing and Paul then begged her for her veil for him to cover his eyes while he was beheaded and promised to return it to her after he died.\textsuperscript{49} The attendants ‘mocked at such a promise, but Plautilla, with a woman’s faith and charity, taking off her veil, presented it to him.’\textsuperscript{50} The legend continues that after Paul’s martyrdom he appeared once again and returned the veil which was ‘stained with his blood.’\textsuperscript{51} This legend is depicted in the decorated initials in Mazarine MS 266 which is rare when compared to the other copies of Lombard’s Collectanea looked at as part of this study.

Although similar imagery has not been discovered in other copies of Lombard’s commentary within this study, the depiction of Paul being beheaded in medieval art including Bibles is relatively common, and it appears in a range of media.\textsuperscript{52} Scenes of Paul being beheaded have been noted as existing in several of thirteenth-century Bibles.\textsuperscript{53} However, neither Paul’s letter to Philemon nor Lombard’s

\textsuperscript{43} Initiale, IRHT, <http://initiale.irht.cnrs.fr/codex/6366/8834> [accessed April 2018].
\textsuperscript{44} Eleen, The Illustration of the Pauline Epistles, p. 102.
\textsuperscript{45} Eleen, The Illustration of the Pauline Epistles, p. 80.
\textsuperscript{46} Eleen, The Illustration of the Pauline Epistles, p. 101.
\textsuperscript{48} Jameson, Sacred and Legendary Art, I, p. 218.
\textsuperscript{49} Jameson, Sacred and Legendary Art, I, p. 218.
\textsuperscript{50} Jameson, Sacred and Legendary Art, I, p. 218.
\textsuperscript{51} Jameson, Sacred and Legendary Art, I, p. 218.
\textsuperscript{53} Eleen, The Illustration of the Pauline Epistles, p. 103.
commentary allude to Paul being beheaded. Indeed as Guy Bauman observed, there is nothing in the Bible which refers to Paul’s death and so the apocryphal literature must be looked at. 54 Although Mazarine MS 266 is rare in its inclusion of this legend when compared to the other manuscripts in the Parisian group as well as the four earliest manuscripts (Admont MS 52, CCCC MS 52, BnF MS Latin 17246 and Vat. Lat. 144), it is known that ‘The Execution of Paul furthermore was associated with the Epistles as early as the ninth century, and was included in the Acts Cycle by the middle of the twelfth century…’ 55 Therefore, the makers of Mazarine MS 266 were clearly familiar with the legend of Paul and Plautilla or they were copying from an exemplar which included similar imagery.

Eleen has isolated other manuscripts which include depictions of the myth of Paul and Plautilla. Most importantly, her study refers to an important Bible which contains ‘the earliest and most complete set of scenes from the apocryphal Plautilla legend.’ 56 The Bible, Avranches MSS 2 and 3, from c. 1210 will be compared to Mazarine MS 266. 57 The fact that images of Paul and Plautilla exist in other manuscripts from the thirteenth century reveals that Mazarine MS 266 is not necessarily rare in its iconography; however, it is rare when compared to the other copies of Lombard’s commentary included in Parisian group of manuscripts at the core of this study. This further demonstrates that although the text remained very similar in copies of Lombard’s commentary, there was a wide range of artwork included in these books. And more importantly, the fact that Mazarine MS 266 includes this myth may provide information as to who it was made for.

Eleen notes that the imagery included in Avranches MSS 2 and 3 is an example of disorder but that it ‘is of a high order of iconographic exactitude’ which allows for the meaning of each scene to be conveyed to the reader. 58 Eleen believes that the artist of Avranches MS 3 might have copied the scenes in the Pauline Epistles from a stained glass window due to the fact that the apocryphal subjects are most often found in windows and because of the fact that the order of events in this Bible are mixed up. 59 In addition to this Bible, Eleen mentions two other manuscripts with similar iconography, Mazarine MS 15 and Rome, Vatican Urbis. Lat. 7, both from c. 1250 – c. 1260 which she notes ‘are the only other Bibles to include the Plautilla episodes in the events surrounding the Execution.’ 60 As she does not mention Mazarine MS 266 anywhere in her work Eleen may not have known that this copy of Lombard’s text includes similar imagery.

The three tables including the order of decorated initials for Avranches MS 3, Vat. Urb. Lat. 7 and Mazarine MS 15 have been taken from Eleen’s study in order to compare visually with the order of the scenes in Mazarine MS 266 in a table which I have compiled. These four tables are available in Appendix VII. In the second table, Eleen uses Roman numerals to designate the sequence of events as they appear in Avranches MS 3 and the order of the sequence of events in Acts and Apocrypha are designated by Arabic

56 Eleen, The Illustration of the Pauline Epistles, p. 80.
57 Eleen, The Illustration of the Pauline Epistles, p. 80.
58 Eleen, The Illustration of the Pauline Epistles, p. 80.
59 Eleen, The Illustration of the Pauline Epistles, p. 81.
60 Eleen, The Illustration of the Pauline Epistles, p. 81.
The four tables demonstrate how common the various events of Paul’s life were in both Bibles and commentaries on the Pauline Epistles in the thirteenth century. A look at the tables in Appendix VII reveals that Mazarine MS 266, Vat. Urb. Lat. 7 and Mazarine MS 15 are the most similar in their depiction of the myth of Plautilla and Paul. All three manuscripts depict Paul’s execution at the start of Philemon and they show Paul returning the veil to Plautilla in the initial prefacing Hebrews. This further demonstrates that Mazarine MS 266 is not rare in terms of its iconography when compared to contemporary Bibles. A closer look at the style of the initials in Mazarine MS 266, Mazarine MS 15 and Avranches MS 3 demonstrates how the myth of Plautilla and Paul was communicated. Unfortunately, images from Vat. Urb. Lat. 7 were not obtained and therefore are not part of this analysis of the iconography. In the initials depicting the myth of Paul and Plautilla in Mazarine MS 266 the first and third initials are very similar. On folio 268r, Paul is shown with long hair and a beard, bare feet and he is illustrated as wearing blue robes with a red shawl like robe over top (Fig. 4.34). The image of Paul on folio 274v is nearly identical to this one except that the colours of Paul’s robes have been switched in that he is shown wearing red robes with a blue shawl over top (Fig. 4.36). Additionally, on folio 268r his right arm is over the red part of the robes but on folio 274v both of his arms are through the appropriate openings of his robes. Plautilla is illustrated in these two decorated initials and has a nearly identical stance in both and the only distinction immediately evident is that on folio 268r her robes are blue and on folio 274v her robes are red. These small differences do not appear to allude to anything more than a desire on account of the artist to distinguish between the two initials to make them slightly different given that the action in both initials is nearly identical: Paul first borrowing and then returning Plautilla’s veil.

On folio 436v of Mazarine MS 15 there is a historiated initial which shows Paul about to be beheaded by a man wielding a sword (Fig. 4.37). It has been noted that this manuscript had two different artists and was never finished. Branner believes that the original artist was a ‘secondary master, for nearly every image is accompanied by a sketch of in the margin.’ An example occurs on folio 436v, depicting the beheading scene attached to Philemon (Fig. 4.38). The fact that this imagery occurs in Philemon is important as it reflects the same style found in Mazarine MS 266. The initials at the start to Philemon and Hebrews in Mazarine MS 15 (Figs. 4.39 and 4.40) also include the same arch that appears in Mazarine MS 266 (Figs. 4.34 and 4.36).

A look at the initials in Avranches MS 3 helps to understand Eleen’s comments about it being an example of disorder. There are four initials which refer to the myth of Paul and Plautilla and they are placed at the start to Galatians, Ephesians, Titus and Hebrews. The initial at the start to Galatians on folio 284r of Avranches MS 3 depicts Paul receiving the veil from Plautilla (Fig. 4.41). This initial is slightly different to those in Mazarine MS 266 and Mazarine MS 15 as there is a third person in the scene. A soldier, evidenced by the fact that he appears to wear chain mail, is holding a sword and stands behind Paul. This image is already communicating Paul’s imminent execution to the reader. The next initial, on folio 286r, marks the start to Ephesians and depicts Paul’s execution (Fig. 4.42). Paul is blindfolded and he is kneeling down. The executioner wears an aggressive expression as he holds Paul’s head with one hand and wields a sword with
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the other. This depiction of Paul’s execution is much more animated than those already seen in Mazarine MS 266 and Mazarine MS 15 and it is the only example of the three where the executioner and Paul face each other. The next closest initial in terms of similar details is that in Mazarine MS 266 (Fig. 4.35). The executioner is behind Paul but, like the initial in Avranches MS 3, the executioner has a hand on Paul. This example shows Paul, with the veil over his eyes, kneeling down and clasping his hands in prayer. Lastly, the initial depicting Paul’s execution in Mazarine MS 15 contains the least amount of detail but it still clearly communicates the execution (Fig. 4.37). This is the only example of the three which does not include Paul covering his eyes with the veil.

The two initials in Avranches MS 3 which show Paul receiving Plautilla’s veil and his execution occur earlier in the Pauline Epistles than the other three manuscripts. However, Avranches MS 3 does follow the pattern of placing these two actions together as in the other manuscripts. The next initial relating to the myth of Paul and Plautilla in Avranches MS 3 includes an image of Paul returning the veil to Plautilla in the initial at the start to Titus (Fig. 4.43). When comparing the three initials depicting the myth as they occur in Mazarine MS 266, Mazarine MS 15 and Avranches MS 3 demonstrates that although the style of decoration differs, the actions depicted are very similar in the three examples. However, Avranches MS 3 is slightly unique as it includes a fourth initial related to the myth of Paul and Plautilla in the initial at the start to Hebrews on folio 296 (Fig. 4.44). Eleen describes this scene as Plautilla showing the veil to soldiers.64

Although the style of artwork varies in Mazarine MS 266, Mazarine MS 15 and Avranches MS 3, they all clearly communicate the myth of Paul and Plautilla. As the images clearly illustrate a series of actions, the more important aspect of these decorated initials is their connection both to Peter Lombard’s commentary and to their placement within the biblical text itself. Mazarine MS 266 was made in the middle of the thirteenth century. As its date of production is later than the other manuscripts included in this study, that alone may explain why the manuscript has the particular artwork associated with Paul and Plautilla in the letters to Titus, Philemon and Hebrews. This would also explain why the same series of images is found in a French Bible from the middle of the thirteenth century. The Bible of Aulne Abbey (private collection) is thought to have been produced in Flanders or Northern France in c. 1240-1240 and Jorn Günther has written a brief description of the manuscript.65 The Bible contains two decorated initials which are similar to those found in the selection of the Lombard manuscripts. At the start of Titus on folio 328 there is a decorated initial with what has been described as ‘Soldiers visiting two men in prison’.66 In the Aulne Abbey Bible, at the start of Philemon on folio 329r there is a decorated initial depicting the beheading of Paul. This image and its placement at the start of Philemon is reminiscent of the series of images in Mazarine MS 266. The final decorated initial in the Aulne Abbey Bible which has a connection to this study’s group of manuscripts is on 329v at the start of Hebrews. Günther describes the initial; ‘A man and a woman holding a garment between them.’67 This initial very probably represents the myth of Paul and Plautilla and the description of the initial describes the same action which occurs in the initials in Mazarine MS 266 at the start of Titus and Hebrews (Figs. 4.34 and 4.36 respectively).

64 Eleen, The Illustration of the Pauline Epistles, pp. 80-81.
Aside from the myth of Paul and Plautilla, the other initials in Mazarine MS 266 depict important moments from Paul’s life. One initial in particular, that which depicts Paul in prison, occurs at the start of I Thessalonians on folio 232r (Fig. 4.30). This association with Paul and prison is important within the context of Paul’s life and is most clear in his letter to Philemon. However, although the initial in Mazarine Ms 266 depicting Paul in prison does not occur at the start of Philemon, the imagery in this manuscript ties all the letters together by connecting them to Paul’s biography. In terms of Paul’s letter to Philemon, it is understood that Paul writes to Philemon about Philemon’s slave Onesimus who has run away. This is summed up by Callahan when he says the following: ‘So firmly established is the interpretation of the epistle […] addressed to the master of a repentant runaway slave that any discussion of slavery in the New Testament invariably alludes to Paul’s Epistle to Philemon.’\(^68\) Paul addresses his letter to Philemon in verse one *Philemoni dilecto*. He then brings up *charitem tuam et fidem* in verse five in relation to Philemon and refers to his charity twice more before asking for a favour; *caritate tua* at verse seven and *caritatem* in verse nine. In verse fifteen Paul then asks Philemon to take back his slave Onesimus *ut aeternum illum reciperes*. Paul asks Philemon to forgive Onesimus and take him back, Paul also vouches for Onesimus at multiple occasions in the hope that Philemon will allow Onesimus to return.

Overall, the decoration in Mazarine MS 266 is unique amongst the Parisian group of manuscripts because it depicts various scenes from Paul’s life. However, it is clear that many of the scenes depicted in Mazarine MS 266 were popular trends in imagery in contemporary Bibles. The tables in Appendix VII demonstrate that the scenes which appear in Mazarine MS 266 were often used in contemporary Bibles including Avranches MS 3, Mazarine MS 15 and Vat. Urb. Lat. 144. Mazarine MS 266 is an example of a copy of Lombard’s text which includes historiated initials but the scenes do not always reflect the text which they preface. This manuscript offers a few obvious links between the text of the letters and episodes of Paul’s life, but in other cases the iconography does seem to have been chosen to suit the text.

There are several examples of manuscripts where the iconography reflects the themes in Lombard’s commentary to Titus and Philemon. The first example is found in a thirteenth-century copy of Lombard’s *Collectanea*, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France MS Latin 670. This manuscript appears to be very similar to other thirteenth-century copies of the text as it is written in two columns and measures 430 × 290 mm. At the start of Philemon, on folio 228r, there is a historiated initial which shows two men, the one with the beard is presumed to be Paul on account of how he is most often depicted (Fig. 4.45).\(^69\) The other figure, who is haloed, is Silas. Paul and Silas are imprisoned and put into stocks in Acts 16. This image clearly reflects the theme of captivity which runs throughout the letter and the commentary.

Eleen argued that initials depicting Paul in prison are ’emphasized by the fact that he must hand a letter through a window or from a tower.’\(^70\) A search for similar iconography results in plenty of examples of this depiction of Paul, reiterating Eleen’s point about having ‘incontestable evidence that this was indeed
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\(^{70}\) Eleen, *The Illustration of the Pauline Epistles*, p. 54.
the way in which Paul’s imprisonment was represented.”71 Douai, Bibliothèque municipale MS 18 is a glossed Bible which was made in Northern France c. 1215 – c. 1230.72 On folio 169v in the decorated initial which marks the beginning of Paul’s letter to Galatians, Paul stands in a tower and hands a letter to a man (Fig. 4.46). This is an example of an illustration that does not reflect the content of the text. However, there are similar examples of this iconography in two Bibles, New York, Morgan Library, M.851 and New York, Morgan Library, M.969 (subsequently New York M.851 and M. 969) which were made in France in the last twenty years of the thirteenth century.73 In addition to their similar provenance, both Bibles have decorated initials at the start of Paul’s letter to Philemon which share certain similarities. This is immediately in contrast to the placement of the initial in Douai MS 18. New York M.851 survives in fragments thus eliminating the use of folia. However, no. 4 in the sequence of surviving fragments presents the initial associated with Philemon (Fig. 4.47). This initial depicts Paul in prison as he hands a book to a messenger. The context clearly connects to the themes connected to the letter. Similarly, on folio 426v of New York M.969 Paul is depicted in prison and handing a letter to a messenger (Fig. 4.48). All three initials, figures 4.46, 4.47 and 4.48 clearly illustrate Paul, standing in prison and handing a letter to a messenger. Aside from the differences in the style of illumination, the depictions are very similar except for the fact that Douai MS 18 places the initial at the start to Galatians and New York M.851 and M. 969 place the initial at the start of Philemon. Evidently, by placing the depiction of Paul in prison at the start to Philemon, New York M.851 and M. 969 are two examples where the iconography appears to have been chosen to suit the content of the text.

Another example of this possible evolution of artwork which relates more clearly to the themes within the letter is found in New York M.395. This Bible was made in the first quarter of the fifteenth century in Paris and on folio 258r the initial associated with Philemon demonstrates the evolution of the two earlier examples of initials (Fig. 4.49).74 The initial in New York M.395 has refined the details which are found in those of New York M.851 and M. 969 in that Paul is clearly illustrated as being behind prison bars. This evolution in the artwork reveals that this theme of imagery was well established in either Bibles or copies of the Pauline Epistles throughout the Middle Ages. Lombard’s commentary on Philemon as it appears in this selection of manuscripts reinforces the themes of the main biblical text. Lombard provides the reader with additional details which the main text does not, allowing for a more thorough understanding of the text. These additional examples from contemporary Bibles as well as the fifteenth-century example (Fig. 4.49) illustrate how popular themes of decoration could become.

The survey of the iconographic choices in the Parisian group of manuscripts illustrates the wide range of styles and themes used in the artwork. It is clear how much the decoration changes in copies of Lombard’s Collectanea, demonstrating both different levels of expense spent on decoration and different approaches to the illustration of the text. This chapter illustrates that there was a trend in the twelfth century of depicting the author of a given text, but the initial depicting Peter in BnF MS Latin 14266 is rare when

71 Een, , The Illustration of the Pauline Epistles, p. 54.
72 Initiale, IRHT, Douai BM MS 18, tome II: [http://initiale.irht.cnrs.fr/codex/8054/5663] [accessed September 2018].
73 Morgan Library, New York [https://www.themorgan.org/manuscripts/list] [accessed July 2018].
74 Morgan Library, New York [https://www.themorgan.org/manuscripts/list] [accessed July 2018].
compared to the Parisian group of manuscripts. Instead, the decoration of the copies of Lombard’s commentary considered here placed emphasis on Paul. The other manuscript within this group which stands out due to the number of detailed historiated initials is Mazarine MS 266. A reader presented with Mazarine MS 266 would read Lombard’s commentary in the light of the initials depicting scenes from Paul’s life. Mazarine MS 266 also includes scenes belonging to apocryphal literature depicting the myth of Paul and Plautilla. Therefore, readers would have possibly interpreted Lombard’s commentary differently when compared to a reader who used a copy without historiated initials, such as Angers MS 69.

The fact that the six manuscripts belonging to the Parisian group all include different styles of decoration is evidence of different interests in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The variation in decoration allows for the decoration to be thought of as an extra form of commentary on the text. Readers of BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 might have read the commentary with a further understanding of Lombard’s established status as a respected theologian given that the manuscript includes a depiction of Peter Lombard as a bishop. The analysis of the initials in Mazarine MS 266 would have encouraged readers to think about events from Paul’s life which would offer the opportunity to make connections to the Pauline Epistles. The fact that some of the scenes depicted in the initials derive from Acts might have meant that readers read the text more thoroughly in order to understand the imagery. This analysis of the decoration in these volumes confirms that the reception of the Collectanea would have been influenced by any accompanying decoration and what that communicated with the reader.
Chapter Five: Reader Response

The previous chapters provide a thorough analysis of the elements of Peter Lombard’s text, together with its layout and decoration, in a selection of manuscripts in order to gain insights into the text, the importance of any included decoration, and how readers would have had different reading experiences depending on the physical form of the manuscripts they used. An important early reader of Lombard’s Collectanea was Herbert of Bosham who was an English student who studied under the Lombard. However, Colish raises an important point in regard to Lombard’s connection to the Abbey of St. Victor and references previous scholarship which doubts the possibility that Lombard had any formal instruction at the abbey. She explains that although Lombard’s Sentences shares similarities with Hugh of St. Victor’s works, ‘It was certainly possible in this period to acquaint oneself with the teachings of thinkers with whom one was not bound in a formal master-disciple relationship.’ Smalley noted that Brady told her ‘that c. 1150 is the most likely date for Herbert’s studies under the Lombard.’ Herbert is most famous for his relationship with Thomas Becket throughout the controversy involving King Henry II. However, Herbert was also responsible for a revision of Lombard’s text which survives in four volumes; one volume of the Psalms is in the Bodleian Library while the other three volumes are in Trinity College, Cambridge. The volumes containing Herbert’s edition of Lombard’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles are currently in Trinity College Cambridge as MSS B.5.6 and B.5.7 (subsequently Cambridge MSS B.5.6 and B.5.7). These have most often been studied for their elaborate decoration, and considered in the context of the Becket crisis, but they are also important evidence for one early reader’s response to Lombard’s work. Beginning with Herbert, this chapter will discuss reader response. There are three different kinds of evidence presented in this chapter: how Herbert reworked Lombard’s text; the choices made in the creation of the other manuscripts; and any later additions or alternations made by readers. Some of this is evidence for intended use while the rest is evidence for actual use.

2 Colish, Peter Lombard, I, p. 18.
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Brady described Herbert’s manuscripts as ‘hardly more than a careful copy of the original writings of Lombard, which added marginal notes.’ However, de Hamel highlighted how much work and revision Herbert did to Lombard’s commentary; ‘Herbert was asked to provide variant readings of the biblical text according to the usages of different churches and to supply cross-references to parallel passages.’ It was noted by Herbert that Lombard had not been able to revise the un-orthodox passages in the commentary as he had unexpectedly been elected to the bishopric of Paris in 1159 and then died in 1160. The four volumes were made in Northern France between 1164 and 1177 with the volumes containing the Pauline Epistles, Cambridge MSS B.5.6 and B.5.7, made between 1170 and 1176. We know that the project was begun before Becket’s death in 1170 as Becket first asked Herbert to, while they were in Pontigny from 1164-1166. Herbert remarked on how much Becket enjoyed reading the Psalms and the Pauline Epistles while at Pontigny. Stella Panayotova explains that the set of manuscripts was first planned in 1164-65, the first two years Herbert and Becket spent in exile in Pontigny, and they were then most likely made in Sens. Herbert noted that the library at Pontigny had copies of the patristic sources from whom Lombard borrowed for his commentary on the Psalms and Pauline Epistles. This period was in the lead-up to the Third Lateran council in 1179 when Lombard and his work were attacked. As explained in the introduction, Lombard’s works were attacked for being heretical in the years after his death in 1160. Herbert’s editions can thus be seen as an effort to ‘underline Peter’s achievement and orthodoxy at a time when his reputation was under attack.’ With this in mind, it helps to understand part of the reason why these editions were made to such a high standard. Another reason for their importance is due to the association with Thomas Becket, archbishop of Canterbury.

The four manuscripts include two volumes of Lombard’s commentary on the Psalms, Cambridge, Trinity College MS B.5.4 and Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Auct. E.inf.6, and two volumes of the commentary on the Pauline Epistles, Cambridge MSS B.5.6 and B.5.7. All four volumes are roughly the same size, 455 x 330 mm, with Cambridge MS B.5.4 including 184 folia, Bodleian MS Auct. E.inf.6 including 143 folia, Cambridge MS B.5.6 including 195 folia and Cambridge MS B.5.7 including 182 folia. These large volumes were carefully planned. The layout of text demonstrates the complexity of what Herbert wished to achieve in producing the best version of Lombard’s commentary and they include elaborate decoration in both the initials as well as in the margins, which was completed by four main
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11 De Hamel, ‘A Contemporary Miniature of Thomas Becket’, (pp. 179); Smith, Masters of the Sacred Page, p. 45.
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artists. These manuscripts are also well-known for being some of the first volumes to include the “alternate line” method which meant enlarging the script for the main biblical text and writing it on alternate lines so that the commentary was next to the appropriate section of text. This style of layout is discussed earlier in the study in relation to the other manuscripts. In addition to the layout of the copies made by Herbert, the most important feature of these manuscripts is the fact that they were produced in order for Herbert to correct any misattributions to the patristic sources and to make a “critical edition” of Lombard’s text. As part of this process, Herbert placed images of the patristic authorities in the margins of the manuscripts which point to passages of the text and hold scrolls with phrases like Non ego or Ego non probo. De Hamel explains how these drawings and accompanying phrases demonstrate that ‘it was not Herbert of Bosham who had dared correct the great Peter Lombard but the patristic author himself.’

Panayotova emphasises that this feature of these four manuscripts meant that ‘Herbert rescued Lombard’s reputation by blaming the errors on careless scribes, and preserved the integrity of his master’s text with the loyalty of a former student.’ This idea of a reader engaging with the marginal notation is important as it demonstrates how much the text mattered to Herbert as well as how much Herbert respected Lombard and his commentary.

Titus and Philemon do not include any pictures of the authorities, so examples here are taken from elsewhere in the two volumes of the Pauline Epistles. The first example depicts Augustine, beside a passage of Lombard’s text from II Corinthians 12:1 on folio 189r of Cambridge MS B.5.6 (Fig. 5.1). Augustine wears robes of red and blue and his facial features are drawn in great detail including red lips. In one hand he is holding a scroll which reads cave which warns readers to ‘beware!’; Herbert believes there is something wrong with this passage of text. With the other hand, the figure of Augustine is pointing with an instrument towards his passage of text, written in a smaller script in the margin. Above his ankles there is a cross-reference to Psalm 17, which was evidently written before the drawing of Augustine, and the artist has drawn around it. The next examples are all taken from the second volume, Cambridge MS B.5.7. A drawing of Ambrose is found on folio 114v in chapter one of II Timothy (Fig. 5.2). The figure of Ambrose is in blue and red robes, with red lips and cheeks and he is tonsured. The scroll he is holding is not entirely legible but it begins with ego aliter and similar to the example with Augustine, Ambrose is pointing at the passage of his text in the margin which is found in Lombard’s commentary to Galatians 6:1. All of the drawings follow this pattern in which the authorities are shown with a scroll and pointing towards their respective texts in order to question the attribution of sources.

17 Turcheck, ‘A Neglected Manuscript of Peter Lombard’s “Liber Sententiarum” and Parisian Illumination of the Late Twelfth Century’, (p. 61); De Hamel, Glosse Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Booktrade, pp. 24-25.
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The next figure is of Jerome, on folio 22v in Galatians (Fig. 5.3). Jerome is in darker robes in grey, different to the robes used for Augustine and Ambrose, with a white beard (blue is used as a highlight) and he is tonsured. The banner that he holds again reads *Ego aliter.* Intriguingly, the passage of text that he points to, related to Galatians 4:10, does not appear in Lombard’s commentary based on the PL edition suggesting that Herbert might have been working with a corrupted copy, and it begins by ordering the reader to look.25 This is an example where the drawings and corresponding text are communicating directly with the reader. The passage also refers to Jerome as *hic glosator.* Similar to these drawings of the Church Fathers, there is also a drawing of Paul in Galatians on folio 19v (Fig. 5.4). Paul is wearing blue and red robes and he has a brown beard with brown hair though he is depicted as being partially bald. The portion of text that he points to again does not appear in Lombard’s commentary but the phrase, *non differt a seruo* might be a reference to Galatians 4:1 as a similar phrase appears in Paul’s letter.26

These drawings of the authorities demonstrate the lengths Herbert went to in order to ensure readers would have access to the most correct version of Lombard’s text. The drawings are detailed and animated which draw the reader in and enable them to connect with the authorities more so than when only the marginal rubric of the author’s abbreviated name is provided. The imagery of the Church Fathers holding scrolls reinforces the value of the authorities, which in addition to the fact that they correct misattributions, reminds the reader of their importance. This is reminiscent of the discussion of the “author as scribe” style used by Turcheck and discussed in chapter two, as these portraits of the authorities are depictions of them as masters of their work.

The Parisian group of manuscripts as well as the three earlier copies added to the study in chapter three do not include these elaborations of the marginal rubrics. The only manuscript out of the Parisian group to include marginal decoration is the two-volume copy of Lombard’s text, BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267. Cambridge MSS B.5.6 and B.5.7 include similar penwork decoration to that in BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267.27 In Herbert’s edition of Lombard’s text these penwork flourishes and drawings often stem from one of the penwork initials within the text and it appears then that the artist has taken the opportunity to express their creativity and skill (Fig. 5.5). This example occurs in II Corinthians and this folio is an example where there is less marginalia in comparison to some other folia in the two volumes. Therefore the artist may have taken the opportunity to draw this design given the amount of free space available to them. The multiple lines link several faces together. This feature appears in the most expensive manuscripts looked at in this study, Herbert’s edition and the two volumes in the Bibliothèque nationale de France. This might be a reflection of the skilled artists that worked on these copies, and the exceptional investment of resources in them.

It is important to acknowledge that Herbert’s volumes were made for two extremely important archbishops, Thomas Becket and William Whitehands. Herbert and Becket returned to Canterbury in 1170

25 *Vide.*  
26 Douay-Rheims Bible, Galatians 4:1: *Dico autem : quanto tempore haeres parvulus est, nihil differt a servo, cum sit dominus omnium /* Now I say, as long as the heir is a child, he differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all.  
27 Refer to figures 2.11, 2.12, 2.13 for the penwork initials in BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 discussed in chapter two.
but Herbert was sent back to France later that year, and Becket was murdered in December 1170. Herbert spent the next four years as secretary for the Archbishop of Sens, William Whitehands. Panayotova explains that it was during these years that Herbert re-dedicated the four volumes of Lombard’s works to William Whitehands. In Herbert’s prefaces to the commentary on the Psalms and the Pauline Epistles (Cambridge MSS B.5.4 and B.5.6) there are letters addressed to Archbishop William of Sens. These copies of Lombard’s text are another example of them being made for an individual opposed for an institution or church.

In addition to the painted figures of the authorities in Cambridge MSS B.5.6 and B.5.7, these volumes include large painted initials at the start of each epistle. Titus and Philemon are in the second volume, Cambridge MS B.5.7, with Lombard’s commentary to Titus beginning on folio 123r and finishing on folio 129r while Philemon begins on 129r and finishes on folio 131r. An image of the start to the main biblical text of Titus on folio 123v is found in the illustrations (Fig. 5.6), the commentary begins on the previous folio with a decorated initial but folio 123v marks the start to the main biblical text of Titus. The biblical text and the commentary are combined into two equal-sized columns, with the commentary surrounding the main biblical text and keeping the “continuous flow” system which was used in copies of Lombard’s text in the last quarter of the twelfth century. De Hamel notes that this style of layout required great organisation and planning. This is clear when looking at Herbert’s edition of the commentary, which has several elements all working together; the biblical text, Lombard’s commentary, marginal rubrics, biblical cross-references and the decoration. Herbert’s copies also include capitula lists which is another similarity it shares with BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267. It appears that only the most expensive copies of Lombard’s text included the capitula lists.

Overall, Herbert’s edition offers a different pattern in decoration when compared to the manuscripts in the Parisian group as well as the earliest copies of the text looked at in previous chapters. Herbert’s edition places small painted initials at the start of each biblical verse in red, blue, green, and orange coloured inks. The initials to the biblical verses are decorated with foliage, animals, and human faces in blue ink and Lombard’s corresponding commentary to each verse is prefaced with a penwork initial (Fig. 5.7). There are a few examples of portraits used to decorate the initials, including one at the start to Colossians which may be a reference to Lombard’s status as a bishop, evidenced by his mitre (Fig. 5.8). Another initial depicts Paul, he has a halo, brown hair and is holding up his hand in blessing (Fig. 5.9). There is another figure in the initial, a man acts as the stem to the initial P and his hands hold the portrait of Paul. Images of Paul were common in commentaries as well as contemporary Bibles as discussed in chapter four.
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The manuscripts included in this particular study demonstrate that, like Herbert’s manuscripts, some were used as high-powered study tools, especially BnF MS Latin 17246 and Angers MS 69 which have the largest number of rubrics. Smalley described how ‘Herbert took pains to see that the authors quoted in the commentary were correctly labelled and attached to the right words of the text, as far as he could judge.’ With this in mind, it may help to investigate further sources used in Lombard’s text as well as to confirm any unconfirmed sources. The marginal rubrics of Titus and Philemon in Herbert’s edition, Cambridge MS B.5.7, will be compared to the BnF MS Latin 17246, the earliest copy of Lombard’s text to be included in this study and one with the largest number of rubrics, in order to see whether Herbert changed much when he revised Lombard’s edition.

Herbert’s edition uses red and blue vertical lines in the margins to illustrate to the reader the length of each borrowed passage (Fig. 5.10). This system is present in most of the manuscripts made before c. 1200 in this study. In Herbert’s edition of Lombard’s commentary to Titus there are thirty-nine rubrics and in Philemon there are fifteen. As seen in chapter three, the earliest manuscripts contain the largest number of rubrics with the number decreasing in the manuscripts made later in the thirteenth century, with the exception of Angers MS 69 which is believed to have most likely been a high-powered study text. BnF MS Latin 17246 contains fifty marginal rubrics in Titus and twenty-four in Philemon both of which are more than the rubrics in Herbert’s edition of Lombard’s commentary. These two manuscripts were made in the same period, c. 1160 – c. 1170. The rubrics which occur in Herbert’s edition are different to those in the Parisian group of manuscripts and they will be looked at in greater detail. The first rubric associated with Titus in Cambridge MS B.5.7 is on folio 123r and it suggests that the borrowed text from Ambrose is quem creauit epistolam commones eum fore sollicitum in ecclesiastica disciplina. BnF MS Latin 17246 also attributes this passage to Ambrose though in this copy the rubric occurs at hanc epistolam scribit on folio 126r, a few words earlier than that on folio 123r in Cambridge MS B.5.7, and there are no additional symbols in the text noting the end of the passage. The red line in the margins stretches until the next rubric which belongs to Augustine.

Folio 123v of Cambridge MS B.5.7 marks the beginning of the main biblical text in Titus, marked by a decorated initial including foliage decoration. The next rubric occurs at eterna quod idem est id est ante omnia tempora promisit. The rubric associates this text with Augustine’s I xii de ciuitate dei, a reference to book one, chapter twelve of Augustine’s City of God. BnF MS Latin 17246 also associates this section of text with Augustine but there are two separate marginal rubrics. The first, associated with eterna quod idem est id est omnia tempora promisit. There is a new symbol within the text at the next word, quomodo, and a rubric in the margin denoting Augustine’s de ciuitate dei. The next rubric in each manuscript occurs at Si dixisset sine peccato. It is interesting as there is a disagreement about the author of the borrowed source, BnF MS Latin 17246 notes that the text belongs to Ambrose’s libro ad bonfacium papam while Cambridge MS B.5.7 notes the same text but gives Augustine as the author. As demonstrated in the discussion of the marginal rubrics in chapter three this source is credited to Augustine.

35 ‘he created an overseer, reminding him to be worried in ecclesiastical instruction.’
The next rubric to appear in both manuscripts occurs at the same place within Lombard’s text, *Quemlibet ulde iustum discutias in hac vita*. The rubric in both manuscripts is a reference to Augustine and a work about John. In BnF MS Latin 17246 the rubric reads *a[u]g super johannem* and the rubric in Cambridge MS B.5.7 reads *augustinus super johannem tractatu 30*. Again, Herbert’s edition appears to add slightly more detail as to the exact placement of the borrowed passages within a given text. They both include the next rubric which refers to Augustine’s *in libro de bono conuigali*. The next rubric appears in both manuscripts and refers to Augustine’s *de uerbis apostoli*. BnF MS Latin 17246 attaches a separate rubric, associating Augustine with *u(er)jati obloqu(e)ndo (ue)l male uiuendo* and then the rubric attached to Augustine’s *de uerbis apostolic* begins at *Cont(ra)dicentes (enim) n(on) uno m(odo) intellig(e)ndi s(un)t*. Cambridge MS B.5.7 places the rubric associated with Augustine’s comments on the apostles at *obloq(uen)do u(e)l male uiuendo*. Herbert’s edition does not appear to differ drastically in its formatting of the rubrics when compared to the eight manuscripts included in the analysis of the marginal rubrics in chapter three. The next few rubrics in BnF MS Latin 17246 do not appear in Herbert’s edition. However, an interesting development is found with a rubric appearing in both manuscripts. In BnF MS Latin 17246 on folio 127v there is a rubric associated with *Si negatio non tantum lingua sit sed et factis* and the rubric denotes a text by Augustine; *fr(ater) ep(isto)la joh(ann)is*. In Cambridge MS B.5.7 the same rubric appears at the same location within the commentary, on folio 126r, but the rubric provides slightly more detail as to Augustine’s text. The rubric reads *fr(ater) epistol(a)s) joh(ann)is s(er)mone III*. In the *PL*, Migne notes that this portion of text is *Augst. super Joannem*. Herbe’t copy provides further detail as to the exact location within Augustine’s text where this passage occurs. This text belongs to Augustine’s third homily on the first letter of John.

Lombard’s commentary on Philemon begins on folio 129r of Cambridge MS B.5.7 and folio 129r in BnF MS Latin 17246. There are only small differences in the presentation of the marginal rubrics in these two manuscripts. The only rubric to include the title of the text, appears in both manuscripts, refers to Augustine’s *de p(er)fictio(ne) iusticie hominis*. The marginal rubrics in Herbert’s edition of Philemon do not provide us with any new information. Portions of Jerome’s text are found in the margins with one example of the text incorporated in the main column of text, on folio 130r (Fig. 5.11). This passage of text is from Jerome’s commentary on Philemon 1:14 and it does not appear in the collation of Philemon demonstrating that it does not appear in the manuscripts included in this study. Therefore, this means that Herbert added further sections from Jerome’s commentary on Philemon.

In addition to the marginal rubrics in Herbert’s manuscripts there are notes in black ink in a smaller hand in the margins which provide the reader with even more information regarding the quote or passage. These notes are biblical cross-references and they have symbols, similar to the system used in identifying the rubrics, and refer to the main biblical text. There are two manuscripts in the Parisian group which also include marginal notations: Angers MS 69 and Mazarine MS 264. The margins in Herbert’s
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36 *PL* 192:389A.
edition are organised by lines into three separate columns (Fig. 5.12). These manuscripts reflect ‘the method of writing the text against the left-hand edge of the column with the gloss actually surrounding it on three sides. This preserved the continuous flow of the gloss, though it required greater planning.’ The attention given to laying out the text in these copies, along with the great lengths Herbert went to in ensuring all misattributions were corrected, demonstrates the amount of planning needed for these copies of Lombard’s text.

The outside columns include passages from borrowed sources as well as biblical cross-references while the middle column is reserved for marginal rubrics. The beginning of Lombard’s commentary to Titus begins on folio 123r of Cambridge MS B.5.7. There is an example of a marginal rubric to Ambrose and there is a passage of text slightly below the rubric and to the right (Fig. 5.13). The passage reads *Jeronimus. Nicopolis ipsa est que ob victoriam augusti quod ibi antonium cleopatramque superauerit nomen acceptit. Ut Jeronimus in explanatione sua.* This passage, belonging to Jerome, includes a symbol above Jerome’s name which corresponds to a symbol within the commentary at *Nicopoli scribit.* A search for this passage in the PL indicates that the source is Jerome’s commentary on Titus. (The passage also occurs in texts related to Titus by Alcuin, Rabanus Maurus and Atto Vercellensis.) This example demonstrates Herbert’s desire to provide a thorough reading of Lombard’s commentary and as Smalley states, ‘Herbert took pains to see that the authors quoted in the commentary were correctly labelled and attached to the right words of the text, as far as he could judge.’ Examples of these blocks of text were discussed in tandem with the drawings of the authorities.

An example of one of the biblical cross-references is beside the passage belonging to Jerome, which was just looked at (Fig. 5.13). There are five separate cross-references, one refers to Jerome, two refer to the book of Psalms and two to Titus. The second reference reads *psalmus cxxxiii super Educens nubes in fine.* This passage refers to Psalm 134. Just below this reference there is another one which refers to Psalm 144 and reads *psalmus cxiii super et uirtutem t(er)ribilu(m).* This reference demonstrates a scribal error in that the scribe wrote ‘cxiii’ instead of ‘cxliii’. Both references are attached to a symbol which corresponds to the following portion of Lombard’s commentary, *Debet enim pontifex habere maternam pietatem.* Psalm 134 verse 7 may be connected to this marginal note, it reads *Educens nubes ab extre mo terrae, fulgura in pluviam fecit; qui producit ventos de thesauris suis.* In the margin the *Educens nu in fine* may actually refer to *Educens nubes* as in the biblical verse. A connection to the second marginal reference to Psalm 144 may be seen with verse 6, *Et uirtutem terribilium tuorum dicent, et magnitudinem tuam narrabant* which includes mention of *uirtutem t(er)ribilu(m).* These examples of biblical cross-references as well as references to other sources, Jerome
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40 PL 26:598C.
42 ‘For the pontiff withholds to have maternal piety.’
43 Douay-Rheims Bible, Psalm 134:7: He bringeth up clouds from the end of the earth: he hath made lightnings for the rain. He bringeth forth winds out of his stores.
44 Douay-Rheims Bible, Psalm 144:6: And they shall speak of the might of thy terrible acts: and shall declare thy greatness.
for example, reinforce Smalley’s claim that Herbert desired to include any borrowed passages or similarities which Lombard had not included in his edition of the commentary.

Herbert’s edition also includes sections of interlinear text added to the main columns of text to join the main biblical text and commentary. Full-page images of folio 123v and folio 124r of Cambridge MS B.5.7 are included in the images section (Figs. 5.6 and 5.14). Folio 123v shows two columns of text which include the main biblical text (in the larger script) and Lombard’s commentary. Folio 124r has the same two columns of the main biblical text and Lombard’s commentary, but there are also additions in a smaller hand to the columns; three different texts are now included in the two columns. These passages are in the same small hand as the cross-references which confirm that the notes in the margins were added at the time when the manuscript was made. An example is found on folio 124r, at the start of Lombard’s commentary to Titus. The text is in a smaller hand than both the main biblical text as well as the commentary (Fig. 5.15). The text is from the first book of Jerome’s commentary on Titus 1:5.45 This addition is part of Herbert’s own edition of Lombard’s text and does not appear in the other manuscripts included in the study. This suggests the possibility that he only obtained Jerome’s commentary at a later stage. Herbert is a rare example within the examples of Lombard’s text seen within this study, where there is evidence of engagement with the text by the person making the text. Knowing about the person who was in charge of producing a copy of Lombard’s text, in this case Herbert of Bosham, provides further evidence that these books could be made for individuals as well as for communities. As discussed in the introduction, de Hamel illustrates that there is evidence that there was a demand for these finely decorated manuscripts containing Lombard’s commentaries by wealthy, less scholarly individuals.46

This study of Herbert’s edition of Lombard’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles reveals that he added additional material, especially from Jerome’s commentary on Titus and Philemon. The fact that he added more material reflects the fact that his aim had been to produce a complete edition of Lombard’s commentary. The additional material appears in the margins as well as integrated into the two columns of text which combine the main biblical text and commentary. Herbert’s edition also differs to the other manuscripts in the decoration. There are decorated initials at the start of each new verse and corresponding commentary which, along with the large decorated initials at the start to each letter, results in an impressive presentation of Lombard’s text. These manuscripts are unique in their inclusion of drawings of the authorities which work to correct misattributions of sources. These drawings in addition to the material Herbert adds to Lombard’s text demonstrate Herbert’s desire to produce the most correct version of the commentary.

**The Parisian Group**

Although the Parisian group of manuscripts does not include the same amount of decoration or marginal notation as Herbert’s copies, there are examples which demonstrate reader response. An interesting similarity ties Angers MS 69 and Mazarine MS 264 together even though their dates of production are
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nearly a century apart; the end of the twelfth century and the middle of the thirteenth century respectively. They both have notes in the margins which are in black ink and offer biblical cross-references. As discussed earlier, these references provide insight into how these manuscripts were used and are an excellent example of reader response. Cambridge MS B.5.7 also includes biblical cross-references and they appear to be contemporary and are in the same hand as the passages attributed to Jerome and others. The cross-references in Mazarine MS 264 appear to have been written by a contemporary hand but those in Angers MS 69 appear to be a later addition. The ability to see which portions of the commentary were important to the readers of these manuscripts is invaluable to this project. These two manuscripts present these references in a very different manner. In Angers MS 69 the notes are difficult to read while the notes in Mazarine MS 264 are extremely neat and appear to be in the same hand as the rubrics and main text, suggesting that they were part of the initial creation of the manuscript, rather than additions by a later reader. The notes in Mazarine MS 264 are very much in line with the system used in the rubrics where a symbol is placed above the reference in the margin as well as over the passage of Lombard’s text. In Angers MS 69 there are no symbols so it is less clear as to which passage of text the biblical cross-reference is meant for. The two examples taken from the Angers MS 69 and Mazarine MS 264 are from the same portion of the text in order to compare the differences in the layout as well as in the differences in the script of the biblical cross-references. This particular biblical cross-reference does not appear in Herbert’s manuscript containing Titus and Philemon, Cambridge MS B.5.7.

On folio 213v of Angers MS 69 and folio 238r of Mazarine MS 264 there is the same biblical-cross reference to Matthew 23. In Angers MS 69 the reference to Matthew 23 is on folio 213v (Fig. 5.16). The reference is beside this passage of Lombard’s commentary on Titus 1:11: \textit{scribis circuitis mare et aridam ut faciatis unum proselytum}. As the cross-reference provides the chapter number it would be easy for readers to find the appropriate passage in a manuscript containing Matthew. The person who added these notes would have read Lombard’s commentary and acknowledged the connection to Matthew 23, noting it in the margin for future reference. Similarly, Mazarine MS 264 explicitly mentions Matthew 23 in the margin beside the same passage of Lombard’s commentary. Within the commentary there is a symbol above \textit{sicut} which continues with \textit{dominus dicit pharisaeis et scribis circuitis mare et aridam ut faciatis unum proselytum} which refers to Matthew 23 (Fig. 5.17). Although the reference in Angers MS 69 does not place a symbol within the text, both manuscripts are providing references to the same portion of text. This is also demonstrated by the fact that both manuscripts include the same marginal rubric to Augustine’s \textit{Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum}. The exact reference to Matthew is at chapter 23 verse 15.\footnote{Douay-Rheims Bible, Matthew 23:15: \textit{Vae vobis scribae et pharisaei hypocritae, quia circuitis mare, et aridam, ut faciatis unum proselytum, et cum fuerit factus, faciatis eum filium gehennae duplo quam vos.} Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because you go round about the sea and the land to make one proselyte; and when he is made, you make him the child of hell twofold more than yourselves.} Lombard’s commentary references the Pharisees which is clearly a reference to Matthew 23:15. As Lombard’s commentary explicitly mentions the Pharisees well-educated readers may not have needed the reference in order to know that Lombard drew from Matthew 23. However, placing the chapter number in the margins would have been useful.
In Cambridge MS B.5.7 this particular portion of Lombard’s commentary does not include this biblical cross-reference to Matthew. Therefore, it is possible that the cross-reference to Matthew 23 was most likely a thirteenth-century addition. This is possible given that it is contemporary for Mazarine MS 264 and the biblical cross-references in Angers MS 69 appear to be in a thirteenth-century hand. These two manuscripts from the Parisian group demonstrate a thorough understanding of Lombard’s commentary and a desire to provide as much insight into the text as possible. In addition to these examples of biblical cross-references, there are other examples of notes in the manuscripts demonstrating reader response.

Out of the six manuscripts included in the Parisian group, BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 contain the greatest number of notes found on the flyleaves. These notes are in different hands, from different times, illustrating that this copy of Lombard’s text was being read throughout the Middle Ages. In BnF MS Latin 14264 there are several different notes on the flyleaf preceding the first folio. One example appears to be in a thirteenth-century script. Unfortunately, a portion of the paragraph is not legible due to damage to the parchment (Fig. 5.18). The passage as it appears in the manuscript reads as:

Xenodochium est loc(us) uen(eri)ab(i)lis in quo p(er)eg(rini) (suscipiuntur). recoi throphium. Siue thochiu(m) ut nol(it) gda loc(us) uen(eri)ab(i)lis in q(uo) paup(eri)es Siue infirm(i) (homines pasquantur). Nosochomium (est) loc(us) uen(eri)ab(i)lis in q(uo) egroti currant(ur). Orphanot(ro)phium (est) locus (uenerabilis in quo parentibus) orbati puerti pasquant(ur). Gero(n)thochomium (id est) loc(us) uen(eri)ab(i)lis in q(uo) paup(eri)es (et) pr(oper)ter sola senectute(m) infirni homines pasquant(ur) uel curantur. Rephotrophiu(m) (est) loc(us) uen(eri)ab(i)lis in q(uo) infantes aluntur. Arbor balsamum lignum siloballamum d(icitu)r fructus uel semen. Carpobalsamum succus opobalsam.48

The first words of the six phrases are capitalised and read as Xenodochium, Ptochotrophium, Nosochomium, Orphanotrophium, Gerontochomium, Rephotrophium and they each have a corresponding definition. A search in the PL for these terms reveals one work in which this block of text appears and the title of said text is Ludovici et Lotharii capitularia.49 As the text does not appear to have any relation to Lombard’s commentary it was most likely added by a reader who found it important or interesting (as observed in other cases by Clemens and Graham when they note that ‘added notes might be entirely miscellaneous, quite unrelated to the book itself but recording something of special interest to its owner or reader’).50 According to Bernice Kaczynski, these words refer to ‘Greek terms naming charitable institutions in Byzantium.51 Kaczynski continues the explanation; ‘The terms designate specific buildings, and though they have different purposes, all provide for the accommodation of people who are destitute or

48 BnF Latin MS 14266 fly leaf before f. 1r. Note that in the last line the word opobalsum also appears over succus. This portion is compared to how Bernice M. Kaczynski notes it in her article on page 1012. Due to the damage to this page of the manuscript certain words are illegible.

49 PL 97:0371.


otherwise in need.  

The definitions attached to the terms ‘were composed by Julian Antecessor, a Constantinopolitan jurist of the sixth century’ but it must be noted that the definitions as they appear in BnF MS Latin 14266 differ slightly to those in Kaczynski’s article.  

This overview of the terms still does not provide a hint as to why they appear in a twelfth-century Parisian manuscript containing Lombard’s Collectanea when the words do not appear in the Pauline Epistles. This manuscript is not a Latin or Greek glossary so that eliminates that possibility as to why these words appear here. In such an expensive and high-quality manuscript it seems inappropriate for an apparently random portion of text to have been added without any purpose. However, the placement of this text in this manuscript demonstrates that someone who had access to the manuscript was reading the Byzantine text and thought it important enough to inscribe in this particular manuscript. This is interesting as it provides insight into which texts were being read at the Abbey of St. Victor. One important thing to note is that as mentioned earlier, there are seven large initials in this passage and the last line beginning Arbor balsamum does not appear in the manuscripts from which Kaczynski draws his evidence from. In BnF MS Latin 14266 the last line within this paragraph reads Arbor balsamum lignum siloballamum d(octo)r fructus uel semen. Carpobalsamum succus. The word opobalsum also appears over succus. This phrase is found in two texts within the PL however, the texts do not appear to have any connection the Lombard’s commentary and so these words are most likely an example of a reader inscribing them from a text they were reading at the time they came into contact with this particular manuscript.

A third thirteenth-century hand is responsible for one phrase roughly one third from the bottom of the flyleaf in BnF MS Latin 14266 (Fig. 5.19). The phrase reads ‘it is written in the law that Christ is eternal, but in that law is nothing in Malachi and he was made man in the same way.’  

The phrase communicates the idea that Christ is eternal while also becoming man. The phrase does not appear in the PL and a search for the complete phrase in the Vulgate does not yield any results which include the phrase in full. However, lege quia Christus manet in aeternum appears in John 12:34 and manet in aeternum appears repeatedly in the Vulgate. The idea of Christ being eternal also appears in the following three verses, Psalm 116:2, Ecclesiasticus 18:22, and Isaiah 40:8.  

Although Malachi is mentioned in the phrase, this particular wording does not appear in the Vulgate and is not found elsewhere. However, this note is interesting because someone who was in contact with this manuscript thought it important to mention Malachi at the start of a commentary on the Pauline Epistles, and was presumably searching for particular biblical themes.

The last note, in a different hand, reads ogerii de baruda est which Tischler notes is a reference to Ogerius Baruda from the early thirteenth century (Fig. 5. 20).  

Tischler does not provide further details for Ogerius Baruda but he connects it to the Andrew inscription on the same leaf of BnF MS Latin 14266 (Fig. 1.6). However, there is no indication that the two are related when the leaf is looked at as a whole.

Kaczynski, p. 1010.  
Kaczynski, p. 1012.  
sc(r)iptu(s) e(st) in lege q(ue) (Christus) manet in et(er)nu(m) s(ed) i(n) qua lege in n(u)lla nichil [or nis?] in malachia (et) ibi (h)omin(es) fact(us) e(st) in ea (et)c(etera).  
Douay-Rheims Bible.  
Towards the bottom of the page there is a significant number of notes in very faint ink. This page, with an array of hands and various topics which are discussed, suggests that this book was being used in the context of studies on a range of topics. This manuscript has clear signs of use and the discussions expressed on the flyleaf demonstrate the relationships which readers had with this copy of Lombard’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles.

Returning to folio 1r of BnF MS Latin 14266, the next two separate sections of text are similar in the script and they are reminiscent of a secretary script from the beginning of the fifteenth century (as described by Michelle Brown).\(^{57}\) The first phrase which is roughly in the middle of the folio reads *argumentum* est opus parum p(re)missum in quo tota materia subsequentis op(er)is p(rel)ibatur (Fig. 5.21).\(^{58}\) This line of text appears in Hugh of Pisa’s *Magnae Derivationes* which is interesting as this text was written in the twelfth century and its placement in this manuscript illustrates that the person who wrote this note was either familiar with this text or had a copy which they were reading alongside BnF MS Latin 14266. And taking into account when this note was added to the manuscript, possibly the fifteenth century due to the particular secretary script, it may be an indication that this text by Hugh of Pisa was still studied or referred to during that period. The third portion of text is also difficult to read, but it is a note on the contents and structure of the work (Fig. 5.22).\(^{59}\) Figures 5.21 and 5.22 appear to be in the same hand as the way some “s” are at the end of words are similar in both examples of text. The “s” looks like an uppercase “B”. On folio 2v of BnF MS Latin 14267 there is another note that appears to be the same hand as 5.21 and 5.22. The paragraph lists the contents of the second volume; Lombard’s commentary on Galatians through to Hebrews (Fig. 5.23). All of these notes demonstrate that BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 was used into the later middle ages. Even though these two volumes include a tremendous amount of fine artwork, these notes suggest that the text in this copy was being read in the context of theological study.

All the elements of these manuscripts, the text and decoration, provide insight into reader response as none of the copies are exactly alike and so, none of the readers of these manuscripts would have had the exact same experience with Lombard’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles. Herbert Bosham’s editions of Lombard’s commentary clearly reflect his desire to provide readers with the most accurate version of the text. The fact that we know so much about Herbert and these copies of the *Collectanea* provides evidence that it was possible for individuals to own such manuscripts. The look at the marginalia in Angers MS 69 and Mazarine MS 264 emphasises different reading practices in the thirteenth century. When compared to the other manuscripts in the study which do not include additional marginalia, it is clear that readers would not have had the same experience with Lombard’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles. It appears that some copies would have been better for study than others. The copies which include a greater number of marginal rubrics demonstrate a thorough reading of the text by the individuals making them. Given that these manuscripts would have been copied from exemplars, there was evidently demand for both kinds of manuscripts containing Lombard’s text; those which include a large amount of marginalia, and those


\(^{58}\) An argument is a small work. In what way all of the material...

\(^{59}\) *Que primis hii habentur [?]. Epistola Pauli ad Romans, et dae eiusdem ad Corinthis, de glosatura magistri Petri Lumbardi quondam parisiensis episcopus, cuius libri epistole ad Romanos [...] sextum decimum [...] prime ad Corinthios capitulum secundum [...] Eiusdem capitulum sextum decimum [...]*
without marginalia. Mazarine MS 266 does not include much marginalia but it does include historiated initials, which are another way a reader could interact with the text. Again, de Hamel’s comments about wealthy patrons requesting copies of this text including fine artwork and the biblical text demonstrates that not everyone who read Lombard’s text were interested in tracking down all of the sources which he borrowed from. The fact that these differences between the manuscripts exist emphasises the fact that although the text does not change in copies of Lombard’s Collectanea, readers using copies of the text with marginalia would have had the advantage in better understanding the full extent of the content.
Conclusion

This research project provides an analysis of Peter Lombard’s *Collectanea* as it appears in a selection of manuscripts which are all believed to have been made in Paris. The main group of manuscripts have dates of production ranging from the late twelfth century to the middle of the thirteenth century. Initially, over sixty manuscripts containing Lombard’s commentary to the Pauline Epistles were identified which emphasises how popular Lombard’s *Collectanea* was in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The group was narrowed down and six manuscripts were chosen as the core of the study in order to be able to provide a thorough analysis of the text as well as any other forms of engagement. In addition to the decision to narrow down the group of manuscripts, and given the length of Lombard’s commentary, the project only focuses on the epistles to Titus and Philemon. These two epistles were chosen due to the fact that they are the two shortest epistles which would ensure the completion of a detailed analysis. A significant amount of the existing scholarship on the *Collectanea* focuses on the other epistles, especially Romans, and therefore this study provides new information regarding Lombard’s commentary to Titus and Philemon. Although there is a substantial amount of scholarship on Peter Lombard and his works, and although many of these sources make note of the authorities from whom Lombard borrowed, the manuscripts only tell the reader of the main patristic authors. Even if the reader was not aware of the other authors from whom Lombard borrowed, it still matters as it helps to understand the composition of Lombard’s text. Even if a reader did not realise that a passage of Lombard’s text had been taken from another text, they were still taking in the material. Although there is extensive existing scholarship on Lombard and his works, including many manuscripts including his texts, this particular research study incorporates various elements in order to produce a multidisciplinary study.

The first chapter looked at the script and style of artwork of each manuscript in order to establish their probable Parisian origins. However, it is important to keep in mind that it is not always possible to know where things were made. It is therefore necessary to go with the best evidence in order to determine a likely place of production. In addition to stylistic analysis, the additional information found on the flyleaves and innermost folia of each manuscript helps to establish previous ownership. BnF MSS 14266 and 14267 as well as Troyes MS 175 were already known to have connections to Paris in existing scholarship, but on the basis of the combination of stylistic and provenance evidence, this chapter established a probable Parisian origin for a group of six copies of Lombard’s text made in the course of the century after his death. As Paris was a major centre of theological teaching and study in this period, and was the place where Lombard produced his work, it is not surprising that it continued to be copied there in significant numbers. The variations in these manuscripts testify both to changes in fashions in manuscript production over time, and specific choices made by patrons. The similarities and differences between these manuscripts thus provide a foundation for an exploration of possible responses to Lombard’s work.

The second chapter focused on the physical form of the manuscripts. This chapter illustrated the difference in layout of the twelfth-century manuscripts to those made in the thirteenth century. Although the earliest copyists experimented with layout, the later manuscripts are very similar in that all include a layout which had become standard by the early thirteenth century. This particular layout places the biblical text and the commentary into two columns with the main biblical text in a larger script. One of the major factors
in the development of the layout was the decision, at some point in the twelfth century to include the biblical text as well as Lombard’s commentary. Similarly, chapter three demonstrated that the text of the commentary does not change drastically in these copies of Lombard’s work. This is further proof as to how standardised the text had become by the thirteenth century once the text became very popular, but makes the different choices about other aspects of the manuscripts all the more striking.

The major findings of this study include that, as a group, these manuscripts illustrate that there was a standard layout of Lombard’s text in the thirteenth century. However, these manuscripts also tell us that a reader would interpret the commentary in BnF MSS 14266 and 14267 differently than if they were to read Mazarine MS 264. Although the layout and commentary text are remarkably standardised in the thirteenth-century copies, the marginal annotations and decoration varies greatly. BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267, the two-volume copy of Lombard’s commentary which was once at the Abbey of St. Victor in Paris, would have been afforded a large budget given the extremely elaborate decorated initials and the use of gilding on most of the initials. The fact that certain manuscripts containing the Collectanea were elaborately decorated opens the discussion as to why. The investment of resources into any manuscript can be read as an expression of the wealth of the patron, but also of the importance of the text, testifying to the recognition of the value of Lombard’s work, even in the era in which the Sentences was accused of heresy. This introduces the idea of audiences who may not have been as educated but, depending on the decoration, could still enjoy and interpret the text, although this seems unlikely as a primary motivation in the context of this work of advanced theology.

The rich decoration in BnF MSS 14266 and 14267 would communicate with the reader that this text is important and valued. The details of the decorated initials, for example the image of Peter Lombard and Paul, would make the reader aware of how important Peter Lombard was. However, if the same reader were to look at Mazarine MS 264, they would not have any such sense of Peter Lombard. They would see fourteen depictions of Paul with a sword or book. Presumably the manuscripts with narrative imagery were also meant to instruct readers through the decoration as well as through the text. Here the different choices made in the manuscripts offer further commentary on the text. Only BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 draw attention to Peter Lombard. Instead, most of the imagery finds parallels in contemporary Bibles, with repeated images of Paul. Amongst these copies Mazarine MS 266 stands out for its extensive cycle of the life of St. Paul, rooting the commentary in the context of Paul’s personal history. If the decorated initials included in Mazarine MS 266 are isolated from the text some of the most significant moments in Paul’s life can be understood.

In addition to the different choices made in the decoration of the books, which were presumably the result of the ideas of both patrons and artists, the six manuscripts contain very different marginal annotations. Three earlier copies of the text allow us to trace the development of the rubrics identifying particular sources. The marginal rubrics as they appear in the manuscripts have been assembled into two separate tables for each epistle which are crucial to the overall study as they provide a visual description of the layout and content of Lombard’s text. These tables effectively demonstrate that although the text is the same in these manuscripts, the marginalia differ greatly. The first table reflects the rubrics found in the text and it becomes clear which sections of the text Lombard wanted to highlight. The second table for each
epistle presents the content of the marginal rubrics which illustrates some of the sources which are included in the text. These tables contribute new findings to the existing scholarship on Lombard’s *Collectanea* and provide scholars of Peter Lombard with a visual representation of where the rubrics occur within the commentary to Titus and Philemon. As the tables list the manuscripts by their respective dates of production, the development of rubrics through the thirteenth century in these manuscripts is immediately noticeable. The major findings are the general decline in the use of rubrics in later copies, and the decision to identify only three patristic sources: Augustine, Ambrose and Jerome. Amongst these, Augustine’s works are generally identified with greater precision than those of the others. In addition, it seems very likely that the marginal rubrics were included in Lombard’s original work.

Although previous scholarship has emphasised Lombard’s use of the *Glossa Ordinaria*, this research has shown that seventy-five percent of Lombard’s commentary to Titus and Philemon is not found in the *Gloss*. A twelfth-century copy of the *Gloss* to the Pauline Epistles, BnF MS Latin 14409 was used in the comparison to BnF MS Latin 14267, a copy of Lombard’s commentary, to demonstrate the limits of his debt to this source. This helps to explain why Lombard’s text was so popular: it provided a greatly expanded commentary, in keeping with its medieval description as the *Magna Glossatura*. In creating his work, Lombard drew on other twelfth-century sources, as well as patristic texts, which makes the decision to identify only three patristic authors all the more striking.

The final chapter brings together the elements from the previous chapters in order to discuss reader response. The chapter revolves around Herbert of Bosham who had studied under Peter Lombard in Paris and was responsible for editing the *Collectanea* after Lombard’s death as well as for the creation of four copies of Lombard’s commentaries on the Psalms and the Pauline Epistles. Those which include the commentary on the Pauline Epistles are at the core of this chapter, Cambridge, Trinity College MSS B.5.6 and B.5.7. These copies are compared to the six Parisian copies. The rest of the chapter provides a comparison between the biblical cross-references in two manuscripts; Angers MS 69 and Mazarine MS 264. As only these two manuscripts out of the Parisian group include biblical cross-references, it is evident that the references were not a standard inclusion in these manuscripts. Overall, this chapter demonstrates that Lombard’s text was read throughout the Middle Ages. The notes in various hands in BnF MSS Latin 14266 and 14267 suggest that this particular copy of Lombard’s commentary was being used in theological study.

The other major finding of this study is that the text of Lombard’s commentary to Titus and Philemon in this selection of manuscripts is extremely similar and the only differences are slight word changes and changes in the Latin abbreviations. However, although the text is very similar this fact emphasises how standardised the text had become by the thirteenth century which is important as it demonstrates the desire for copies of Lombard’s text to be produced in large quantities. The largest finding that this study makes is the fact that although the commentary to Titus and Philemon does not change drastically, the number of marginal rubrics in each manuscript differs greatly. This helps to understand the audiences of these particular manuscripts. Copies of Lombard’s commentary with a greater number of marginal rubrics were most likely intended for highly educated people who might be more interested in sources. Academic books today have far more footnotes than popular science books. The variations in the
marginal rubrics demonstrate changes to reading practices as well as to copying practice in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. One reason for the omission of marginal rubrics in later copies of Lombard’s text is probably simply due to laziness in the context of copying a very complex text. However, the changes in the number of marginal rubrics may be due to Lombard’s text becoming more of a standard text to be consulted as an authority, rather than a piece of theology to struggle with. This analysis has established that although the text remained relatively the same in copies from the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, the fact that there are differences in the presentation of the decoration, marginal rubrics and additional material means that readers would have had different experiences reading and interpreting Lombard’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles.

This research has used analysis of Latin, text, art history and knowledge of medieval manuscripts in order to bring a multidisciplinary approach to Lombard’s Collectanea. Some portions of the study were easier than others, but this study attempts to provide scholars of Lombard’s commentary on Titus and Philemon with new findings. This research has added new detailed information on a group of manuscripts to the existing scholarship of Lombard’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles. Descriptions and analysis of the textual and decorative elements of the following manuscripts add to the existing, though limited, scholarship on these particular copies of Lombard’s text; Angers MS 69, Troyes MS 175, Dole MS 27, Mazarine MS 266 and Mazarine MS 264. In addition, the comparison between these manuscripts as well as all of the others discussed in the thesis, those including Lombard’s commentary as well as similar texts, produced a unique comparison of manuscripts.

A significant addition to existing scholarship is the collated version of Lombard’s commentary to Titus and Philemon which is included in the study. This collation provides future scholars of the Collectanea with a visual presentation of the text as it appears in a selection of manuscripts and it opens up the opportunity for the continuation of the complete text to be added to the collation. This study also opens up the possibility for scholars to complete a similar analysis on the remaining twelve Pauline Epistles. Although the thesis provides evidence as to the provenance for the main group of manuscripts, the definite history of production for each manuscript remains unknown. As this thesis provides detailed information for some manuscripts which, until now, had received little attention, it will open up a dialogue with other scholars in order to help establish possible provenance even further.

With the benefit of hindsight, it would have been interesting to broaden the selection of manuscripts even more. As is natural with research, additional manuscripts which provided interesting comparisons were only identified later on in the research which meant they could not be added to the collation of the text or the study of the rubrics. With the knowledge of the existing patterns in the rubrics and layout, broadening the selection of manuscripts would be a good starting point to compare with other manuscripts in order to understand whether these patterns are the result of a regional emphasis or representative of a boarder emphasis, and to establish the relationships between the surviving manuscripts. Given the fact that Lombard used similar texts for his commentaries on the Pauline Epistles and Psalms, as well as the Sentences, it would have been interesting to compare the marginalia and decoration in copies of Lombard’s Sentences and his commentary on the Psalms. Focussing on an additional geographical area of France to compare with the manuscripts which were produced in Paris would offer an interesting
comparison for the layout and decoration and to explore further whether the marginal rubrics would follow the same pattern in terms of the dates of production. Thus this research opens up potential future lines of research on the manuscripts of Peter Lombard’s *Collectanea*, his works more broadly, and the development and use of glossed texts into the thirteenth century.
Appendices

Appendix I – Manuscripts of Peter Lombard’s *Collectanea* from France and England

These manuscripts were collected from several sources including scholarly texts and library catalogues. The amount of detail in each description varies depending on what information was available.

1. Alençon, Bibliothèque municipale MS 95, 12th century.
2. Alençon, Bibliothèque municipale MS 96, end of the 12th century.
3. Amiens, Bibliothèque municipale MS 83, 12th century.
4. Amiens, Bibliothèque municipale MS 85, 12th century.
5. Angers, Bibliothèque municipale MS 69, c. 1160 – c. 1200, 246 folia, 374 x 270 mm.
6. Avignon, Bibliothèque municipale MS 76, fourth quarter of the 12th century.
7. Avranches, Bibliothèque municipale MS 32, second half of the 12th century.
8. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 52, 12th century, 203 folia, 340 x 230 mm.
9. Cambridge, Trinity College MS B.5.6, c. 1170 – c. 1176, 195 folia, 455 x 330 mm.
10. Cambridge, Trinity College MS B.5.7, c. 1170 – c. 1176, 182 folia, 455 x 330 mm.
12. Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale MS 80, c. 1200.
13. Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale MS 81, second half of the 12th century.
14. Dole, Bibliothèque municipale MS 27, second quarter of the 13th century, 242 folia, 374 x 267 mm.
17. Gray, Bibliothèque municipale MS 2, 12th or 13th century.
26. Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine MS 261, 13th century, 380 folia, 340 x 230 mm. This manuscript includes other texts in addition to Lombard’s commentary.

27. Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine MS 262, 12th or 13th century, 210 folia, 339 x 244 mm.

28. Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine MS 263, 12th century, 110 folia, 315 x 223 mm.

29. Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine MS 264, 13th century, 282 folia, 447 x 303 mm.

30. Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine MS 265, late 12th or early 13th century, parchment, 242 folia, 390 x 266 mm.

31. Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine MS 266, c. 1215-1230, 304 folia, 400 x 245 mm.

32. Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine MS 267, early 13th century, 165 folia, 340 x 233 mm. This manuscript begins with Galatians.

33. Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine MS 268, c. 1220 to 1230, 193 folia, 386 x 268 mm.

34. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Latin 648, 12th – 13th century, 355 x 240 mm.

35. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Latin 649, 13th century, 360 x 240 mm.


37. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Latin 659, 13th century, 249 folia, 370 x 280 mm.


40. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Latin 662, 13th century, 257 folia, 345 x 245 mm.

41. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Latin 663, 13th century, 267 folia, 440 x 310 mm.

42. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Latin 664, 13th century, 137 folia, 460 x 315 mm.

43. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Latin 665, 13th – 14th century, 283 folia, 460 x 310 mm.

44. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Latin 668, 13th century, 294 folia, 435 x 295 mm.

45. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Latin 669, 13th century, 277 folia, 440 x 310 mm.

46. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Latin 670, 13th century, 260 folia, 430 x 290 mm

47. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Latin 671, 13th century, 316 folia, 445 x 290 mm.

48. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Latin 672, 13th century, 231 folia, 405 x 285 mm

49. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France MS Latin 14266, c. 1160 – 1180, 190 folia, 390 x 270 mm.

50. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France MS Latin 14267, c. 1160 – 1180, 157 folia, 390 x 270 mm.


52. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France MS Latin 17246, c. 1160, 161 folia, 325 x 245 mm.


54. Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève MS 78, 12th or 13th century.

55. Reims, Bibliothèque municipale MS 156, 13th or 14th century.

56. Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale MS 48, 13th century.

57. Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale MS 79, c. 1200-1250.

58. Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale MS 90, 12th or 13th century.

59. Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale MS 175, early 13th century, 217 folia, 378 x 255 mm.

60. Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale MS 245, early 13th century.

61. Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale MS 389, 12th century.
62. Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale MS 393, 13th century.
63. Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale MS 431, 13th century.
64. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana MS 144, 12th century, 263 folia, 260 x 174 mm.
65. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana MS 695, 12th century, 154 folia, 298 x 205 mm.
66. Vendôme, Bibliothèque municipale MS 21, early 13th century.
67. Vendôme, Bibliothèque municipale MS 24, first half 13th century.
Appendix II – Peter Lombard’s Commentary on Titus

The main purpose of the collation included in Appendices II and III is to establish whether the content of the commentary is essentially the same in the six manuscripts. The initial goal of completing the collation was to discover whether there were any major additions to the commentary within this group of manuscripts. However, once the collation was completed it became clear how standardised the commentary is. Although the commentary is essentially the same in this group of manuscripts as well as in the *Patrologia Latina*, there are variations in the Latin. However, the collation does not aim to discuss the minor differences in the Latin used in the six manuscripts. Instead, the collation presents the commentary as it appears in the six manuscripts in order to demonstrate that although there are variations in the Latin as well as omissions, on the whole, the six manuscripts present the same commentary on Titus and Philemon. The collation provides an introduction to the presentation of the commentary in these six manuscripts and therefore offers future scholars who are interested in the text with a starting point with regard to these particular manuscripts.

A: Angers, Bibliothèque municipale MS 69

B: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France MS Latin 14267

C: Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale MS 175

D: Dole, Bibliothèque municipale MS 27

E: Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine MS 266

F: Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine MS 264

*PL: Patrologia Latina*

This collation uses BnF Latin MS 14267 (B) as its base text. All abbreviations are written out in full in order to present the text clearly. Any variations to the text in the other manuscripts and in the version edited in the *Patrologia Latina* are noted in footnotes.

Paulus seruus Christi et cetera. Hanc epistolam scribit apostolus Tyto quem creauit episcopum monens eum fore sollicitum in ecclesiastica disciplina. Tito enim relictus episcopus ex humilitate et ex simplicitate nimis patienti a nichopoli scribit de episcopali officio imperiose et potestatue tractando praecripta ei sua auctoritate utili. Debet enim pontifex habere maternam pietatem et patris severitatem ut sit fortis superbis et suauis modestis ut non habens timoris angulum nec elationis supercilium urat et lucent unde in ueste legalis pontificis erat coccus bistinctus qui habet speciem ignis. Ignis autem duo facit urit et luceat et ita et pontifex gladio praedicationis scilicet ignito eloquio urere debet mordaci reperationem et metuenda conminatione et lucere blandis fouendo et delectabilia promitendo. Ideo de manna dicitur quod

---

1 C, D, E, F: commonens.
2 PL: byssimus.
3 C, D, E, F: habebat.
4 E and F: praedicationis gladio.
5 PL: minatione.
indurabatur ad ignem et liquescebat ad solem et baculus pontificalis ab inferiori pungit et in\textsuperscript{6} summo in anteriors extenditur in se rediens quia ecclesiasticus doctor gladio uerbi pungere debet id est aspere redarguere peccantes quod est ex inferiori natura et correctis in anteriors dirigere ita tamen\textsuperscript{7} ut ad propriam conscientiam sui consideratione redeat si forte in se habeat quae alis anuntiat est igitur intentio apostoli instruere Titum de episcopali officio atque monere\textsuperscript{8} ut id imperiose tractet et haereticos uiet modus talis primo salutat deinde instruct eum de episcopali officio docens eum quid agere debeat et quales episcopos per ciuitates constituere deinde qualiter diuersos uel sexu uel etate uel conditione uiet debet postea\textsuperscript{9} monet eum de uidentis haereticis. Premittit\textsuperscript{10} autem salutationem dicens Paulus nomine seruus conditione non tamen peccati misera seruitute sed dei\textsuperscript{11} quidam nobilitate qualiter moyses et daviui serui sunt appellati et maria ancilla. Apostolus autem Christi iusu quasi dicat humilitas non tollit potestatem et dignitatem apostolus dico secundum fidem electorum dei id est tenens et praedicans fidem quam tenent uel qua saluantur electi dei et ideo magis\textsuperscript{12} laborandum est pro ea\textsuperscript{13} et secundum agnitionem ueritatis quae ueritas est secundum pietatem id est Christi religionem hoc ideo dicit quia est ueritas et\textsuperscript{14} liberalibus artibus sed quae nihil pertinet ad Christianam religionem apostolus Christi sum dico et hoc in spem imitetur id est\textsuperscript{15} per hoc sperans uitam eternam haec est res hic est fructus apostolici officii per hoc commendat officium apostolicum non teipius esse agendum sequitur\textsuperscript{16} quam\textsuperscript{17} uitam eternam dei ante tempora secularia uel eterna quod idem est id est ante omnia tempora promisit. Quodmodo promisit cum nundum essent homines quibus promitteret quia in eius eternitate\textsuperscript{18} et in ipso uero eius comederno iam predestinatione fixum erat. Quod suo tempore futurum erat\textsuperscript{19} promisit ergo ante tempora quia in se eterno sic fixum erat ante quam tempus esset quod cum creaturis cepit non ergo possumus dicere uerum etiam tempus quoniam Deus non dandum aliquid fecerat ideo ait quam\textsuperscript{20} promisit dei\textsuperscript{21} ante tempora secularia quasi dicit\textsuperscript{22} non est recens promissio sed ante tempora omnium seculorum addit qui non mentitur id est qui uerac est per quod certa ostenditur\textsuperscript{23} promissio uite. Que quanto certior est tanto minister debet esse sollicitus. Ut autem certius sit manifestauit suis temporibus id congruis scilicet\textsuperscript{24} uerbum suum id filium haec est uita eterna. Manifestauit dico non solum rei effectu sed etiam in predicacione quae credita est mihi ut fidei cui

\textsuperscript{6} PL: a.
\textsuperscript{7} C omits tamen.
\textsuperscript{8} E omits monere, uses intentione instead.
\textsuperscript{9} B writes Postea monet eum de uidentis haereticis in bottom margin. Most likely forgotten initially and the scribe added it later in the bottom margin due to not having space within the column.
\textsuperscript{10} All mss use premitit while the PL uses praemittit.
\textsuperscript{11} A, C, D underline dei in red as part of the main biblical text but other mss do not.
\textsuperscript{12} All manuscripts include magis after et ideo but the PL does not.
\textsuperscript{13} B is the only manuscript to place pro ea after laborandum.
\textsuperscript{14} D uses cum instead of et.
\textsuperscript{15} A only manuscript to use et instead of id est.
\textsuperscript{16} All manuscripts include sequitur after agendum but the PL does not.
\textsuperscript{17} C, D, E, F have the Q in Quam in a large and coloured initial.
\textsuperscript{18} C only manuscript to have additional text after eternitate: id est eterna uoluntate.
\textsuperscript{19} The phrase quod suo tempore futurum erat is included in all of the manuscripts, with small variations, but it is not found in the PL.
\textsuperscript{20} D omits quam.
\textsuperscript{21} A, C, D, E, F: deus promisit while the PL and manuscript B reverse the words to promisit deus.
\textsuperscript{22} A, E, F omit dicat.
\textsuperscript{23} C ostenditur certa.
\textsuperscript{24} D replaces scilicet with in.
tu o tite comparticipas. Credita est mihi predicatio dico et hoc secundum preceptum saluatoris nostri dei cui in salute hominum minus obedimus si quomodo remittitur. Paulus inquam hanc epistolam scribit tito
directo filio suo secundum communem id est catholicam fidem non priuatam alicuius. Catholicon enim
grece latine dicitur commune uel uniuersale et in scribendo primum salutat in hunc modum. Gratia sit tibi et
pax a deo patre et Christo Iesu saluatore nostro manifesta sunt haec huius rei primo dicit quid agere debeat
et quales ordinare praesbyteros ita incipiens. huius rei gratia reliqui te crete cum inde recederem ut

corrigas mala in peccantibus addendo bonis ea que desunt ad perfectionem et nota quo quod dum hoc recolit
apostolus sicut ei disposemus monent exequi et id est quales constituen dedo xijciat presbyteros. id est episcopos ut
pastoralis curae onus suscitater in multos diuisum. constitueas dico sicut ego tibi disposemus id est quales constituen
dico quales ordinare praesbyteros sicut ego tibi disposemus id est quales constituen
dicte cum inde recederem ut

sine crime id est sine peccato criminali uel infamia criminali. si dixisset sine peccato nullus in ecclesia
rectus posset ordinari minister. multi enim baptizati fideles sunt sine crime. sine peccato uero in hac
uita neminem dixerim non quia peccati alicuius remaneat quod in baptismate non dimittatur sed quia in
nobis in huius uitae infirmitate manentibus cotidie fieri non quiescunt quae fideliter orantibus cotidie
remittantur. quemlibet ualde iustum discutias in hac uita quamuis. iam sit dignus iusti uocabulo non est
tamen sine peccato unde iohannes si dixerimus quia peccatum non habemus nos ipsi seducimus et ueritas
in nobis non est. sed plane multi iusti dicti sunt sine querela quod intelligitur sine criminal. nulla enim
querela iusta est de his qui non habent crimen. Crimen ergo est querela id est graue peccatum
accusatione et damnatione dignissimum ut homicidium adulterium aliqua immunditia fornicationis furtum
ira et huius modi. quae cum ceperit homo non habere incipit caput eriger in libertatem sed ista
inqua saeculorum uel quae ante fuerant obsunt. huic sententiae augustinus contradicit his uerbis. Acetius
intelligunt qui nec eum qui cathecuminus uel paganus habuerit alteram ordinandum esse censuerunt quia de
sacramento agitur non de peccato nam in baptismismo omnia peccata dimittuntur et qui dixit si nuper est uirgo

non peccat satis declaruit nuptias non esse peccatum propter sacramenti autem sanctitatem sicut femina etiam si cathaecumina uiciata fuerit non potest post baptismum inter dei uirginies consecrari. ita non absurde uisum est digamum non peccasse sed normam quandam sacramenti amissse non ad utiae bonae meritum sed ad ordinationis ecclesiasticae signaculum neccssarium et sicut plures antiquorum patrum uxores significauerunt futuras ex omnibus gentibus ecclesias uni uiro subditas. id est Christo ita noster antistes id est episcopus unius uxoris uir significat ex omnibus gentibus unitatem uni uiro subditam id est Christo. itaque sicut duobus pluribusue dominis seruire sic ab uno uiro in alterius transire conubium non licet quia apostatare ab uno deo et ire in alterius adulteriam superstitionem semper est malum. ideo ait unius uxoris uir in quo spes continentiae est et sacramentum. sequitur filios habens fideles id est sane fidei non in accusacione luxuriae aut non subditos id est nec saltem de luxuria accusatos uel sibi non subditos. Alioquin nec spes est in eo corrigendi alios nec frontem habet ad alios talium cohabitator. Oportet enim quasi talis debet constitui episcopus oportet enim id est necesse est ad tractationem officii episcopum esse sine crimine id est irreprehensibilem sicut dispensatorem dei cum dicit episcopum aperte ostendit presbyterorum nomine episcopos supra fuisse designatos sequitur non superbum non iracundum non percusseorum id est non aliorum mentes aliter quam oportet loquendo percutientem uel ad litteram non ferocem non crudelem non cupidum lucri sed hospitalem benignum iustum sobrium proximo sanctum deo continentem se ab illicitis id est ab ira superbia.

A, D, E, F: reverse the order to peccata omnia.
46 D: reverses order to esse non.
47 C: uinciata. In the PL: uitiata.
48 C: omits dei.
49 C: uirgine.
50 B: digamum.
A: looks as though it was originally a D but was changed to a B.
A, C, E, F: bigamum.
D: omits it.
51 All mss: normam. In the PL: formam.
52 C: omits sacramenti.
53 F: omits meritum.
54 F: omits sed.
55 C: omits ad.
56 All mss: ordinationis.
PL: ordinis.
57 C: si cum.
58 D: uni uiro subditas ecclesias.
59 A, C, D: a uiuo uiro.
60 C: omits transire.
61 E: cognubium.
62 D: includes et before quia.
63 A: supersticionem.
64 E: sequitur si.
65 D, E: omitt in.
66 D: saltum.
67 C: alioquim.
68 C, D and the PL: irreprehensibilem.
69 A, C, D, E, F and the PL: dei dispensatorem.
70 D: repeats aperte ostendit twice.
71 F: adds non uinolentum.
72 D: omits non percussorem which is part of the main biblical text.
et ceteris amplectentem amore eum sermonem qui est secundum doctrinam fidelem id est ueracern ita haec habeat ut potens sit ut ait et scientia exhortari scientes in doctrina su et redarguere eos qui contradicunt uritati obliquando uel male uiuendo. contradicentes enim non uno modo intelligendi sunt paucissimi quippe no contradicunt loquendo sed multi male uiuendo. Quis enim audet apertissime loquendo contradicere uritati non contradicunt multi lingua sed uita quos redarguere magnum opus est grandis sarcina cluis arduus sunt enim quasi bene dixi eos qui contradicunt sunt enim increta multi et inobedientes in se et uaniloqui ad alios et seductores circuimentionibus et cuiuscunque generis fraudibus et maxime quia de circumcisicione sunt id est de iudeis qui sub nomine Christi iudaizare docebant renati enim in Christo non puri erant Christianiquia parum legem parum christum uenerari uolebant de quibus subdit quos oportet redargui ideo quia ipsi sunt qui subuertunt uniuersas domos id est totam familiam docentes quae non oportet et hoc faciunt gratia turpis lucri scilicet terrenae rei id est pro terrenis acquirendis uel gratia turpis lucru id est ut faciant proselitos sicut dominus dicit phariseis et scribis circuitis mare et aridam ut faciatis unum proselitum. Dixit quasi uere tales sunt sicut dixit quidam ex illis qui eos nouerat. Iste fuit epigmenides cretensis in cuius libris hoc inuenitur nec eius prophetia ad illa eloquia dei pertinet quae iudeis sunt credita et ideo nomen eius non commemorauit apostolus sicut solet commemorare prophetas dei dicens sicut et dauid dicit uel ysaias vel tacitis nominibus illorum dicit sicut scriptum est et ea scriptura intelligitur in qua est auctoritas dei. homo autem in eruditus canis rabiosus veritati oblatrans ausus est dicere istum de prophetis iudeorum fuisse de quo ait apostolus. dixit quidam ex illis proprius qui uerum dixit etsi poeta esset propheta dico illorum non dei et proprius illorum quia eorum naturam bene aperuit. Quod utique ad hoc dictum est ne dei propheta putaretur non ergo iudaeorum sed

---

73 D: adds id est here.
74 PL: sana / B: su / A: sua but sana written above it at some point / C, D, E, F: sua.
75 F: omits uno.
76 D: replaces enim with autem.
77 C: repeats lingua after sed, most likely a mistake.
78 A, B: magnus opus / C: bonus opus / D, E, F: bonum opus.
79 All mss: dixi / PL: dixit.
80 All mss: increta / PL: incerti.
81 PL: ad altos / E: correction seen in that originally ad illos alios but illos has, at some point, been crossed out.
82 C, D: omit et.
83 B: only ms to use parum not partim / PL also uses partim.
84 C: omits subdit.
85 D: domos uniueras.
86 F: two dots above docentes refer to note in margin which reads: quia dicunt legalia absuanda esse cum euangelio.
87 A, C, D: omit id est.
88 C: lucris.
89 F: note in margin reads cretenses super mendaces.
90 B: three dots above nec refer to a phrase in the bottom margin which is in a v shape. Most likely an example of a scribe forgetting to add a few words and so is forced to include it in the margin. The phrase is in the same had: Inuenitur qui homo inter prophetas non. E omits this phrase.
91 F: biblical cross reference to Romans is attached to credita, in margin: ro III. Primum quid quia credita sunt illi eloquia dei.
92 D: replaces illorum with eorum.
93 F: symbol above eruditus with the following in the margin: id est faustus qui prophetas respuebat.
94 PL: omits uritati oblatrans.
95 E: illorum quia eorum naturam bene aperuit appears as an added note in the margin.
96 D: apparuit.
cretensium proprius erat propheta qui dixit cretenses semper sunt mendaces et malae bestiae. sanguinem sitientes et uentres pigri id est gulosi et ideo pigri et ne minus credas ei quia gentilis erat eius uerba commendat apostolus dicens testimonium hoc uerum est sciendum quod licet dixit qui dixit cretenses semper sunt mendaces et malae bestiae.

sanguinem sitientes et uentres pigri id est gulosi et ideo pigri et ne minus credas ei quia gentilis erat eius uerba commendat apostolus dicens testimonium hoc uerum est sciendum quod licet dixit qui dixit cretenses semper sunt mendaces et malae bestiae.

Quod uidetur / E: complete phrase in margin (note uidetur spelling). Quod uitque ad hoc dictum est ne dei propheta uidetur in margin.

E: omits non ergo iudaorum sed cretensium proprius erat but it appears in the margin.

D: omits sunt.

A, C, D: prefices sanguinem with sed / E, F: prefices sanguinem with quia.

E: sciens / F: biblical cross reference in margin: licitum est auctoritas sa scriptus actus id est homines quam bona auctoritate loquant.

A: places licet after auctoritate.

F: auctoritate.

E: ait dei do(minus).

A: in margin beside illo uiuimus is the following biblical cross-reference, XVII actus.

C: omits secundum.

F: bos.

F: biblical cross-reference in margin reads quam constituerunt atheniensis acceb ne tenebrarum in crucifiscime domine quoniam dyonisius ariopagita dixit deum in muisse nature pati ante elementa mentiri.

A: quas.

All mss except for B include a de after est.

C, E, F: cumque.

All mss except for B: necessarium, C has one ‘c’ while others have two.

A, C, D, E, F: scripta.

F: note in margin attached to accipienda, ibi enim quedam sunt in honesta.

F: symbol above lege found in margin refers to biblical cross-reference, deut. XXI.

B: pilis appears above unques in a different hand and ink.

C: et instead of atque.

D: omits purum but there is a blank space there as if it was erased / F: symbol above purum attached to note in margin: ….uitus plicidis abst…bonis / A: originally parum but the A changed to a U in darker ink.

A: originally had quam ad causam but a line is through ad and ob is written above it in darker ink.


A: sunt.

E: omits id est.

E: sunt forgotten but added into margin.

E: replaces uel with id est.

A: auertentium.

A: oponitur.
interiora uerborum legis colorem secuntur non saporem. putant enim nunquam\textsuperscript{127} recedendum esse ab his\textsuperscript{128} que\textsuperscript{129} moyes tradidit ut puta de escarum differentia. unde subdit omnia enim quasi dicat uere auertunt se a ueritate quia omnia humanis usibus\textsuperscript{130} concessa munda sunt mundis scilicet illis qui fide bona sumunt et iusti sunt quod ipsi negant ideo quia in lege quedam moyes prohibuit et ab immundis munda discreuit\textsuperscript{131}. hoc autem\textsuperscript{132} non secundum naturas quas deus creaut intellegi uoluit sed secundum significationes. omnia ergo munda sunt mundis secundum naturam\textsuperscript{133} in qua creatu sunt unde in genesi uidit deus\textsuperscript{134} cuncta que fecerat et erant ualde bona secundum significationes tamen quedam immunda sunt iudeis nec nobis omnia apta sunt uel propter salutem corporum uel propter consuetudinem humanae societatis. Cum ergo sua cuique redduntur et naturalem ordinem seruant omnia munda sunt mundis constantinatis autem per peccata et infidelibus scilicet qui non credunt in deo uel deum. nichil mundum est quia non sunt digni donis dei sed et mens id est\textsuperscript{135} intellectus et conscientia eorum inquinatae sunt. Quasi dicat non ex cibo est inquinatio eorum sed ex malo intellectu et conscientia peccatorum. et uere mens er conscientia eorum inquinatae sunt quia confitentur quidem uerbis se nosse deum factis autem negant ut enim johannes ait. Qui dicit se nosse deum et mandata eius non custodit mendax est\textsuperscript{136} si negatio non tantum lingua sit sed et factis certe multos inuenimus antichristos qui ore confitentur christum et moribus dissentiant ab eo. Quisquis factus negat\textsuperscript{137} christum antichristus est. Tales sunt omnes\textsuperscript{138} mali catholici qui non uerbis sed factis negant. Nolite ergo esse tanquam de fide securi adiungite fidei recte uitam rectam ut christum confiteamini et fidei uerba dicendo et factis bene uiuendo. nam si confitemini uerbis\textsuperscript{139} et non factis fides talium morum prope fides est\textsuperscript{140} demoniorum\textsuperscript{141}. Cum sint quasi dicat confitentur se nosse deum cum tamen sint abominabiles id est deo odibiles et incredibiles id est nec habiles\textsuperscript{142} credere\textsuperscript{143} et ad omne opus bonum reprobati id est a deo reprobati ut non habeant gratiam\textsuperscript{144}. Tu\textsuperscript{145} autem quasi dicat illi docent quod non oportet tu autem loquere ea quae decent sanam doctrinam id est doctrinam sanae fidei. haec sunt quae ad bonos mores pertinent scilicet hortare senes\textsuperscript{146} ut sobrii sint pudici ne luxurient prudentes prouidentes fidei neecessaria. sani in fide scilicet

\begin{footnotes}
\item[127] A, B, F: nunquam / C, D, E: numquam.
\item[128] A, B: his / C, D, F: hiis / E: hys.
\item[129] C: quem.
\item[130] D: omits usibus.
\item[131] All mss: discreuit / PL: discernit.
\item[132] A: biblical cross reference.
\item[133] A: adds unde after naturam.
\item[134] F: marginal note.
\item[135] C, E: omit id est.
\item[136] E: est initially omitted but added after completion of column of text.
\item[137] A: biblical cross reference in margin, J ad titum.
\item[138] A: quiquis factus negat christum antichristus est tales sunt omnes written in the margin, presumably forgotten and added afterwards. Note as well that the ink is a different shade than the main commentary.
\item[139] D: omits et.
\item[140] E: after uerbis there is uera docen but it is crossed out with a red line.
\item[141] A: prope fides est is in a different ink, see note 137.
\item[142] F: biblical cross-references in margin.
\item[143] 143 id est deo odibiles et incredibiles id est nec habiles\textsuperscript{144} credere\textsuperscript{145} et ad omne opus bonum reprobati id est a deo reprobati ut non habeant gratiam\textsuperscript{146}. Tu\textsuperscript{147} autem quasi dicat illi docent quod non oportet tu autem loquere ea quae decent sanam doctrinam id est doctrinam sanae fidei. haec sunt quae ad bonos mores pertinent scilicet hortare senes\textsuperscript{148} ut sobrii sint pudici ne luxurient prudentes prouidentes fidei neecessaria. sani in fide scilicet
\item[144] C, D, E, F: abominabiles.
\item[145] A, C: abiles.
\item[146] D: after credere there is abeo but it has a black line drawn through it.
\item[147] A, C, D, E, F and the PL: after gratiam, ad bene operandum.
\item[148] B, C, D, E, F: use a larger script for the T which coincides with the Tu in the main biblical text also beginning with a coloured initial.
\end{footnotes}
ut habeant integram fidem similiter ut sint\textsuperscript{149} sani\textsuperscript{150} in dilectione dei et proximi et in ordine ipso caritatis et sint sani in patientia temptationum\textsuperscript{151} et tribulationum hortare etiam anus similiter esse in habitu sancto ut scilicet earum incessus motus uultus sermo praeferant sanctitatem. non criminatrices id est crimina aliiis imponentes\textsuperscript{152} quod solent facere adolescentulis non multo uino servientes solent enim\textsuperscript{153} esse quaedam quae corporis frigescente luxuria uino se pro libidine dederunt. bene\textsuperscript{154} docentes non\textsuperscript{155} quidem publice uiros sed priuate adolescentulas ita tamen ut doceant ipsas adolescentulas prudentiam ut amant uiros suos uel ita distingue. bene docentes ita ut prudentiam doceant hic distingue deinde sequitur adolescentulas hortare ut uiros suos quos carnali affectu naturaliter diligunt ament etiam\textsuperscript{156} pudica dilectione ut scilicet cum pudore uiris debitum potius reddant quam\textsuperscript{157} exigant et filios suos diligant non modo carnali sed etiam spirituali amore doceant eam etiam\textsuperscript{158} esse prudentes mentis intelligentia. castas corporis continet sobrias in cibo\textsuperscript{159} et potu domus suae curam habentes benignas subiectas uiris suis ut non diuitiis uel nobilitate\textsuperscript{160} perflatae uiris suis imperare\textsuperscript{161} desiderent. subiecte sint uiiris suis dico ita ut uerbum dei id est doctrina euangelica non blasphemetur\textsuperscript{162} si habent uiros infideles quibis propensius propter timorem dei obsequi debent et conglobare ut hoc uidentes non blasphemant\textsuperscript{163} nomen dei et id est doctrina euangelica qui prophani sunt\textsuperscript{171} inmici fidei erubescant uidentes quia quae docent\textsuperscript{172} pravam non curant sed etiam fortres et pingues necant.

\textsuperscript{149} D: sunt.
\textsuperscript{150} C, E, F: sani sunt.
\textsuperscript{151} PL: tentationum.
\textsuperscript{152} D: imponentes
\textsuperscript{153} C: adds etiam after enim.
\textsuperscript{154} D, E, F: large initial for the B in Bene.
\textsuperscript{155} D: places non after quidem.
\textsuperscript{156} F: places an i after ament rather than etiam.
\textsuperscript{157} E: a line is drawn through quam.
\textsuperscript{158} A, C, D, E, F: places etiam after doceant.
\textsuperscript{159} A: cybo.
\textsuperscript{160} F: note in margin, quedam est quia nobiles sunt desposuit ros suos.
\textsuperscript{161} D: imperare.
\textsuperscript{162} F: biblical cross-reference, ro ii dei blaspematur per nobis m gentes
\textsuperscript{163} C: blasphemetur.
\textsuperscript{164} A, B, E, F: after si male: se habent / D: after si male: habent.
\textsuperscript{165} D: dolet placed after modum.
\textsuperscript{166} C, E: immo / D, F: imo has a symbol above it presumably to note that imo is a shortened form of imo.
\textsuperscript{167} F: biblical cross-reference in margin; Ys (Ysaia) XLVIII laude mea infrenalute ne inter eas.
\textsuperscript{168} E: formam follows esse.
\textsuperscript{169} D: in omnibus is omitted.
\textsuperscript{170} A: hi.
\textsuperscript{171} A, C, D, E: et after sunt.
\textsuperscript{172} C: docent.
\textsuperscript{173} F: biblical cross-reference in margin; actus xx malis pastores non parcunt onibus.
\textsuperscript{174} A: non parcunt in black ink opposed to the lighter, slightly brown ink used throughout the commentary.
quantum in ipsis est et si ille uiunt de misericordia dei uiunt tamen quantum ad pastores malos pertinet occidunt. Quomodo male uiuendo male uiuentem oculos a regulis domini declinantem et in hominem intendentem incipit dicere apud se. si praepositus meus sic uiuit ego qui sum qui non faciam quod ille facit. Omnis ergo qui male uiuit in conspectu eorum quibus praepositus est quantum in ipso est occidit eos ideo seruo dei eminenti in membris summis pastoris dictum est in omnibus praebitis teipsimum exemplum bonorum operum scilicet in doctrina recta in integritate uite et corporis in grauitate ne leuis sis. sed autenticus et uerbum tuum sit sanum et irreprehensibile quod non ualeat reprehendi loco dictum et tempore ut is qui ex aduerso est id est qui nobis contrarius est uincatur uel uereatur nichil habens malum dicere de nobis seruos etiam hortare subditos esse dominis suis quibus etiam hortare omnes praedictos ut ita se habeant ut praescriptum est ut ita ornent in omnibus actionibus suis doctrinam salvatoris domini nostri bonis operibus et fide doctrinam dicit ornari.
dominicanum ornamentum enim doctoris uel pastoris est honesta uita discipuli. Apparuit enim quasi dicat omnes m onendi sunt ut ornent quia omnibus natus est christus nullum exclusit et hoc est quod ait apparuit enim per carmem gratia dei et saluatoris nostri id est deus et saluator noster scilicet dei filius et si inuisibilis sit in forma dei tamen per gratiam apparuit in forma serui. et omnibus hominibus hoc id est ad utilitatem omnis generis hominum sine quo non profuisset nobis nasci erudiens nos exemplo uita et doctrina in quo eum sequi debes scilicet ut erudias. erudiens nos dico ad hoc ut nos abnegantes id est fugientes impietatem uane culturae et ignorantiam et desideria secularum quae a mundi huius principe subgeruntur sobrie in nobis et iuste ad proximum et pie ad deum uiuamus in hoc seculo tam fragili nos dico. expectantes ut certi et solliciti beatam spem id est gloriam aeternam et aduentum uel manifestationem glorie magni dei et saluatoris nostri iesu christi qui non in infirmitate ut prius sed in gloria et potestate ueniet praemia daturus secundum merita qui in primo audentu ad eo humilis fuit quod non solum erudiuit sed dedit dico ad hoc ut redimeret nos per sanguinem ab omni iniquitate tam originali quam actuali et mundaret in baptismo a culpa et pena populum sibi acceptabilem uel peculiarem id est proprium sectatorem bonorum operum. Ad hoc redemit nos christus ut puram uitam sectantes et repleti operibus bonis regni dei heredes esse possimus. hec loquere nescientibus et exhortare scientes et argue neglientes uel rebelles et hoc cum omni imperio id est potestate quia iam non aspere hoc accipitur cum pro
salute fieri sciatur ita cum imperio ut nemo contemmat pro simplicitate. ammone quasi dicat et si tu habes imperium spirituali tamen amone illos subditos esse principibus scilicet regibus et ducibus et potestatibus minoribus et obedire dicto illorum non quidem ad malum sed admine paratos esse ad omne opus bonum id est obedere illis in dominio et admine neminem blasphemare et si premuntur ab illis. Quasi dicat admine ut ad malum tardi sint et ad bonum parati scientes quid singulis persolui oporteat quia singulis paratur merces. non litigiosos esse sed modestos omnem mansuetudinem ostendentes ad omnes homines bonos uel malos christianos omnibus hominibus humiles uult uideri. sic enim possunt perfici ad futuram spem uocari. Eramus enim quasi dicat hoc ideo debemus quia et nos aliquando fuimus quod ipsi sic et ipsi poterunt esse quod nos sumus per eandem gratiam et hoc est quod ait. Eramus enim et nos aliquando insipientes et si philosophi essent quidam nostrum tamen sapientia carebant et eramus incredui errantes per mala et seruenties desiderii animi et uoluptatibus carnis uaria agentes uitam nostram in malitia id est in mala nocendi uoluntate et invidia de aliorum successibus et si nocere non licuit odibiles deo et aliis hominibus et inuicem odientes alios. Cum autem benignitas et humanatus saluatoris nostri dei id est cum benignus et humanatus deus saluator noster appa

---

241 E, F: adds omni after cum.
242 D, E: add te after nemo.
244 D: imperium.
245 A, C, D, E, F: admone.
246 D: omits et.
247 D: omits dicto.
248 E: omits id est.
249 E: another persolui oporteat is written after singulis but it is crossed out.
250 C, D, F: coloured initial E at the start of Eramus / E: coloured initial B, later corrected by placing a small E beside it.
251 E: nos after quasi dicat crossed out.
252 A: et after nos.
253 A: sic et ipsi added afterwards.
254 C: uestram.
255 D: appears after tamen.
256 E, F: opera after mala.
257 D: servientes desiderii et uoluptatibus uera animi carnis. Symbols at desiderii and animi to notify readers of a correction, animi meant to be after desiderii.
258 E: after uitam, etiam nostrum but it is crossed out.
259 A, F: malicia.
260 A: malicia.
261 A: uoluptate.
262 F: biblical cross reference in margin, ro. I detractors deo odibiles. I jo ni qui odet fratrem suum homicida est.
263 A, C: humanitas / E: apparuit follows humanatus.
264 D, E: omits et.
265 F: biblical cross reference in margin, mundo per carneg, lunis per fidem.
266 C: nec.
267 C: omits ex.
268 A, C, D, E, F: hominibus.
269 F: magnam written in margin.
regenerationis\textsuperscript{270} id est per baptismum id est\textsuperscript{271} in quo deposite\textsuperscript{272} uterum homine generatur nouus et
renouationis spiritus sancti quia cotidie magis ac\textsuperscript{274} magis renouamur per spiritum in baptismo datum.
Quem spiritum\textsuperscript{275} scilicet effudit\textsuperscript{276} in nos habunde\textsuperscript{277} scilicet ad remissionem omnium peccatorum et
copiam iuritutum et hoc per iusum christum salutare nostrum ad hoc ut\textsuperscript{278} iustificati gratia ipsius heredes
simus interim in presenti utiae aeternae et hoc secundum spem et si nondum secundum rem. et iste sermo
scilicet quod chritus saluat et heredes fecit est fidelis\textsuperscript{279} id est uerax et de his\textsuperscript{280} praedictis uolo te
confirmare alios ut curent\textsuperscript{281} in operibus bonis prae esse\textsuperscript{283} alius multis qui\textsuperscript{284} credunt deo ut ita uolo te
confirmare\textsuperscript{285} scilicet\textsuperscript{286} eos qui credunt deo ut curent in operibus bonis prae esse\textsuperscript{287} alius multis uel sibi
ipsis. Ideo uolo te de praedictis\textsuperscript{288} confirmare alios quia haec praeucta sunt bona in se et utilia alius
hominibus. Stultus\textsuperscript{289} autem quasi dicat de his\textsuperscript{290} confirma stultas autem quaestiones ubi\textsuperscript{291} nec salus nec
utilis scientia est\textsuperscript{292} et genealogias id est originum enumerationes et contentiones quas de lege\textsuperscript{293} faciunt ut
de cibis quos alii assrent. discernendos alii non et pugnas legis ut quando in emendata scriptura de annis
matusale\textsuperscript{294} uel de huiusmodi alius contraria uel impossibilia\textsuperscript{295} sentire uidetur. deuita sunt enim inutiles id
est sine fructu et uane id est falsae et\textsuperscript{296} non solum haec\textsuperscript{297} de uita sed etiam hereticum hominum post
primam et secundam correctionem id est postquam bis feceris correctionem de uita. haeretici sunt qui per
uerba legis\textsuperscript{298} impugnant proprium enim sensum astruunt uerbis legis ut prauitatem mentis suae legis
auctoritate commendant qui uitandi sunt quia frequentis correcti\textsuperscript{299} exercitatiores essent ad malum deuita
dico. Cur ecce sciens quia qui huius modi est id est incorrigibilis subuersus est\textsuperscript{300} id est\textsuperscript{301} perditus et

\textsuperscript{270} D: after regenerationis, et reno but it is crossed out.
\textsuperscript{271} A, D, E: omits id est.
\textsuperscript{272} A: biblical cross-references in the margin.
\textsuperscript{273} F: biblical cross-reference in margin, II cor. IIII ti uenitare eph Viii. P. 46 r column.
\textsuperscript{274} A, C, D, E, F: symbol for et.
\textsuperscript{275} D: occurs after scilicet.
\textsuperscript{276} F: biblical cross-reference in margin, Joel II effundam pm meum. 485.
\textsuperscript{277} A: abunde.
\textsuperscript{278} C, D, E, F: coloured initial U.
\textsuperscript{279} E: the F is missing from fidelis.
\textsuperscript{280} C, D: hiis.
\textsuperscript{281} A: the u was initially forgotten but added above the word.
\textsuperscript{282} E: omnium after in.
\textsuperscript{283} D: omits esse.
\textsuperscript{284} A: the following lines are in a darker ink than the previous text.
\textsuperscript{285} E: following confirmare there is an alios but it is crossed out.
\textsuperscript{286} D: placed after eos.
\textsuperscript{287} A, D, F: omits esse.
\textsuperscript{288} C: omits de praedictis.
\textsuperscript{289} C, D, E, F: coloured initial at the start of Stultas.
\textsuperscript{290} D, E, F: hiis.
\textsuperscript{291} D: ut.
\textsuperscript{292} D: est is placed before scientia.
\textsuperscript{293} C: legis.
\textsuperscript{294} D: matusale.
\textsuperscript{295} A: possibilia / D: imposibilia.
\textsuperscript{296} C: omits et.
\textsuperscript{297} A: hoc.
\textsuperscript{298} A, C, D, E, F: legem follows legis.
\textsuperscript{299} A: correctis / F: an additional correcti is written but it is crossed out.
\textsuperscript{300} F: omits est.
\textsuperscript{301} E: replaces id est with et.
delinquit quia scirent peccati proprio iudicio condemnatus. propio iudicio se condemnavit qui errorem laudat et uritur in utiuperat. Cum misero ad te archemam uti timedo cretensibus dum ad me ueneris festina uenire ad me nichopolim ibi enim statui yemare. Ideo dicit ut festinet post epistolam datam uenire quia uult eum uidere causa affectus et ut plenius confirmet in ecclesiastica disciplina. Zenum legis peritum iudex hoc dicit non quia peritior sit apollo sed quia huius professionis fuerat in synagoja et apollo qui perfectus erat in scriptura sollicito premite ita sollicite ut nichil desit illis id est ut quae ad uiatricum necesaria sunt eis habeat in suis sistarchiis quasi quis quareneret unde autem res erit illis. unde habet tytus quod eis ad uiatricum largiatur. Respondet Discant autem et nostri id est cretenses ut alii praesesse ibi in bonis operibus dando ministris non dico ad quaelibet sed ad usus necessarios et hoc ideo ut non sint infructuosi et iuxta parabolam arboris quae non facit fructum bonum exisitantur et in ignem mittatur. Ideo iubet illis sumptus necessarios dari quia dignum erat ut qui spiritualia tradant non illis deessent carnalia. Apollo episcopus fuit corinthiorum qui propter seditionem concitatam aduersum se a pseudo apostolis discesserat cum zeno socio suo ad tyton ut priusquam ueniat nichopolim praemittat eos ut sollicita ut nichil in uiatrico illis desit. Salutant te omnes qui mecum sunt fratres propter compendium simul omnes consalutatores significat. Saluta eos qui nos amant non fictae sed in fide id est fidelis affectus deinde generaliter omnes salutat dicens. Gratia dei sit cum omnibus uobis amen.

302 C, D, E, F: coloured initial at the start of cum.
303 A: the h was originally left out but is written above it.
304 C: aut.
305 A, C, D, E: tyticum.
307 A: eum written above in.
308 D: doctrina.
309 Comits quia.
310 A: appollo.
311 C: sinagoga.
312 A: appollo.
313 A, C, E: scripturis.
315 A: titus.
316 D, E: coloured initial D.
317 A: cretensis / C, D, E, F: cretenses.
318 E: etiam prefaces ut.
319 F: biblical cross-reference.
320 A: exidentur.
321 A, C, D: necessarios.
322 F: biblical cross-reference.
323 A, C, D, E: zena.
324 C, F: titum.
325 C: tito.
326 C: there is another eos but it is crossed out.
327 D, E, F: coloured initial at the start of salutant.
328 A, C, D, E: omit fratres.
329 F: biblical cross-reference.
330 D: nos amant in fide non ficta.
331 C: occurs after Salutat.
Appendix III – Peter Lombard’s Commentary on Philemon

A: Angers, Bibliothèque municipale MS 69
B: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France MS Latin 14267
C: Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale MS 175
D: Dole, Bibliothèque municipale MS 27
E: Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine MS 266
F: Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine MS 264

PL: Patrologia Latina

In BnF MS Latin 14267, folio 112r marks the beginning of the argument as well as the capitula lists.

The capitula lists in BnF MS Latin 14267 (B) on folio 112 reads:

De phylemone et apostolia et archipo et domestica eius ecclesiastice. Moriam faciente. De phylemone et apostolo pro eo in orationibus suis semper me de apostolo sene et uincto et phylemoni imperante eun demque pariter. De epafra concaptiuo apostoli et marco et aristarcho et dema et luca ad uitoribus apostoli.

Between the end of Titus and start of Philemon in C, D, E; Phylemoni familiares litteras facit pro Onesimo (in D, E, F: honesimo) seruo eius scribens (E: eis, F:ei) ab urbe romana (F: roma) de carcere (F: biblical cross-reference).

D: large amount of text between Titus and Philemon.

Folio 112v marks the beginning of the commentary.

Paulus uinctus\(^1\) et cetera hanc epistolam scribit apostolus Phylemoni\(^2\) Colosensi\(^3\) qui nulla ecclesiasticae\(^4\) ministrationis preditus erat dignitaye. sed uir laudabilis\(^5\) in plebe\(^6\) cui familiares litteras mittit pro onesimo\(^7\) seruo suo qui cum dampno eius\(^8\) fugerat sed ab apostolo audito euangelio baptizatus est cui et ueniam deprecatur apostolus scribens ei a roma de carcere et est intentio\(^9\) apostoli implorare ueniam onesimo\(^10\) apud Phylemonem\(^11\). Modus talis prius salutat illum\(^12\) cum uxore et filio deinde agit gratias deo\(^13\) de bonis eorum

---

2. F: philemoni.
4. C, D, E, F: ecclesiasticae.
5. E, F: erat follows laudabilis.
6. A: scilicet ecclesiastice written above plebe.
13. C: omits deo.
commendans fidem et caritatem eorum. Postea Phylemonem commobret cum ei imperare posset ut onesimo parcat et gratias deo agat quia talem illum recipit ut non seruum estemet sed dilectissimum fretem. deinde dicit ut paret sibi hospitium speranti ad ipsum ire praemittit uero salutationem dicens. Paulus uinctus Iesu Christi id est pro Christo Ihesu non dicit apostolus quod est nomen dignitatis. sed uinctus quod est nomen humilitatis quia non imperat sed orat est enim hic intercessio pro onesimo ieo quae humiliatitatis sunt commemorat incipiens ab iniuria sua ut dignitatem suae es saepis faceret. Sicut enim peccati causa uinciri opprobrium est sic contra pro christo custodiae uincula sustinere maxima gloria est. eo enim tempore in custodia erat ideo ait. Paulus uinctus Iesu Christi quasi dicat cuius debes misereri non ess e causa doloris quod eris si immisericors filium cruciaueris et timotheus frater et cetera cuius etiam causa debes misereri scribunt hanc epistolam Phylemoni dilecto prouentu uirtutum. uel sicut in greco habetur diligibili qui scilicet diligi mere tur et adiutori nostro ministerio praedicationis et apie uxori eius cui scribit ut haec virum exoret. Kariissime sorori in fide non ficta et archippo filio eius colossensium ministro ut et hic patrem exoret conilitomi nostro qui mecum in eadem
laborat militia et ecclesiæ quæ in domo tua uel eius est id est toti familiae eius ut et hi orent eum. et ante alia salutat in hunc modum. Gratia sit uobis id est remissio peccatorum et pax mentis et reconciliatio ad deum a deo patre nostro et domino iesu christo. Gratias post salutationem de bonis gratias agit commendans fidem et caritatem eius quæ ideo commemorat ut memorata bonitas mouerat eum ad ueniam ait ergo gratias ago deo meo semper memoriam tui faciens in orationibus meis. Unde autem gratias agat aperit subdens audii caritatem tuam et fidem id est commendationem fidei et caritatis tue quam fidem et caritatem habes in domino iesu et in omnes sanctos uel in omnibus sanctis. Quia in christum credebat et diligebat et sanctis credebat et diligebat et per opera fidei et caritatis christo seruiebat et sanctis ut communicatio quasi dicat fidem habes et caritatem in christo et in sanctis ita ut communicio fidei tue euidens fiat id est ut fides tua communicas euidens sit et hoc in agnitione omnis boni in Christo Iesu id est ita euidens sit ut hoc merito cognoscatur omne bonum esse in te per christum id est omnium bonorum sufficientia. Uel ita memoria faciens tui et gratias ago in orationibus habitis de hoc ut cum fidei tuae id est operatio fidei qua seruis christo et sanctis euidens fiat in agnitione omnis boni quod est in Christo Iesu id est idem cognitione boni aeterni ut illud expectetur in premium. Hoc enim orat apostolus ut operatio illius cum cognitione fiat bonitatis id est ut tali mente operetur ut in futurum expectet premium ipsum christum non retributionem temporalium. Gaudium enim quasi dicat ideo hoc oro quia gaudium magnum habui in
corde et consolationem in aduersis in caritate tuae non solo uirtutis habitu in corde uiguit sed etiam extra in opere manifestata est hac scilicet quia uisera sanctorum id est filii sanctorum karissimi uel erga te propensi sanctorum affectus interni. O frater per te digne illos recipientem a suis laboribus quodam modo respirantes requierunt quia sanctorum neccessitatibus utensilia ministruit et ita sanctorum affectus erga illum propensius eo consolante quieuit et refrigeratus est. Propter quod scilicet quia seruis aliis et ad benefaciendum promptus es multo magis mihi seruire debes. Ego multam habens fiduiam non dico poestatem in christo iesu id est per Christum ihesum imperandi tibi quod pertinet ad rem id est ad tuam utilitatem. non dico contra tua licita quasi dicat fiduiam habeo imperandi quod est utile tibi et mihi. Non dico me habere poestatem tibi contra hoc licet cum tamen habeam poestatem imperandi quod licet habens inquam fiduiam operandi propter caritatem meam uel tuam magis obsecro cum sis talis uita et etate ut ego paulus qui senex sum dico non solum sed et nunc uinctus Christi ihesu per quod magis debes moueri obsecro inquam te de meo filio Onesimo. Magnum est et laudabile non de humili uiro sed de sullimi.

---

83 E: omits enim.
84 E, F: que.
85 D: solum.
86 F: carissimi.
87 E: initially written as effectus but the first e was changed into an a.
88 C: recipientes.
89 C: laboribus is placed after quodam modo.
90 A: utensilia is in a darker ink.
91 C, D, E, F: coloured initial.
92 D: aliquid written but the ‘qu’ is crossed out so that it reads alii.
93 D: placed after fiduciam.
94 D, E, F: fiduciam.
95 A, C, E, F: ihesu.
96 A: chistum placed after ihesum.
97 F: ihesum.
98 D: imperandi.
99 D, E, F: fiduciam.
100 E: omits ‘quod ... poestatem tibi’.
101 A: placed after utile.
102 A: tibi is written in a darker ink above quod / C, D, F: tibi occurs after quod.
103 A, C, D: followed by imperandi.
104 F: note in margin reads nemo habeat poestatem imperandi illiatum.
105 C: omits habeam.
106 D, E, F: fiduciam
107 A, C, E, F: imperandi.
108 E: omits uel.
109 A: another magis is written but is crossed out.
110 C: orare.
111 D: following impero, poestate is written but the testate is crossed out.
112 D: omits tibi.
113 F: biblical cross-reference, illegible in the available scanned images.
114 D: obscurat.
115 C, D, E, F: sum placed after autem.
116 C, D: omit sed.
117 C: sum placed after uinctus.
118 A, D, E, F: ihesu / C: ihesu christi.
119 E, F: honesimo.
120 A, C, D, E, F: omit uiro.
uero si cum\textsuperscript{122} se inclinat\textsuperscript{123} et obsecurat filio meo dico quem genui\textsuperscript{124} in fide cum essem in uinculis et ideo teneris\textsuperscript{125} cum\textsuperscript{126} diligo qui tibi aliquando dum infidelis erat fuit inutilis tua tollendo\textsuperscript{127}. Nunc autem utilis est et tibi et mihi\textsuperscript{128} seruiendo scilicet mihi\textsuperscript{129}. et\textsuperscript{130} per me\textsuperscript{131} tibi cuius est quicquid seruus tuus mihi\textsuperscript{132} fecit quem remissi tibi tu autem suscipe id est recipe illum ut mea uiscera id est\textsuperscript{133} meum in eo recipe affectum. Uel ut mea uiscera id est ut meum karissimum filium.\textsuperscript{134} Onesimus\textsuperscript{135} profugum decurrentem ad diuinum auxilium cum esset in custodia baptizauit apostolus uidens in illo utilitatis spem quem\textsuperscript{136} sic commendat ut\textsuperscript{137} suum animum in illo significet\textsuperscript{138} recipi. Sequitur quem ego uolueram mecum retinere ut pro te mihi\textsuperscript{139} ministraret in uinculis euangelii\textsuperscript{140} sine\textsuperscript{141} consilio autem id est\textsuperscript{142} consensu tuo nihili\textsuperscript{143} mihi\textsuperscript{144} uolui facere ut bonum tuum scilicet quod tuus seruus\textsuperscript{145} mihi\textsuperscript{146} seruit ne id est non esset\textsuperscript{147} uelut\textsuperscript{148} ex necessitate\textsuperscript{149} id est\textsuperscript{150} contra uelle tuum sed voluntarium ut tamen uelit deus faci\textsuperscript{151} qui\textsuperscript{152} operatur in\textsuperscript{153} nobis et uelie et operari pro bona uoluntate. Forsitan enim quasi dicat ideo suscipe illum quia utilis fuit fuga eius forsitan enim ideo discersit ad\textsuperscript{154} horam a\textsuperscript{155} te ut reciperes illum in eternum scilicet hic et in futuro dicendo. Forsitan sententiam temperat hoc ideo dicit quia omnia humana sunt dubia et potuit alia causa\textsuperscript{156} esse quare

\textsuperscript{121} A, C, D, E, F: sublimi.
\textsuperscript{122} A, C, D, E, F: omit cum.
\textsuperscript{123} D: humiliat.
\textsuperscript{124} F: biblical cross-reference, illegible in the available scanned images.
\textsuperscript{125} E: tenerius / F: tenerius.
\textsuperscript{126} F: cum dico.
\textsuperscript{127} D: tolendo.
\textsuperscript{128} E: et mihi et tibi.
\textsuperscript{129} C: michi.
\textsuperscript{130} C, D, E: omits et.
\textsuperscript{131} F: omits per me.
\textsuperscript{132} A, C, E, F: tuus mihi seruus / D: mihi tytus seruus.
\textsuperscript{133} A, C, D: ut replaces id est.
\textsuperscript{134} A, C, D, F: preceding phrase written as; ut mea uiscera [F: id est] ut meum carissimum [C, D: karissimum] filium uel ut mea uiscera id est meum in eo recipe affectum / E: preceding phrase written as; ut mea uiscera id est meum recipe in eo affectum.
\textsuperscript{135} E, F: honesimum.
\textsuperscript{136} C: omits quem.
\textsuperscript{137} D: in.
\textsuperscript{138} C: followed by in illo.
\textsuperscript{139} C: michi.
\textsuperscript{140} A: placed after sine.
\textsuperscript{141} C, D, E, F: coloured initial S.
\textsuperscript{142} E: followed by consilio autem id est.
\textsuperscript{143} A, C: nichil.
\textsuperscript{144} A, C, D, E, F: omits mihi.
\textsuperscript{145} A, E: omits seruus.
\textsuperscript{146} C, E: michi.
\textsuperscript{147} C: cesset.
\textsuperscript{148} C: uelud.
\textsuperscript{149} C: necessitate.
\textsuperscript{150} E: omits id est.
\textsuperscript{151} E: quod deus facit.
\textsuperscript{152} F: biblical cross-reference; phy ii. Not entirely legible.
\textsuperscript{153} A: ut.
\textsuperscript{154} D: a.
\textsuperscript{155} C: ad.
\textsuperscript{156} C, D, E, F: causa placed after esse.
deus\textsuperscript{157} sic fieri disposuerit siue permiserit reciperes illum dico. iam non tantum ut serum sed pro serum quod ante erat\textsuperscript{158} fratrem karissimum uel secundum alien litteram reciperes illum dico iam non tantum ut serum sed ut fratrem karissimum plus serum. Fratres enim\textsuperscript{159} plusquam serui cari sunt illum dico maxime mihi carum\textsuperscript{160}. Quanto autem magis quam ante uel quam mihi tibi\textsuperscript{161} carus\textsuperscript{162} esse debet et in carne scilicet quia seruus tuus est et in domino quia fidelis frater est uel ita frater\textsuperscript{163} est et maxime mihi magistro tuo frater\textsuperscript{164} est. Onesimus\textsuperscript{165} enim\textsuperscript{166} offenso proprio domino ad hoc ut oblitteratis\textsuperscript{171} peccatis utilis reuerteretur\textsuperscript{172} in tantum ut non solum domino suo aequalis\textsuperscript{173} fieret meritis sed ipsi magistro suo\textsuperscript{174} frater et ne Phylemon\textsuperscript{175} quia dominus erat contra serum suum\textsuperscript{176} inflaretur\textsuperscript{177} humiliat eum\textsuperscript{178} dicens illum fratrem ei et in carne quia ex\textsuperscript{179} uno\textsuperscript{180} adoremus\textsuperscript{181} omnes et in domino per fidem\textsuperscript{182} [et hoc est quod subdit. Quanto autem magis quam ante tibi super\textsuperscript{183} est et in carne per conditionem prime\textsuperscript{184} natiiutatis et in domino per fidem\textsuperscript{185} ] quae\textsuperscript{186} omnem superbiam amputat\textsuperscript{187} et quia ita est\textsuperscript{188} ergo\textsuperscript{189} id est ideo si habes id est si habere uis me socium suscipe illum\textsuperscript{190} sicut me si enim non suscips\textsuperscript{191} non es socius. Si auteum aliquid nocuit tibi aut debet hoc mihi imputa. Nunc excusationem omnem cum\textsuperscript{192} uelit\textsuperscript{193} eum\textsuperscript{194}.

\textsuperscript{157} A, C, D, E, F: deus placed after fieri.
\textsuperscript{158} B: erit but an 'a' is written above the 'i' to note the correction.
\textsuperscript{159} D: occurs after plusquam.
\textsuperscript{160} A: originally malum but 'carum' is written above it in a darker ink.
\textsuperscript{161} A: written in a darker ink / C, D, E, F: occurs after carus.
\textsuperscript{162} A: followed by est.
\textsuperscript{163} A: fratrem but the ending is underlined with dots presumably to note that this ending is incorrect.
\textsuperscript{164} A: written in a darker ink above fratrem / F: in written after est but it is crossed out.
\textsuperscript{165} D: omits et.
\textsuperscript{166} A: fratrem but the ending is underlined with dots presumably to note that this ending is incorrect.
\textsuperscript{167} A: omits est.
\textsuperscript{168} D: ? / E, F: honesimus.
\textsuperscript{169} D: omits enim.
\textsuperscript{170} D: omits domino.
\textsuperscript{171} E: ob litteratis / F: biblical cross-reference in margin; ? delens.
\textsuperscript{172} A: biblical cross-reference.
\textsuperscript{173} A, B, E, F: equalis / D: equalis; the e and u originally left out but are written above the ql.
\textsuperscript{174} A, C, D, E, F: omits suo.
\textsuperscript{175} A, F: philemon.
\textsuperscript{176} A, D, F: omit suum.
\textsuperscript{177} D: inflarentur.
\textsuperscript{178} E: dominus placed after eum but was crossed out at some point.
\textsuperscript{179} D: ex est.
\textsuperscript{180} E: biblical cross-reference.
\textsuperscript{181} E: biblical cross-reference.
\textsuperscript{182} B: a symbol above fidem refers to a passage in the bottom margin. The text was clearly forgotten when the text was initially written. The passage is in the same hand so the scribe evidently noticed the mistake and corrected it. The passage is included in the collation within square brackets.
\textsuperscript{183} A, C, D, E, F: frater.
\textsuperscript{184} F: prime natiiutatis et in domino per fidem originally omitted but it is written in the margin.
\textsuperscript{185} C: omits et in domino per fidem.
\textsuperscript{186} A: que.
\textsuperscript{187} A: ut follows amputat but it is underlined with dots to indicate it should be omitted.
\textsuperscript{188} D: followed by si, coloured initial.
\textsuperscript{189} C, F: coloured initial E at the start of ergo.
\textsuperscript{190} F: illis.
\textsuperscript{191} D: sic follows suscipis but is crossed out.
\textsuperscript{192} E, F: con.
\textsuperscript{193} D: cumuellet / E: uellet / F: uellit.
sibi imputandum 195 esse 196 dicit si uel lesit 197 debet aliquid et ut magis credentur 198 quod dicit addit. Ego 199 Paulus scripsi manu mea ego reddam uel hic uel in futuro reddam tibi dico 200 ut non dicam tibi quod non modo tua sed etiam teipsum debes mihi ad seruiendum quasi dicat minus exigo a te quam debes deinde supponitur ad uiratio cum ait 202. Ita o frater ego fruar 203 te in domino id est gaudebo de 204 te in regno dei sicut 205 feceris quod rogo 206 quid est illud ecce. Refice uiscera mea id est filium uel affectum meum 207 in domino id est propter dominum deinde blanditur ei dicens 208 in 209 obedientia tua 210 scripsi tamen 211 facies supra id quod dico 213 prouocat uim eim sic blandiendo ut 214 amplius faciat quam postulatur ab eo. Solet enim fieri ut qui de se uidet bene sentiri meliorem se prebeat. Deinde ut solliticiorem 215 faciat et ad obediendum promptiorem uenturum se ad illum significat subdens. simil 217 autem et para mihi hospitium 218 uel hoc potest eum 219 mouere ad ueniam ideo dico para. Nam spero 220 per orationes uestras me donari ubi hoc dicit ut magis obediant. Solent enim absentes contemni 221. Salutat 222 te Epaphras 223 conceptius meus in Christo Ihesu et Marcus et Aristarchus 224 Demas et Lucas auctores mei gratia domini nostri Ihesu 225 Christi sit cum spiritu 226 tuo 227 amen.

---

194 C, E, F: cum.
195 D: iputando.
196 A, D, E, F: omit esse.
197 D: uelle sit.
198 B: ‘da’ is written within the inner margin in a different hand to the correction in footnote 178. The ‘da’ appears to communicate the correction of credentur to credatur / C, D, E, F: credatur.
199 B, D, E, F: coloured initial / D: id est follows ego.
200 D: dico occurs after futuro.
201 B: originally omitted from the text but an ‘m’ is written in a lighter ink beside debes / F: michi.
202 C: ait written twice but the first one is crossed out.
203 C: small hole in the parchment occurs after fruar. The hole was there at the time the scribe copied out the text as evidence by the fact that there is not any text missing and the scribe wrote around the hole /E: note in margin reads; sed nunc qui solo deo est fruendum ita si hoc uerbum fruendi propter sumetur.
204 A: biblical cross-reference in margin. xx frat....
205 E: si. / E: enim placed before feceris.
206 C: omits sicut feceris quod rogo and replaces with si enim / D: dei sicut frater omnis quod rogo.
207 D: omits meum.
208 C, D, E, F: coloured initial.
209 E, F: de.
210 D: adds et cetera after tua.
211 C, E, F: tibi.
212 E: quod et.
213 D: omits scripsi tamen sciens quaies supra id quod dico.
214 C: non follows ut.
215 A: written in a different hand and different ink. The original text appears to have been rubbed out / D: sollicitiorem / E, F: sollicitiorem.
216 C: omits eum.
217 C, D, F: coloured initial.
218 E, F: hospicium.
219 F: eum placed after mouere.
220 E: note in margin; Ja v. multum nalet disputatio iusti.
221 E, F: contemni / E: note in margin; fiunt est multa in absentia alczui qui non fientu eo perfinet.
222 E: coloured initial.
224 F: Aristarchus.
225 A, C, E, F: Ihesu.
226 A: followed by sancto.
Appendix IV – The Marginal Rubrics

The four tables in this appendix refer to the following manuscripts, which are in the order of their respective dates of production, with A being the earliest:

A: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France MS Latin 17246
B: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 52
C: Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana MS 144
D: Angers, Bibliothèque municipale MS 69
E: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France MS Latin 14267
F: Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale MS 175
G: Dole, Bibliothèque municipale MS 27
H: Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine MS 264
Table 1: Quotes of the authorities as they appear in Titus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Augustine</strong></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jerome</strong></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ambrose</strong></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Manuscripts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:1</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td></td>
<td>hanc epistolam scribit</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:1</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td></td>
<td>quem creavit episcopum</td>
<td>B, D, E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:2</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>in spem vitiae anterinae</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, B, C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:2</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>hic est fructus</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:2</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>De Civitate Dei</td>
<td>quomodo promit</td>
<td>A, B, D, E, F, H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:2</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>De Genesi Contra Manicheos</td>
<td>non ergo possamus</td>
<td>A, B, D, H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:2</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>quia vero exst</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:3</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>ad marcellinum de civitate</td>
<td>id est congruis</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:4</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>quia verax est</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:6</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>Ad bonifacio</td>
<td>Si dixisset sine peccato</td>
<td>B, C, D, E, H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:6</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>Ad bonifacio</td>
<td>Si dixisset sine peccato</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:6</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>super joannem</td>
<td>Quamlibet valde</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:6</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>sed plane multi</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:6</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>in eodem</td>
<td>quod intelligatur sine crimine.</td>
<td>A, B, D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:6</td>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td>post baptismum quando</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, B, C, D, E, F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:6</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>De Bono Coniugali</td>
<td>acutius intelligunt qui nec eum</td>
<td>A, B, C, D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:6</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>De Genesi Contra Manicheos</td>
<td>non ergo possumus</td>
<td>A, B, D, H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:6</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>in eodem</td>
<td>Si dixisset sine peccato</td>
<td>B, C, D, E, H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:6</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>in eodem</td>
<td>Si dixisset sine peccato</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:6</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>super joannem</td>
<td>Quamlibet valde</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:6</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>sed plane multi</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:9</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>in eodem</td>
<td>sed non ideo omnia</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:9</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>in eodem</td>
<td>sed non ideo omnia</td>
<td>A, B, D, F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:12</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum</td>
<td>Iste fuit Pigmenides Cretensis</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, E, H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:12</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>in eodem</td>
<td>Quod utique ad hoc dictum est</td>
<td>A, D, H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:13</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>in eodem</td>
<td>Sciemendum quod, id est deus divinita</td>
<td>A, D, H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:13</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>in eodem</td>
<td>sed non ideo omnia</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:14</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>nemo justificatur</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:14</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>avertantium se a veritate</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, B, C, D, E, G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:14</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>ut faciant proselitos</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, F, H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:15</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>sicut dominus</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:15</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>Contra Faustum</td>
<td>hoc antem non secundum</td>
<td>A, B, D, E, F, H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:15</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>Super Joannem</td>
<td>Si negatio non tantum lingua</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 2:3</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>Contra adversarium</td>
<td>sed non ideo omnia</td>
<td>A, B, D, E, G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 2:3</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>Super Joannem</td>
<td>Quas i dicat: Confidentur se</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 2:7</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>ut scilicet eam in successus</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, B, C, D, E, H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 2:7</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>Solent enim esse quaeacdam</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, B, H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 2:5</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>ut non divinis vel nobilitate</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, B, C, D, G, H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 2:5</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>si habent viros infideles</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, B, D, E, G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 2:6</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>quia invenit solet modum</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, B, D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 2:6</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>ut frenata</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, B, C, D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 2:7</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>ut scilicet quod</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, B, D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 2:7</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>Aliter pastor occidit</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, B, D, E, F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 2:7</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>Omnim ergo qui male vivit</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, B, D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 2:8</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>Vereatur nihil habens malum dicere</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, B, D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 2:10</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>bona openbus et fade</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, D, E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 2:10</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>fugientes impetatem vanæ</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 2:12</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>ignotanti et desalientia</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 2:13</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>Gloriae magni Dei</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 2:14</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>ad hoc ut redimeret</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, B, D, F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 2:15</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>quia iam non aspere hoc accipitur</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, B, C, D, H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 3:2</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>ut ad malum tardi sint et ad</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 3:2</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>quia invenit solet modum</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, B, D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 3:3</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>illecebus hominibus</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, B, D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 3:5</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>iam specuturae salutis</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, B, C, D, E, F, H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 3:9</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>originum enumerationes</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, B, C, D, F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 3:10</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>haereticus sunt qui per verba</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, B, D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 3:10</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>qui vitandi sunt quia frequentus</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 3:12</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>id est dicatur ut festinet post</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, D, H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 3:13</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>quia perfectus erat in Scriptura</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, B, C, D, G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 3:14</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>id est situs sumptus</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, B, D, G, H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 3:15</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>propter compendium simul</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 3:15</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>propter compendium simul</td>
<td></td>
<td>A, B, D, G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 3:15</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>id est fideli affectu</td>
<td></td>
<td>C, D, G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Content of the Marginal Rubrics in Titus
Table 3: Quotes of the Authorities as they appear in Philemon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Augustine</strong></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jerome</strong></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ambrose</strong></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Manuscripts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td></td>
<td>nulla ecclesiasticae</td>
<td>A, B, D, F, G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td></td>
<td>deo agat quia talem</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td></td>
<td>ab iniuria sua ut dignitatem suae</td>
<td>A, B, D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sicut enim peccati causa vinciri</td>
<td>A, B, E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eo enim tempore in custodia erat</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td></td>
<td>sicut in Graeco babetur</td>
<td>A, B, D, E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td></td>
<td>tua vel</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td></td>
<td>eius est id est toti familiae eius</td>
<td>A, B, F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td></td>
<td>id est operatio fidei qua servis</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, E, G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td></td>
<td>cum cognitione boni aeterni</td>
<td>A, B, D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoc enim orat Apostolus</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td></td>
<td>operetur ut in futurum</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:7</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td></td>
<td>quia sanctorum necessitatibus</td>
<td>A, B, D, G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td></td>
<td>Magnum est et laudabile</td>
<td>A, B, D, F, G, H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:12</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td></td>
<td>Onesimum profugum</td>
<td>A, D, G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:12</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td></td>
<td>ut suum animum in illo significet</td>
<td>A, B, D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:14</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td></td>
<td>De perfectione iustitiae hominis</td>
<td>ut tamen velit Deus facit</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:16</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td></td>
<td>maxime mihi magistro tuo</td>
<td>A, B, C, E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:16</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td></td>
<td>per fidem quae omnem</td>
<td>B, D, G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:16</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td></td>
<td>per conditionem prae</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:18</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nunc excusationem omnem</td>
<td>A, B, D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:19</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td></td>
<td>supponitur adjuratio cum ait</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:21</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provocat eum sic blandiendo</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:21</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deinde ut sollicitorem eum</td>
<td>A, D, G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:22</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoc dicit ut magis obedient</td>
<td>A, B, D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix V – Transcription of Titus and Philemon as it appears in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France MS Latin 14409

Italics: Main biblical text.

Bold: Marginal gloss.

Underlined: Interlinear gloss.

f. 143v – Titus 1:1

Paulus seruus dei apostolus.

[Left margin] Tito relictum crete episcopo ex simplicitate et humilitate nimis patienti praescripta ei sua auctoritate utili scribit de episcopali officio imperiose tractando nicopoli.

[Interlinear] Humilitas non tollit potestatem.

f. 144r – Titus 1:1 to 1:7

autem Christi Ihesu secundum fidem electorum dei et agnitionem ueritatis quae secundum pietatem est in spem uite aeternae, quam promisit qui non mentitur deus ante tempora saecularia manifestauit autem temporibus suis. Uerbum suum in predicatione quae credita est michi secundum preceptum saluatoris nostri dei: tito dilecto filio secundum communem fidem. Gratia et pax a deo patre et christo ihesu saluatore nostro. Huius rei gratia reliqui te rete ut ea quae desunt corrigas et constituas prebiteros per ciuitates sicut ego tibi disposit. Si quis sine crimine est unius uxoris uir fideles habens filios non in accusatione luxuriae aut non subditos. Oportet enim episcopum sine crimine esse sicut.

[Left margin] In spem ut huius res hic fructus commendat officium non tepidius agendum.

Promisit quia in se eterno sic fixum erat et nunquam tempus esset quae cum creatis cepit.

[Interlinear] tenens et praedicans fidem secundum est ueritas in liberalibus arcibus.

quae nichil ad christianam religionem. Que quanto certior tanto minister debet esse sollicitior omnia temporia.

[Right margin] Ante tempora non recens promissio sed ante tempora omnium saeculorum et ut certius sit. Manifestauit congruit temporibus solet uerbum id est filium haec est uita eterna.

[Interlinear] Secundum ut fidel ciui comparacipas. cui in salute hominum minus obedimus si quomodo remittimus.


[Left margin] Huius rei gratia dum hoc recolit. sicut ei disposuerat monete exsequi.
addendo ad perfectionem episcopos mala singulas sicut peccato criminali uel infamia criminali non peccato spes continentiae et sacramentum sane fidei.

Crimen est querela id est dignum accusatione et damnatione in quo ab augustinus pontan aliquam immunditia a fornicationis. Fideles habens filios. Nec saltem de luxuria accusatos uel sibi non subditos. alioquin nec spes in eo est corrigendi alios. nec frontem habet ad alios talium cohabitator. talis debet constitui neccessese est enim ad tractionsen officii eum esse sine crimine id est inreprehensibilem. Episcopum hic aperte ostendit. Presbiterorum nomine episcopos supra fuisse designatos.

Augustinus. Unius uxoris uir. Acutius intelligunt qui nec eum qui cathecumenus uel paganus habuit alteram ordinandum esse censuerunt quia de sacramento agitur non de peccato. Propter sacramenti sanctitatem sicut femina si cathecumina uitiata est non potest post baptismum inter dei uirgines consecrare ita non absurde uisum est digamum non peccasse sed norman sacramenti amisisse non ad uite meritum sed ad ordinationis signaculum. Unius uxoris uir episcopos significat ex omnibus gentibus unitatem uni uiro christo subditam sicut duobus dominis seruire sic ab uno domino apostatare et in alterius superstitionem ire noliet.

f. 144v – Titus 1:7 to 1:13

dei dispensatorem non superbum non iracundum non uinolentum non percussorem non turpis lucri cupidum sed hospitalem benignum sobrium iustum sanctum continentem ampectentem eum qui secundum doctrinam est fidelem sermonem ut potens sit exhortari in doctrina sana et eos qui contradicunt arguere. Sunt enim multi inobediente uaniloqui et seductores maxime qui de circumcisione sunt quos oportet redargui qui uniuersas domos subuertunt docentes quae non oportet turpis lucri gratia. Dixit quidam ex illis proprius ipsorum propheta. Cretenses semper mendaces malae bestiae uentris pigri. Testimonium hoc uerum.

Non percussorem id est non alliorium mentes. Aliter quam oporteat loquendo percutientem uel non ferocem non crudelem.

Licet diuine auctoritati unde uoluerit quod uerum inueniri testimonium sumere sicut et Paulus athenis sed non ideo omnia que ibi sunt confirmat.

Quidam epimenides cretensis.

Bene aperuit non dei quia unium dixit si poeta. sanguinem sitientes gulosi et pigri ne minus credas quia gentalis.

f. 145r – Titus 1:13 to 2:4

Adolescentulas ut viros.

[Interlinear] non ut soles molliter quia nescunt uim scripturarum iam et non dei uel ten enim quia ipsi negant qui bona fide sumunt.

Secundum naturas. Unde et erant ualde bona secundum significationes quedam inmundas iudeis nec nobis omnia apta sunt uel propter salutem corporis uel propter consuetudinem humanae societatis.

[Interlinear] et iusti sunt per peccata qui non credunt quia non sunt digni donis dei. non tamen excibo est in qui natio sed ex malo intellectu et conscientia peccatorum. uerbis quidem qui dicit se nosse deum et mandata eius non custodit mendax est deo odibiles. nec habiles crede a deo reprobati. Secundum hortare per uidentes fidei necessaria ut habeant integram similiter sani in dilectione et patientia hortare esse crimina imponentes. Ita uel.

Ut doceant adolescentulas prudentiam uel adolescentulas hortare.

f. 145v – Titus 2:4 to 2:11

suos ament filios suos diligant prudentes castas sobrias domus curam habentes benignas subditas uiris suis ut non blasphemetur uerbum dei. iuuenes similiter hortare ut sobrii sint. In omnibus teipsum prebe exemplum bonorum operum in doctrina in integritate in grauitate. Uerbum sanum inreprehensibile ut his qui ex aduerso est uereatur nichil habens malum dicere de nobis. Seruos dominis suis subditos esse in omnibus placentes non contradicentes non fraudantes sed in omnibus fidem bonam ostendentes. Ut doctrinam salvatoris nostri dei ornent in omnibus. Apparuit enim gratia dei salvatoris omnibus hominibus.

[Interlinear] esse in cibo et potu. Si male se habent si habent uiros in fideles.

Quibus propensius proptior timorem dei obsequuntur.

Ut non blasphemetur hoc ad senes et ad omnia potest referri.

Quia iuuenus promptior est ad lapsum contineri iubetur quod ut facilius sit. magistrum iubet formam esse ut quod docet uerbis ostendat factis ut ita prophani erubescent.

[Interlinear] Aliter pastor occidit oxes quantum in se est et si ille uiuunt Ut te uel corporis ne leuis tuum sit. Loco dictum et tempore hortare hoc modo poterunt placere hoc refertur ad omnia senes ut sobris etcetera hortare meritum doctoris est onesta uita discipuli per carnes dei per gratiam et sumus ibi lis.
Onnes monendi sunt ut ornent quia omnibus natus est nullum exclusit.

erudiens nos ut abnegantes impietatem et saecularia desideria sobrie et iuste et pie uiuamus in hoc saeculo expectantes beatam spem et aduentum gloriae magni dei et salvatoris nostri ihesu christi. Qui dedit semet ipsum pro nobis ut nos redimeret ab omni iniquitate et mundaret sibi populum acceptabilem. sectatorem bonorum operum. Haec loquere et exhortare et argue cum omni imperio. Nemo te contempnat. Admone illos principibus et postestatibus subditos esse. dicto obedire ad omne opus bonum paratos esse neminem blasphemare non litigiosos esse sed modestos omnem ostendentes mansuetudinem ad omnes homines. Eramus enim et nos aliquando insipientes.

sine quo non fuisset nascitur in quo eum sequi debes uanae cultae. In nobis ab proximum ad deum tam fragili per hoc certi et solliciti gloriae eternae non solum erudiuit.

Per hoc securi sumus de spe. tam ab originalibus quam actualibus. Ut peculiarem id est proum nesciuntibus. Argue iam non aspere hoc accipitur cum pro salute fieri sciatur. scientes negligentes uel rebelles. Ita cum imperio per simplicitate si tu habes imperium spirituale tamen regibus ducibus.

Quia singulis paratur merces. minoribus illorum non quidem ad malum et si promuntur ab illos uerbus et factis quia sic infideles uocantur bonos uel malos hoc ideo debemus quia et nos aliquin.

Insiipientes etsi philosphi.

fuimos que ipsi sic et ipsi poterunt esse que nos sumus per eandem gratiam.

increduli errantes seruientes desideriis et uoluptatibus uariis in malitia et inuidia agentes odibles odientes inuicem. Cum autem apparuit benignitas et humanitas salvatoris nostri dei non ex operibus iustitiae quae fecimus nos sed secundum suam misericordiam saluos nos fecit. Per lauacrum regenerationis et renouationis spiritus sanctii quem effudit in nos abunde per ihesum christum salvatorem nostrum ut iustificati gratia ipsius heredes simus secundum spem uitae aeternae. Fidelis sermo et de his uolo te confirmare ut curent bonis operibus pre esse qui credunt deo. Haec sunt bona et utilia hominibus. Stultas autem questions genealogias et.

per mala animi carnis nocendi si nocere nolicuit deo uel aliis hominibus mundo per carnem uel nobis per fidem benignus et humanatus deus. uel larga misericordia dei iam spe futurae salutis. Iam spe futurae salutis per baptismo. In quo deposito ueritati homine generatus nouus quia cotidie magis et magis
renouamur per spiritum in baptismo datum ad remissionem omnium ad copiam uirtutum et si nondum secundum rem. Iste sermo est fidelis praedictis alios.

[Right margin] ut uolo confirmare sed eos qui credunt deo ut curent.

[Interlinear] aliis multis uel sibi ipsis quia de his confirma ubi nec salus nec utilis scientia.

f. 147r – Titus 3:9 to 3:15

contentiones et pugnas legis de uita. Sunt enim inutiles et uanae. Hereti cum hominem post unam et secundam correctionem de uita. scienis quia subuersus est qui eius modi est et delinguit proprio iudicio condempnatum. Cum misero ad te artheniam aut titicum festina ad me ueniere nicopolim. Ibi enim statui hiemare. Zenam legis peritum et apollo sollicite praemitte ut nichil illis desit. Discant autem et nostri bonis operibus praeesse ad usus necessarios ut non sint infractuosi. Salutant te qui mecum sunt omnes. Saluta qui nos amant in fide. Gratia dei cum omnibus uobis. amen.

[Interlinear] quas delege faciunt ut decibis sine fructu falsae non solum haec uita sed et correctionem pro quambris feceris.

[Right margin] Hereticus est qui per uerba legis legem impugnat qui uitandi sunt quia frequentius correcti exercitationes essent ad malum.

[Interlinear] cur praeditus in corrigibilis et quia scientia peccat proprio iudicio se condempnatum qui errorem laudat uritatem uituperat uult cum uidere causa affectus et ut plenius firmet in ecclesiastica disciplina ficerat in sinagoga qui perfectus erat in scripturis. Ita sollicite unde autem res illis id est cretentes ut illi sibi ipsis dandos ministris non fite.

f. 147v – Philemon 1:1 to 1:7

Paulus uinctus ihesu christi et timotheus frater philemoni dilecto et adiutori nostro et apiæ sorori carissime et archippo commilitoni nostro et ecclesiae quae in domo tua est. Gratia uobis et pa x a deo patre nostro et domino ihesu christo. Gratias ago deo meo semper memoriam tui faciens in orationibus meis audiens caritatem tuam et fideum quam habes in domino ihesu et in omnes sanctos ut communicato fidei tuae euidens fiat in agnitione omnis boni in christo ihesu. Gaudium enim.

[Left margin] Philemoni familiares litteras mittit pro onesimo seruo eius qui cum condampno eius fugerat sed ab apostolo audito evangeliu baptizatus est cui et ueniam deprecatur apostolus scribens a roma de carcere.

[Right margin] Paulus uinctus non dicit apostolos nomen dignitatis sed humilitatis quia non imperat sed orat. quasi cuius debes misereri non esse causa doloris si in misericors filium cruciaueris.

[Interlinear] cuius etiam causa debes misereri prouentu uirtutum ministerio praedicationis uxori eius ut haec uirum oret filio colosensium ministro ut et hic patrem exoreto toti familiae ut et hi orent.

[Left margin] Memorata bonitas commoveat potest ad ueniam.
Hoc orat apostolus ut operatio eius cum cognitione fiat ueritatis bonitatis id est ut tali mente operetur ut in futurum in de expectet premium.

per opera fidei et caritatis seruit sanctis communicans fidei nostrae fides uram tua uel quod alis tua communicas euidens sit ut hoc merito cognoscatur omne bonum esse in te per christum hoc ideo oro.

f.148r – Philemon 1:7 to 1:14

magnum habui et consolationem in caritate tua quia uiscera sanctorum requieuerunt per te frater. Propter quod multum fiduciam habens in christo ihesu imperandi tibi quod ad rem pertinet propter caritatem magis obseco cum sis talis ut paulus senex nunc autem et uinctus ihesu. Obsecro te pro meo filio quem genui in uinculis onesimo qui tibi aliquando inutilis fuit nunc autem et michi et tibi utilis quem remisi. Tu autem illum ut uiscera mea suscipe quem ego uolueram mecum retinere ut pro te michi ministraret in uinculis evangeli. Sine consilio autem tuo nichil uolui facere uti ne uelat ex necessitate bonum tuum esset sed voluntarium.

f. 148v – Philemon 1:15 to 1:23

forsitan enim ideo discissit ad horam a te ut aeternum illum reciperes iam non ut seruum sed pro seruo karissimum fratem maxime michi quanto magis autem tibi et in carne et in domino. Si ergo habes me socium suscipe illum sicut me. Si autem aliquid nocuit tibi aut debet hoc michi imputa. Ego paulus scripsi mea manu ego reddat. Ut non dicam tibi quod et teipsum michi debes. Ita frater ego te fruar in domino refice uiscera mea in christo. Confidens de obedientia tua scripsi tibi sciens quoniam et super id quod dico facies simul autem et para michi hospitium. Nam spero per orationes uestras donari me uobis. Salutat te epafras concaptiuus.

f. 148v – Philemon 1:15 to 1:23

suscipe quia utilis fuit fuga.
Forsitan ideo dicit quia omnia humana dubia et potuit alia esse causa quare sic deus disposuerit.

hic et in futuro tantum uel plus carum carus esse debet quia seruus tuus quia fidelis frater et ideo.

Pro seruo quod ante fratrem karissimum uel karissimum plus seruo fratres enim plus quam serui cari sunt.

Michi magistro tuo frater et ne quia dominus contra seruum inflaretur humiliat eum dicens fratrem ei et in carne quia ex uno adam omnes et in domino per fidem.

si non suscipis non es socius uel hic uel in futuro reddam dico non modo tua ad seruendum.

Minus exigo quam debes.

adiuratio. Gaudebo de te in regno dei filium uel affectum uel hoc monet ad uenium.

f. 149r – Philemon 1:23 to 1:25

meus in christo ihesu. Marcus aristarcus demas et lucas adiutores mei. Gratia domini nostri ihesu christi cum spiritu uestro amen.

Hanc Epistolam scribit Apostolus Philemoni Colossensi, qui nulla ecclesiasticae ministrationis praeditus erat dignitate, sed vir laudabilis in plebe, cui familiares litteras mittit pro Onesimo servo suo, qui cum damno ejus fugerat; sed ab Apostolo audito Evangelio baptizatus est, cui et veniam deprecatur Apostolus, scribens ei a Roma de carcere. Et est intentio Apostoli implorare veniam Onesimo apud Philemonem. Modus talis: Prius salutat illum cum uxore et filio. Deinde agit gratias Deo de bonis eorum, commendans fidelium et caritatem eorum. Postea Philemonem obsecrat, cum ei imperare posset, ut Onesimo parcat, et gratias Deo agat, quia talem illum recipit, ut non servum aestimet, sed dilectissimum fratem. Deinde dicit ut paret sibi hospitium speranti ad ipsum venire.

Peter Lombard

Hanc Epistolam scribit Philemoni Colossensi, qui nulla ecclesiasticae ministrationis praeditus erat dignitate, sed vir laudabilis in plebe, cui familiares litteras mittit pro Onesimo servo suo, qui cum damno ejus fugerat, sed ab Apostolo audito Evangelio baptizatus, cui et veniam precatur, et culpam deprecatur Apostolus scribens ei a Roma de carcere. Et est intentio Apostoli implorare veniam Onesimo apud Philemonem. Modus talis est, prius salutat eum cum uxore et filio; deinde agit gratias Deo de bonis eorum, commendans fidelium et caritatem eorum, postea Philemonem obsecrat, cum ei imperare posset, ut Onesimo parcat, et gratias Deo agat, quia talem illum recipit, ut non servum existimet, sed dilectissimum fratem. Deinde dicit, ut paret sibi hospitium speranti ad ipsum venire.

Anonymous
Appendix VII – Pauline Iconography

1. Decorated initials in Mazarine MS 266.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Scene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rom.</td>
<td>f. 2r</td>
<td>Stoning of Stephen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Cor.</td>
<td>f. 75r</td>
<td>Paul converts the Jews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Cor.</td>
<td>f. 132v</td>
<td>Paul before a King (presumably Nero)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>f. 164r</td>
<td>Conversion of Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesians</td>
<td>f. 190r</td>
<td>A blind Paul is led to Damascus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippians</td>
<td>f. 208r</td>
<td>Paul healed by Ananias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colossians</td>
<td>f. 220v</td>
<td>Paul is baptised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Thessalonians</td>
<td>f. 232r</td>
<td>Paul is beaten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Thessalonians</td>
<td>f. 240v</td>
<td>Paul converts the Jews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Timothy</td>
<td>f. 246r</td>
<td>Paul escapes from Damascus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Timothy</td>
<td>f. 259v</td>
<td>Paul, servant and a king (presumably Nero)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus</td>
<td>f. 268r</td>
<td>Plautilla gives Paul the veil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philemon</td>
<td>f. 272v</td>
<td>Paul is beheaded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrews</td>
<td>f. 274v</td>
<td>Paul returns the veil to Plautilla</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| IV | Rom. | f. 269r | Conversion of Paul | (1) |
| V  | I Cor. | f. 269r | Paul Led Blind to Damascus | (2) |
| III | II Cor. | f. 280r | Paul Before a King (probably Nero) | (9) |
| IV  | Gal. | f. 284r | Paul Receives the Veil from Plautilla | (10) |
| V  | Eph. | f. 286r | Execution of Paul | (11) |
| VI  | Phil. | f. 297v | Paul Healed by Ananias | (3) |
| VII | Col. | f. 289r | Baptism of Paul | (4) |
| VIII | I Thess. | f. 290v | Miracle of the Viper | (8) |
| IX  | II Thess. | f. 291v | Paul's Escape From Damascus | (5) |
| X  | I Tim. | f. 292v | Miracle of the Lame Man | (6) |
| XI | II Tim. | f. 294r | Miracle of the Evil Spirit | (7) |
| XII | Titus | f. 295r | Paul Returns the Veil to Plautilla | (12) |
| XIII | Philemon | f. 295v | Paul Before a King (probably Nero) | (13) |
| XIV | Hebrews | f. 296r | Plautilla Shows the Veil to Soldiers | (14) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Romans</th>
<th>f. 377v</th>
<th>Saul Receives Letters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Corinthians</td>
<td>f. 382</td>
<td>Stoning of Stephen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Corinthians</td>
<td>f. 386</td>
<td>Conversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>f. 388v</td>
<td>Conversion (2nd episode)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesians</td>
<td>f. 390r</td>
<td>Paul Led to Damascus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippians</td>
<td>f. 391r</td>
<td>Paul Fed by Ananias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colossians</td>
<td>f. 392r</td>
<td>Paul Healed by Ananias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Thessalonians</td>
<td>f. 393r</td>
<td>Paul Baptized by Ananias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Thessalonians</td>
<td>f. 394r</td>
<td>Paul Preaching in Damascus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Timothy</td>
<td>f. 394v</td>
<td>Paul Led to a King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Timothy</td>
<td>f. 395v</td>
<td>Paul's Escape from Damascus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus</td>
<td>f. 396v</td>
<td>Paul Addressing two Jews (in Rome?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philemon</td>
<td>f. 396v</td>
<td>Execution of Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrews</td>
<td>f. 397r</td>
<td>Paul Returns Veil to Plautilla</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Romans</th>
<th>f. 417v</th>
<th>Stoning of Stephen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Corinthians</td>
<td>f. 421v</td>
<td>Saul Receives Letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Corinthians</td>
<td>f. 425v</td>
<td>Conversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>f. 428v</td>
<td>Paul Led to Damascus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesians</td>
<td>f. 429v</td>
<td>Paul Beaten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippians</td>
<td>f. 431r</td>
<td>Paul Led to a King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colossians</td>
<td>f. 432r</td>
<td>Paul Healed by an Angel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Thessalonians</td>
<td>f. 433r</td>
<td>Paul Preaching in Damascus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Thessalonians</td>
<td>f. 434r</td>
<td>Paul's Escape from Damascus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Timothy</td>
<td>f. 434v</td>
<td>Unidentified scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Timothy</td>
<td>f. 435v</td>
<td>Paul Fed by Ananias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus</td>
<td>f. 436r</td>
<td>Unidentified scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philemon</td>
<td>f. 436v</td>
<td>Execution of Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrews</td>
<td>f. 437r</td>
<td>Paul Returns Veil to Plautilla</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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