Essential reading before using this draft text

This highly provisional text is the work of many hands. The principal responsibility for its current state lies with Bruce Brasington: bbrasington@mail.wtamu.edu and Martin Brett: mbbr110@gmail.com, who may well have misrepresented much information generously supplied by others, amongst whom Greta Austin (GA), David Dumville (DD), Linda Fowler-Magerl, Michael Gullick (MG), Christof Rolker (CR), Robert Somerville (RES), Danica Summerlin (DS) and Anders Winroth (AW) deserve special mention. It is an immeasurable distance away from a secure text, and every element in it is subject to constant revision. In particular, most of the work has been done from microfilm and fiche of varying quality. Direct inspection of the manuscript would often resolve our uncertainties. The text of 2009 differed from the earlier version in four main respects.

Firstly, a number of further copies were studied, and more details on their character inserted in the list of manuscripts; occasional variants were added from them in the apparatus. The process helped to identify a number of errors in the earlier text, while making the apparatus even more cumbersome than before.

Secondly, the cross-references to Gratian were revised and corrected – though the process is doubtless neither accurate nor complete.

Two new documents were added. The first is a map, but not an edition, of the material found at the end of many copies, panend.doc. The second is the Conspectus; this provides an overview of the canons omitted or inserted in a larger number of copies than have been collated in detail. Notes on the omission or insertion of whole canons, which were found in the text of the first version, were transferred to the Conspectus here, except in a few cases where the difference is found in a very large number of copies, or where the omission is the apparent result of physical damage. Additions or omissions within canons remained in the apparatus.

In the 2014 version more manuscripts were identified and noted, and the parallel annotated Decretum was developed in some sections, with occasional consequent adjustments to the apparatus here. The changes in 2015 are incremental only, with some further scrutiny of copies and correction of errors.

As always, the compilers would be delighted to receive any further information on copies known or unknown from interested scholars, and to have their errors corrected with all appropriate, or even inappropriate, rigour.

2. ix. 2015

Select Bibliography

The bibliography below is a modified, simplified and updated version of that in L. Kéry, Canonical collections of the early middle ages (1999) 253-60, but with no pretence at bibliographical precision. It contains only works directly related to the text and the manuscripts.

Author: Traditionally Ivo of Chartres; for a systematic challenge to this claim see Rolker (2006), (2007) and most fully (2010) below.

Date:
A: Fournier-Le Bras 2.95-97: Not before 1094-1095, because the Panormia depends on the Decretum; the Panormia, however, contains many canons of the important council of Clermont nor any documents which can be dated to the last years of the pontificate of Urban II; therefore the Panormia was also compiled around 1094-5, i.e. very shortly after the Decretum.

B. Sprandel, Ivo von Chartres 73 n. 61: quite likely that a longer period of time elapsed between the compilation of the Decretum and the Panormia; cf. approving of this, Fuhrmann, Einfluss und Verbreitung 2.560 n. 372 but cf. the position adopted in Landau, 'Dekret' 34.

C: Brett (San Diego) after 1095, possibly as late as 1110.

D: Fransen (San Diego): possibly incomplete at Ivo's death.

E: Before c. 1110, Fowler-Magerl, most recently in Clavis 209-10.

F: Between 1113 and 1118, Rolker (2006) 245-67 and (2010) passim, but in detail 272-84; the argument turns in part on the date and character of the Leges Henrici primi, for which see too Brasington (2006).

In principle the date could be determined more accurately if the earliest collections to draw on the Panormia could be identified and then themselves dated. This has not yet been done with entire precision, not least since Fournier’s date has been widely accepted, and often assumed, without discussion, though Rolker’s argument is by far the most detailed and broadly based so far. We have hesitated to accept palaeographical claims for the early date of some copies as a contribution to the dating, partly because the time-scale of c. 1095 x c. 1118 is so narrow, partly because almost all these early dates are contested.

Editions. 1) Editio princeps: Liber decretorum sive Panormia Ivonis accurato labore summoque studio in unum redacta continens, S. Brant, (Basel 1499) http://tudigit.ulb.darmstadt.de/show/inc-ii-499/0361. From an unidentified and eccentric copy. The additions at the end principally consist of 15 cc of Lateran II. Of the manuscripts studied so far, Sl has a conclusion closest to Brant’s edition, though rather shorter. The most distinctive characteristics of the main text in the edition are of three kinds.

Firstly, there are a number of subheadings within the books, and of extended rubrics, which are closely related to those of Gratian, which have not been found in any extant copy. These may be the work of Brant, and the edition by Vosmedian extends this process. Secondly, there are a number of canons either inserted, omitted or transposed by reference to the bulk of the known copies, which are much less likely to be editorial interventions. These are indicated in the ‘Conspectus’, and are worth emphasising since a number of descriptions of other copies spend much time in describing peculiarities of their text which are in fact standard features of the transmission; occasionally, indeed, such divergences have been used to support arguments which cannot be sustained.

Lastly there are a number of texts containing larger insertions of material also found in Gratian. While these could be the work of Brant or his collaborators, the survival of such eccentric mss as Vp shows that the supposed editor may well have been working in the twelfth/thirteenth century rather than around 1499.

Naturally enough, Friedberg’s annotation to the standard edition of Gratian follows all these aberrations of the Brant/Vosmedian text, and is correspondingly a thoroughly untrustworthy guide to the text of the Panormia or to its relation to that of the vulgate Gratian.

2) Melchior de Vosmedian, Pannormia, seu Decretum D. Ivonis Carnothensis episcopi restitutum, correctum & emendatum opera et diligentia Melchioris à Vosmediano cum indice locupletissimo nunc recèns ab eodem D. Doctore Vosmediano summa diligentia composito (Louvain 1557); based on Brant, though V. knew of other copies he encountered during his stay in England in the service of King Philip of Spain and adjusted his text considerably.

3) Migne, PL clxi. 1041-1344, from V. but with some manipulation.

On these see particularly Landau, ‘Die Rubriken und Inschriften von Ivos Panormie’, BMCL 12 (1982) 31-49

Literature

A. Theiner, Disquisitiones criticae in praecipuas canonum et decretalium collectiones (Rome 1836)

M. Conrat (Cohn), Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des römischen Rechts im früheren Mittelalter 1 (Leipzig 1891; repr. Aalen 1963), 383-385
F. G. A. Wasserschleben, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der vorgratianischen Kirchenrechtsquellen* (Leipzig 1839), 61-77


A. García y García, *Historia del Derecho Canónico 1: El Primer Milenio* (Instituto de Historia de la Teología Española. Subsidia 1; Salamanca 1967), 1.318-320


P.M. Gassó and C.M. Battle, *Pelagii I papae epistulae ...*, Scripta et documenta 8 (1956)


A. Vetulani, ‘Sredniowieczne rekopisy plockiej biblioteki katedralnej [Medieval MSS from the Cathedral Library at Plock]’, Roczniki Biblioteczne 7 (1963), pp. 313-443 with French and Russian summaries [Les Manuscrits du moyen âge de la cathedrale de Plock].

G. Fransen, ‘Varia ex manuscriptis’, *Traditio* 21 (1965) 515-20


— ‘Un corpus inédit de droit canonique’ in *Humanisme actif: melanges d’art et littérature offerts a Julien Cain* (1968) 2. 271-81


Horst Fuhrmann, *Einfluß und Verbreitung der pseudoisidorischen Fälschungen* MGH Schriften 24 (1972-4) 2.554-562


P. Linehan, ‘The synod of Segovia (1186)’, *BMCL* 10 (1980), 31-44


*Councils and Synods ...* 1 ed. D. Whitelock et all. (1981)


R. Somerville, Papacy, councils and canon law in the 11th-12th centuries (1990)


M.B. Parkes, Scribes, scripts and readers ... (1991)


G. Fransen, ‘La tradition manuscrite de la Panormie d’Yves de Chartres’, San Diego 23-25, underlining the extent to which the various forms of the text differ (distinct from his 1987 article in BMCL though the titles are the same)


M. Brett, ‘Urban II and the collections attributed to Ivo’, San Diego 27-46


R.E. Somerville with S. Kuttner, Pope Urban II, the Collectio Britannica and the Council of Melfi (1996), esp. 16-21


M. Brett, ‘Creeping up on the Panormia’, Grundlagen des Rechts 205-70, (on the divisions among the manuscripts, claiming that the presence of 8.135-6 is not a characteristic distinguishing manuscripts otherwise less ‘primitive’ in form).


Idem ‘A snapshot from the process of the textual development of Ivo’s works (comparative analysis of Angers, Bibliothèque municipal, MS 399 with BAV Reg. lat. 973 and other textual witnesses)’, Ius Ecclesiae 18 (2006) 217-38, on Ac.


**Bishops, texts and the use of canon law around 1100: Essays in honour of Martin Brett** ed. B. Brasington and K. Cushing, Aldershot 2008,  
Kathleen Cushing, ‘Polemic or handbook? Recension Bb of Anselm of Lucca’s *Collectio canonum*’, 69-77  
Linda Fowler-Magerl, ‘The collection and transmission of canon law along the northern section of the *Via Francigena* in the eleventh and twelfth centuries’, 129-39 (Sb, with detailed analysis of the appendix)  
Christof Rolker, ‘History and canon law in the *Collectio Britannica*: a new date for London, BL Add. 8873’, 141-52  
Bruce Brasington, ‘Notes from the edge’: marginalia and glosses in pre-Gratian canonical collections’, 165-81 (CaDb)  
Anders Winroth, ‘Roman law in Gratian and the *Panormia*’, 183-90  

**Readers, texts and compilers in the earlier middle ages: Studies in medieval canon law in honour of Linda Fowler-Magerl** ed. Martin Brett and Kathleen G. Cushing, Farnham 2009,  
Robert Somerville, ‘Another re-examination of the Council of Pisa, 1135’, 101-10 (DaMj)  
Martin Brett, ‘Margin and afterthought: the *Clavis* in action’, 137-63.  
(CaCcDaFbFcHaLaLeOePaPhPoPpPtPyQaSbSgTdVoVpWc, with passing ref. to others, and plates from DaShBp)  

Id. *From a reading book to a structualized canonical collection: the textual development of the Ivonian work* (2010), in part reprinting earlier studies.  

Christof Rolker, ‘Ivo of Chartres and the *Panormia*: the question of authorship revisited’, 187-206  


**Conventions used in the draft text**  
So far as there is a base ms. it is a microfilm of Pf, but the readings of the main text are usually those which conform to the agreement of the Cambridge and Victorine copies of Ivo’s *Decretum* with the Molinaeus edition if there is a consensus (though sometimes variant readings of the Siguenza or Palatine copies are taken to overthrow it), or to those of Paris Bibl de l’ Ars. 713 where it is the only known possible source. An agreed ID reading is usually asterisked in the apparatus. These copies are discussed more fully in the *Decretum* section of the site. This principle is occasionally abandoned where the ID reading is only found in a limited number of *Panormia* copies which have no other particular claim to respect. Otherwise the selection of readings is largely uncritical. Where the ID consensus breaks down, or the source appears to be an unidentified form of the 4L, the selection of a reading is either random or based on a rough-and-ready judgement of the intended sense. The punctuation is partly inherited, partly adjusted to our sense of the meaning, partly a reflection of the scribes’ interpretation, but there is nothing systematic or considered about any of it. The spelling in the main text has been crudely ‘normalised’, with no distinction between e.g. dipthong ae, tailed e and plain e, and the c/t distinction is more or less that of modern convention (it is often indeterminate in the microfilm). We usually use ‘i’ where the copies have between ‘i’ and ‘y’, prefer e.g. *quodcumque* to *quodcunque*, reduce capitalisation to a near minimum except for e.g. *Deus, Filius* etc, prefer eg. *extirpit* to *extirpt*, though there is no such consistency in the
copies. In the apparatus we tend to follow the spelling of the variant copy, if it is unique. It should be noticed in particular that we here follow the modern distinction between ‘u’ and ‘v’, which is not the case in our Tripartita text; in searching the texts this is important. Angle brackets in the notes indicate subsequent insertions; manuscripts which are bracketed in the apparatus have been reported to us by others, but we have not verified the reading.

The apparatus is broadly a positive one, since otherwise it would be unclear which copies have been checked, though the effect is often absurd. If no variant is noticed it may be supposed that CaMgPITbTc agree, but nothing may be assumed of any other copy. Where a reading of Brant is noted without further comment, it should be assumed that Vosmedian and Migne follow Brant; where Vosmedian is cited against Brant without further comment, it may be assumed that Migne follows Vosmedian. The numbering of the canons is that of Migne, with A, B, C, etc used to distinguish canons omitted in the editions. Only the most substantial divergences of the editions are noticed here. Canons omitted by Migne but found widely are printed in the standard typeface. Some additional passages within canons which are currently only known from a small group of copies are inserted in smaller type where they are of special importance. Less apparently significant additions to the texts are only found in the apparatus, and canons added in few copies are only recorded in the Conspectus. The omission of canons in some copies is also recorded only in the Conspectus, except where the omission is found very widely.

The formal source is generally noted at the foot of each canon, where it is known, but the material sources are virtually never noted. The appearance of some form of the canon in Gratian is usually recorded, even if sometimes it is near certain that Pan. is not the immediate source. Canons from Pts I and II of Gratian which are not found in the earlier form identified by Winroth are marked with a ‘+’. Since this early form lacked Pt III, De consecratione, entirely, these references are not so marked. Where the text is also found in the Decretum, notes on earlier sources are only found there, and the apparatus should be compared with the draft text of the Collectio Tripartita, and the annotated copy of Migne’s version of Ivo’s Decretum, elsewhere on the site.

**Abbreviations and other guides to the text**

The following abbreviations are used throughout (excluding the ms sigla in the list of Panormia mss, and the initials of contributors above).


4L Collection in Four Books, as described by J. Gilchrist, ‘The manuscripts of the Canonical collection in Four Books’ ZRG Kan. Abt. lxix (1983), supplemented from Clavis canonum under VO, VR, VS.

5L Collection in Five Books (Clavis canonum, 82-5 as FU, FV; cf CCL Cont. M. 6 for I-III only)

9L Collection in Nine Books of Wolfenb. ms Gud. 212 (Clavis canonum, 207-9 as WO, WP)

9L (Basil.) Collection in Nine Books of Vat. Archivio S. Pietro C 118 (Clavis canonum DR)

9L (Vat. 1349) Collection in Nine Books of Vat. lat. 1349 (Clavis canonum FY)

74T Diversorum patrum sententie sive Collectio in LXXIV titulos digesta ed. J. Gilchrist (1973)

183T G. Motta, Liber canonum diversorum sanctorum patrum sive Collectio in CLXXXIII titulos digesta (1988) (Clavis canonum NO)

A Readings in the apparatus from canons found in Paris, Bibl. de l’Arsenal 713 B (Clavis canonum LP, for which cf too Brett, ‘The sources and influence’), interspersed with canons from Ivo’s Decretum. See now more fully Austin (2012).

too, for all these versions and the aberrant AL Bb, Clavis canonum 139-48, 157-8, 169-71, Cushing, ‘Polemic or Handbook’ (2008).

Alger R. Kretzschmar, Alger von Lütïchs Traktat ‘De Misericordia et Iustitia’ (1985)


Anseg. Die Kapitulariensammlung des Ansegis (Collectio capitularium Ansegisi) ed. Gerhard Schmitz (MGH Capitularia ns 1996)

Ars. 713 cf A above; the same collection, as cited among possible sources at foot of a canon.


BD Burchard of Worms, Libri decretorum in PL 140.537-1066 (for variants see Clavis canonum, BU, BV, BX, BW)

BenL Benedictus levita’s Capitularia, reprinted from the ed. by Baluze in PL 97 (= B); the ongoing web-edition by Schmitz and Hartmann (= E) has been checked for the sections it covered on 10/2/14: http://www.benedictus.mgh.de/edition/edition.htm. The Additamenta are cited as BenL A.

BMCL Bulletin of Medieval Canon Law n.s

Brant The edition of 1499

Caes. Collectio Caesaraugustana (Clavis canonum, 239-42, CA)

Caes. II Enlarged Collectio Caesaraugustana (Clavis canonum, 242-4, CB, CC)


CCL Corpus christianorum, Series latina

Clavis canonum Linda Fowler-Magerl, Clavis canonum. Selected canon law collections before 1140. Access with data processing (MGH Hilfsmittel 21, 2005), revised from her earlier Kanones. Also now on line at http://www.mgh.de/ext/clavis/

Coll. Sem. Sémur BM M. 13, for which, and the related mss, see Clavis canonum, 104-10 as SM, SN, SP, SS. The citations are from the ms, but the numbering is that of Clavis canonum. A recently discovered copy is now at Columbia University in New York.

Coll. Bruges Bruges, BM ms 99 (Clavis canonum, 183-4 as UH, UI)

Coll. Lanf. Collectio Lanfranci (Clavis canonum, 181-2 as LA, LB; cf Nicolas Álvarez de las Asturias, La colección canónica de Lanfranco de Bec, Roma 2004)

Coll. Tarrac. Collectio Tarraconensis (Clavis canonum, 133-6, TO, TR, TM)

CSEL Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum

Ctp Collectio Tripartita (the numbers as in the draft text on the site; those of Clavis canonum IT differ slightly, esp. in A 1)

DA Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters

Deusd. Die Kanonessammlung des Kardinals Deusdedit ed. V. Wolf von Glanvell (1905)

EA Epistolarum Anselmi in Sancti Anselmi opera omnia ed. F.S. Schmitt (Edinburgh 1946-61) iv-v
Ethym. *Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi etymologiarum sive originum libri XX* ed. W.M. Lindsay (1911, repr. 1985)


Hib. *Die irische Kanonensammlung* ed. H. Wasserschleben (1885)

ID The consensus of the *editio princeps* of Ivo’s *Decretum* by Molinaeus from two lost copies in 1561 (*IDm*) with the copies in BN lat 14315 (*IDp*) and Cambridge, Corpus Christi Coll. 19 (*IDc*); other copies noted are London BL Royal ms 11 D vii (*IDr*), BN lat. 3874 (*IDb*), Siguenza Archivo de la Catedral 61 (*IDs*) and Vatican BAV lat. 1357 (*IDv*), Pal. lat. 587 (*IDd*); for these see Landau, ‘Das Dekret des Ivo von Chartres’ *ZRG Kan. Abt.* lxx (1984) and the introduction to the *ID* section of the site. None of these is a direct copy of any other. Note that Molinaeus sometimes offers variant readings in the margin in larger type, apparently from his second copy, which are treated as significant, and conjectures from elsewhere in smaller type, which are ignored. Readings (or errors) introduced by Fronteau or Migne are also ignored.


*Migne* Migne’s edited version of Vosmedian in *PL* clxi

*PL* J-P Migne (ed.) *Patrologia latina*


*TC* Paris BN lat. 13368 (and its related copies), for which see *Clavis canonum* (TC) 136-7, and Rolker in *ZRG Kan. Abt.* 91 (2005)

*Vosm.* The edition of 1557

*W* Wasserschleben’s account of what is now Kraków, Bibl. Jag. 613 in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der vorgratianischen Kirchenrechtsquellen* 61-77.

*XIIP, (I) and (II)* The two forms of the Collection in Twelve Parts (*Clavis canonum* TX, TP; cf J. Müller, *Untersuchungen zur Collectio Duodecim Partium*, 1989)

*XP* Collection in Ten Parts (*Clavis Canonum* ZE)

*ZRG* *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonistische Abteilung*

There are two accessible incipit indexes. The earlier is that at the end of Theiner’s *Disquisitiones* (above), where *lv* represents the *Panormia*, *Ps.Iv* the *Decretum*; it has many idiosyncracies and errors. A much fuller and more accurate one is found in Dr Fowler-Magerl’s *Clavis canonum*, giving cross-references to our draft.