

TRIPARTITA. PREFATORY NOTE

Caveat lector

What follows is not even the draft of an edition, but a rough working text, originally assembled by MB for very limited purposes, done almost entirely from microfilm of varying quality. It has been worked on over many years, migrating across several word-processing programmes, and entered by an incompetent typist. It may perhaps have some convenience for others, but is far removed from a polished or properly verified text. Its failings survive despite the unstinting help of many friends, who have contributed far more than is made clear in the text.

In particular Greta Austin, Bruce Brasington, Linda Fowler-Magerl, Jörg Müller, Christof Rolker, Karl-Georg Schon, Robert Somerville, José Miguel Viejo-Ximénez and Anders Winroth have been unfailing in their help and advice – little sympathy though they may have with the use that has made of it. We have also had the benefit of a number of discussions with Szabolcs Anzelm Szuromi, though a careful reader will see that our interpretation of the evidence does not entirely coincide with his. The custodians of all the manuscripts cited have invariably been prompt and generous in responding to requests for help, and this is but a slight token of gratitude to them. Recently Przemysław Nowak has undertaken a detailed study of the whole work, and most of the recent additional information here has been supplied by him; in particular he has examined **H** and the Berlin fragment, and has made a minute examination of the Polish mss **P** and **N**. His larger interventions are noted with the initials PN, but extend in detail well beyond that. All questions, suggestions, corrections or complaints, which would be very welcome, should be addressed to him at p-nowak@gmx.de.

Manuscripts

First version

A Alençon BM 135 (abbreviated in A 1) from St Evroul; in long lines. In part related to HQ – it has related dislocations in A 2.3-4 and A 2. 26 - but more idiosyncratic. It lacks some of HQ's peculiarities and frequently agrees with T or O against them, though O has often been altered later. The scribe frequently confuses 's' and 'x' or breaks off in mid-word. s. xii¹; see

http://www.enluminures.culture.fr/documentation/enlumine/fr/rechguidee_00.htm

G Cambridge, Gonville & Caius College 455(393) - to B 28.10, where it ends incomplete at the end of a quire; in two columns. A text full of idiosyncratic readings, not easily related to any other. It is in an Anglo-Norman, and probably English, hand of s.xii med. (1120 x 1160 sugg. Dr Tessa Webber, July 2007), with good and unusual coloured initials. It shows few signs of use, but a second and slightly later hand made some marginal additions in Part B. Early on, some rubrics are in marginal panels, which occupy some of the main writing space. Afterwards they are in the text. The binding is of c. 1914. Formerly belonged to John Banister, who acquired it from his uncle, Joshua Lambert, in 1608. It passed later to William Moore, who gave a collection of 150 manuscripts from various sources to the College in 1659 (Prof. C.N.L. Brooke, pers. comm., identifying the book as Bernard, *CMA* no. 1117, which a concordance in the College copy makes the present 455/393. See too Szuromi (2010) 116-9, 151-4.

H Berlin, Hamilton 345, in long lines. The text begins with the Ivonian preface as far as 'querere debeat' (Prol. 142, ending before the list of contents), followed by the *Tripartita* preface proper. It has the dislocated version of A 2.3-4, 2.26 as in Q and (partially) A. Also s. xii med. and later in Italy, where it may have been from the outset; the hand is rather heavy. It is unique in attributing the collection to Ivo of Chartres.

J Paris BN lat.13656 (to B 29. 239 med.); partly illegible at beginning and end, where it ends at the foot of fo. 340v, apparently incomplete; in long lines, s. xii. The hand is a rather heavy one. There is a lacuna caused by physical loss after fo. 1, covering 1.1.4 med. -1.2.15 med. (which deprives us of important evidence for the canons present in the earlier version after 1.1.8 but omitted in the later version). The text is very close to Z, which may have been copied from it (but see under Z for 1.4.8A). After 1.4.8 it adds 8B, with a marginal cross, apparently reflecting its presence earlier as 1.4.4. This is found otherwise here only in Z, but in HQ reappears below as 1.12.1A. In 1.54. after 29 it has two canons, both again marked with a marginal cross. 29A is only otherwise found at the end of T (and largely repeats 27), though 29B does not appear to repeat an earlier text and is also found in GHQA. It has three repetitious canons from *ID* 16 in 3.29 (86A, 103A, and 222A) not found in any other reported ms. As with 1.54.29A-B (and 153A, 153B, 195A), marginal crosses appear to indicate that they were to be excised, and none are copied in Z, though Z's corrected inscription to 3.29.87 seems to show that 86A stood in its ultimate exemplar. J has sometimes been adjusted later, but not in a way that establishes the use of a second exemplar. From the abbey of S. Mary, Josaphat (OSB, Chartres). See too Szuromi (2010) 78-81, and T below.

O Oxford, Bodleian Lib. D'Orville 46 (SC 16924), from A 1.5.4 to B 20.32 (med.), lacking a quire at the beginning (the first surviving quire is lettered 'b') and more at the end; in long lines. It has also lost a leaf or leaves after fo. 48, covering A 1.54 from mid-c. 13 to the end of the Pelagius section. It is written in an Anglo-Norman hand of s. xii med., and in the earlier sections the rubrics are often boxed in the margin. It was annotated in a number of later hands. Originally a copy of the first version apparently based on a text which had some of A's idiosyncratic readings (though not A itself, since it is not abbreviated), it was partly corrected from another first version copy. It does not have the dislocation found in HQ (and partly in A) in A 2.3-4, 2.26. In the passages where O overlaps with T they are usually very close.

Q Paris BN lat. 4282 (Quentin) in long lines; complete, and with the dislocation in A 2.3-4 and 26 as in H, with which it shares many variants, and another, not in H, after 1.46.16. The text is idiosyncratic and idiosyncratically corrected. It also has a few dislocations of its own (and is misbound after fo. 80). Mid to late s.xii. See too Szuromi (2010) 76-8

T Copenhagen, Thott 4^o 555 (from A 2.28.38), in long lines; at the end has a duplicate version of a Pelagius canon otherwise only noted in J, with which it also shares some minor eccentricities in other texts, though in general closer to OA than either HQ or ZJ. Generally this is a good copy of the first version as far as it goes. Its end is idiosyncratic. Again apparently French in origin, s. xii¹

Z Paris BN lat. 3858, in long lines; a complete text of the first version but with readings in detail closer to the second than those of HQA. Against the other first version mss the text of Z is much closer to J than to TGO, and may well have been copied from it. It omits almost all the texts marked with a cross there, except 1.4.8B, but is apparently unique in including 1.4.8A – largely repeated in 1,12,1-2a. The conclusion of B 29 links it (loosely) rather to HQ than to T. It is a good clear copy, only lightly corrected, though much smaller hands have inserted some of the rubrics, and many cross-references to Gratian. See too Szuromi (2010) 74-6, 139-41. From Troyes. s. xii¹

First version fragments

Bodl. Oxford Bodl. Bodley 561 for B 29.8-283A, in a hand which is probably English, in long lines, s. xii¹. The *Trip.* element is part of a composite MS assembled in this form by c. 1200, by which time it seems to have been at St Albans, though the original scribe is not known there. Its readings align it generally, but not exclusively, with HQ. See too Brett (1992) 157-65, 172-4.

Second Version

B Paris BN lat. 3858A (Bigot), in two columns. The copyist only numbered some canons in sequence, but often treated the c. nos of the collection in other copies as if they were c. nos in the source. The text has many variants not yet found elsewhere, but is in general a version close to V and P, rather than W, an apparently distinct form of the second version; However, B and W share a string of extracts from *IP* 1 at the end, which are not found elsewhere. Like VP, and against W, it lacks A 1.14.14, and like PW it lacks the additional canons after B 9.2 against V. s. xii¹, from Fécamp, in a known hand: B. Branch, 'Willermus peccator et les manuscrits de Fécamp, 1100-1150', *Cahiers de civ. med.* 26 (1983), 195-207. Unique among *Trip.* mss in including the canons of C. Westminster 1125 at the end.

C Paris BN lat.3858B (Colbertinus), in two columns; Fournier's base ms, a copy of the second version which has been heavily corrected at intervals, often against a first version copy, usually by erasure. The microfilm I have used is often obscure, even where the manuscript has not been altered. Its text has some variants otherwise only found in L, and others which link it with the original form of RX; there are a large number of cases where C and R (but not X) have subsequently been corrected. One or two of the alterations to C suggest it has been 'contaminated' by readings from Gratian, though in principle the derivation might be the reverse. It has been annotated in some detail by an early modern scholar. s. xii². It is said to be from Le Mans.

D Admont 162 (to B 20. 58), fos 6-139; not damaged at end, in long lines. D is closely related to KNM though a copy of none (or of their source, since it lacks some of KN's distinctive shared readings), and among these is very close to M, like which it omits canons at fairly frequent intervals. Like M too, it lacks the additions after B 9.2 which are found in N, but the other omitted canons in both D and M make the significance of this hard to assess. The text has been heavily corrected, but not apparently from a copy of another version. Has a small set of additions after B 14, and extensive material added in several hands at the beginning and end, much of it also shared with M, for which, at least in these sections, it may well be the source – for

these see DKMN app. file. For bibliography see <http://www.ksbm.oeaw.ac.at/lit/frame.htm>

K Berkeley, Law Library, Robbins 102 (to A 2.19), in long lines; it ends with some early additions – for these see DKMN app. file, so the text is not physically damaged. As far as it goes, it is very close to N, and the abbreviated DM, but none is a copy of any other. It may be significant that there is a marked change of script in N and D where K ends, though not in M. Almost certainly at Lambach by the time the (unpublished) catalogue was drawn up, but almost certainly written at Admont. s. xii. For a detailed description of the ms see: <http://app.cul.columbia.edu:8080/exist/scriptorium/individual/CU-ROB-738.xml?showLightbox=yes>. Over a short section the text is laid out very oddly, as may be seen at fos 72v-3, illustrated there.

L Zemský archiv v Opavě, pobočka Olomouc, Sbíрка rukopisů Metropolitní kapituly u sv. Václava Olomouc, CO.205. This text seems unrelated to DKMN, and sample collations show its closest connections to be with C, rather than RXS, though it agrees with these against C from time to time. The text is complete, but is not a good one. It is seriously dislocated in A 2, though the shift is noticed by marginal notes in another hand. In the middle of A 2 the text is interrupted by canons from the version of the Council of Reims of 1131, as found in the *Codex Udalrici*, in another hand. It cannot be a copy of C, for it lacks some of its minor peculiarities, but must depend on something very like C's immediate ancestor, with which it shares the additions in B 9 (also in RXSNV) and a multitude of other lesser variants. It is currently held to have been written in the years 1139–1141, at an early stage of bp Henry Zdík of Olomouc's creation of his cathedral library, and the additions have been attributed to a scribe trained at Mainz under Archbishop Adalbert I (Nowak (2012) 357-8, citing earlier literature).

M Munich Staatsbibliothek Clm 12603 (St Pancratius in Ranshofen, OSA), in two columns. The *Tripartita* ends in mid-leaf (fo. 121v) at B 20.58; after a change of hand, much of the added matter found also in D follows, and then some texts peculiar to this copy, ending at fo. 150rb. The relation between the two books is very close, for they also agree in omitting a number of canons entirely, and both have the same appendix after B 14 – for these see DKMN app. file. It is, however, unlikely that the *Tripartita* text was copied from either to the other, for there are idiosyncratic readings in both to distinguish them. There are numerous lesser omissions in the text which have been supplied, apparently by the main hand, in the margin - these are only occasionally noted.

N Gniezno, Archiwum Archidiecezjalne – Biblioteka Katedralna, Ms. 25, in long lines. To B 20.32, ending in mid fo.200r, a half leaf; the verso has notes in a modern hand. A short section covering B 20.37-58, 36, 35, is inserted after A 2.46. The scribe rarely distinguishes between 'tamen' and 'tantum', and is haphazard in abbreviations for 'quod', 'quid', 'quis' etc. N is closely related to K until K ends, less closely to DM, all four have a shared ultimate archetype. Unlike DM, however, it has the added canons in B 9 after c 2, otherwise found only in CLRXSV. It has a mass of idiosyncratic readings, and some insertions in A 2 – for these see DKMN app. file. The text has been heavily annotated by several later hands, including extensive cross-references to Gratian. s. xii. For a full codicological description, with ample

bibliography, see Nowak (2008), proposing that the copy was made in South Germany or the Steiermark for Archbishop Jacob of Gniezno (c. 1124-48), and reporting the brief additions on pp. 1-2 and Nowak (2012) 356.

P Kraków, Archiwum Krakowskiej Kapituły Katedralnej, Ms. 84, in long lines. This begins with the preface on fo.1 and ends incomplete at the foot of fo. 185v, the last leaf of quire XXIII, at c 172 of the *capitulatio* to B 29. It is followed by:

a) fos 186r-231r: Amalarius, *Regula canonicorum* i (lacks preface), pr. *PL* cv. 815-954.

b) fos 231v-41v: *Martirologium Bede*.

c) fos 242r-9r: Ordo Romanus VII, liturgical texts as in Monte Cassino 451, fos. 88-94, 73v-7, excerpts from Ordo L (cf Andrieu, *Les ordines* i 196, 198-9).

d) fo. 249r-v: Two inventories of the cathedral treasury and books, one dated 1101, the other 1110 in the time of bishop Maurus (d. 1118), both in the same hand. Further acquisitions in the time of the bishop have been added in another hand.

Dr Nowak published a short note, with three plates from the beginning and end of the book, in *Źródła kultury duchowej Krakowa*, ed. Elżbieta Macioł, Kraków 2007, I/7, and a detailed description with ten plates in 'The manuscripts of the *Collectio Tripartita* in Poland' (2008). What follows is drawn largely from that account.

It has been argued, esp. by David, that the book is the *capitulare* listed in the 1110 inventory, which would make it the earliest dated copy of the collection. David further suggested that its archetype was probably brought to Poland by the papal legate Gualo, who had close connections with Ivo, in 1103, and that **N** was taken from the same exemplar. Neither case is at all cogent. **N** clearly follows a distinct tradition. The date proposed for both also rests on very weak arguments. There is not yet any good evidence that the revision which issued in the later version was done at Chartres or as early as 1103, and Ivo himself appears to use the earlier version in the *Decretum*, so any connection with the legate must be precarious. Further, Vetulani rightly objected that *capitulare* is not a conventional word for a collection of canons, but rather for a set of gospel pericopes (Vetulani 1951, 495-8, also id. *Le plus ancien inventaire d'une bibliothèque polonaise*, Krakow 1971, 23-4). Alternatively one might suggest a *Liber capitularium*. Neither description fits **P** very well.

Nowak identifies at least eleven hands, of which three worked in both the *Tripartita* and in the later material, and one of these was responsible for the inventories. He suggested earlier that the book was written in the Rhineland, but in 2012 (356 and n. 91) preferred northern France, partly encouraged in this view by Prof. Hartmut Hoffmann. It seems to follow that the book was accompanied to Poland by at least one of the scribes. The evidence of the inventories places the whole book in Poland by 1118 at the latest, since additions were made to the second inventory apparently during the lifetime of Maurus. This confirms that **P** is indeed the earliest known dated copy, even if that date may be rather later than has been supposed. The scribes of **P** are eccentric, and sometimes the forms are hard to interpret; there is frequently no distinction between (e.g) *-itur*, *-iret* and *-int*. In some sections, chiefly but not exclusively whole quires, the inscriptions and rubrics are omitted (as they are in part of Amalarius in the later section). There is a serious dislocation of the text in B 20-22, which produces much confusion of numbering and arrangement. Only a few of the numerous idiosyncracies of the text are recorded in the apparatus. Broadly it represents the same form as in BV, and agrees rather more often with V than B in detail. Particularly, the extracts from Anacletus in A 1.2 are copied in a single block,

with no breaks and no rubrics. However, it agrees with B (and W) against V in lacking the added canons after B 9.2.

R Vatican, Reg. lat. 973 (cf the Ballerini in *PL* 56.348-9), in two columns. R is close to C, like which it has added canons in B 9 and has often been corrected, apparently against a first version copy, in exactly the same way. R is certainly not a copy of C (and L shares many idiosyncracies with C against RX), often agreeing with X (and sometimes S) against CL. It is most closely related to X, and both share a few readings with the KNDM group against CLS; defects of the ultimate exemplar of RX have been corrected much more fully in R than in X. A smaller group of changes link R with readings otherwise only reported in S. The hands are elegant and lucid, and probably French. The last twenty lines of fo.173rb have been erased, and only the odd word could be recovered under u/v light (Leonard Boyle 4.iii.93 letter), so it now ends in mid-B 29.283. s.xii². The presence of other texts unrelated to those found at the end of most second version copies in a s. xii hand on fo. 173r-v suggests it has always lacked those found in CL, S or WB. See too Szuromi (2010) 67-71, 134-8.

S Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz lat. fol. 197; from Maria Laach. The palaeographical date is conventionally given as s.xii/xiii, but this seems too late. It is an eccentric copy of the second version. Apart from the idiosyncratic way in which A 2.44 comes after Toledo XII, rather than Toledo VII, it has a massive *capitulatio* to the whole work on fos 1v-18v in which the canons after B 29.284 have been added in another hand. The recto of fo.19 is blank, and fos 19v-21v have a synodal order (Schneider Ordo 17, beginning ‘Hora conuenienti quando episcopo uel eius uicario’ and ending ‘dies indulgentie uocatur’, and including a text of the *Admonitio synodalis*). A much later text beginning ‘Sicut in construenda domo precipuus est architectoris’ and ending ‘uniuersali ecclesie nec alteri cuicumque’ is added in a hand of s.xvi¹ on fo. 22r-v; fo. 23r is blank. A list of popes in the main hand on fos 23v-4 runs up to Urban [II], but was subsequently continued to Hadrian [IV]. This is followed by the Ivonian preface (ending as H does, above, though with variants), and then by the *Tripartita* preface proper. The usual *capitulationes* for each section are then inserted in the text in the conventional way. Both the first *capitulatio* and the text lack A 1.66-7. Uniquely, it marks a clear break after A 2.49 with a distinctive explicit, and has a large decorated initial to the first cap. of A.2.50. The manuscript was used by Friedberg, and in the apparatus (though not the table in the preface) he sometimes gave a double numbering of Trip. B in brackets, treating A 2.50 as B. 1. The text ends at B 29.284, followed by five additions apparently peculiar to it. It has A 1.14.14, 1.38.26a and the added canons after B 9.2, and has the re-arranged versions of A 2.39 and B 17. The detailed readings of S are puzzling. Usually, though not always, they align it closely with CLRX, (as with the marginal notes to A 2.2.1) against KNDM, W or BVP, but in A 2 there are a considerable number of cases where the main text has the reading of the earlier version (and particularly H) against all the other copies of the later form. There are two striking cases in A 2.50. In c 30 a passage has dropped out from all the other later mss by eye-skip, but is present in S, and in c 38 a last sentence is found in the earlier mss, but only in S among the later ones. The effect is less visible in Part B, though still present. Elsewhere in Part B the inscriptions are often truncated or absent, and a number of canons are also abbreviated. There are numerous corrections in another hand, some minor marginal additions, and frequent lexical glosses. It is probably not significant that S, like W, sometimes numbers canons in A 1 which are the only ones in the name

of that pope as if they were part of the preceding sequence. In the microfilm the rubrics are faint, and not always legible. S was used extensively by the editors of the letters of the popes of the ninth century in the MGH *Epistolae* series. [A number of the readings from S have been verified or supplied by PN]

V Vorau, Stiftsbibliothek 350 (only odd variants noticed here); ends with B 29. 284 (no additions); on fly-leaf: 'Decreta Bernh' prepositus contulit S. Marie sanctoque Thome apostolo monasterio'. In long lines s. xii. In the early form of the revision found in BP, but it lacks any of B's additions at the end, and very rarely agrees with B in detailed variants, if rather more often with P. Unlike B or P, however, it includes the added canons in B 9 after c 2, which are otherwise peculiar to the later revisions. Very occasionally it shares readings with KNMD. In Part A the rubrics drift from text to margin and back in a way otherwise characteristic of the first version. The text has been much corrected, by more than one hand, and on a number of occasions the later reading is closest to the corrected text of C. As in P the Anacletus texts are in a solid block, but here the rubrics of the *capitulatio* are entered in the margin. Rubrics are often omitted, especially in B 29, though space has been left for their insertion. s xii

W Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August Bibl. Helmst. 180, s. xii med, or a little earlier, in two columns; probably originally French [PN]. On fly-leaf: 'Ego Bruno indignus sacerdos offero Deo et sancte Marie ista decreta pro remedio anime mee', one of several gifts to the cathedral library of Hildesheim by Bruno, who was bishop 1153-61 – *Handschriften der Dombibliothek* ii 81. An idiosyncratic text. In Part B at least it lacks the additions after B 9.2 found in CLRXSV and has some readings in the text which are closer to the first version (esp. ZJ) than even B, V or P is, though it shares with B the string of extracts from *Panormia* I at the end. However, it does also have some features of the later form (notably the additions to the text of the Council of Nicea (A 2.1.11-2), which are present in CLRS, but not in X. There seem to be no significant convergences with the KNMD group. The frequent corrections are not characteristic of any second exemplar that I can identify. s.xii¹ - med.

X Zurich, Zentralbibliothek Car. C 42 (Mohlberg, *Mittelalterliche Handschriften* no. 250), which belonged to the nunnery of SS Felix and Regula OSB at Zurich (the Frauenmünster) later; s. xii, probably quite early, in two columns, and in several hands. This copy was first called to more general attention by RES. It has the second version text in a form which belongs in general with the CLRS complex, and agrees most often, though not always, with R (with which it shares a number of omissions, which are more often supplied later in R than in X). Sometimes however it agrees with C even against L. Like CLRS it has A 1.14.14, A 1.38.26a and the added canons after B 9.2, and has the re-arranged versions of A 2.39 and B 17. It has no additions. Frequent corrections, and additions of text originally omitted, have been inserted by an early hand (perhaps that of the rubricator) in the text and margins, clearly from the exemplar, or from another copy in the same tradition.

Second version fragments

Pal Vienna Pal. 982 for fragments of Part B

Köln, Stadtarchiv 7010 199 (W*199), for which see Johanna Petersmann in *DA* 30 (1974) 447-8, *Clavis canonum* 191-2, is essentially a re-arrangement of Trip. A in ten topical books. The book has suffered some damage, and particularly the loss of a quire containing 2.15.3 med. – 3.7.12. A second version in Leipzig UB Haenel 16, also once at Köln, is a better copy, and probably is the source for the one still at Köln. It too has lost a quire, this one covering 5.2.25 med. – 5.4.62 med., so between the two mss the whole can be reconstructed. Though neither Petersmann nor Fowler-Magerl made the claim, their accounts could be read as suggesting this as a witness to the circulation of Trip. A without Trip. B. However, Trip. B does in fact appear occasionally in the collection – Köln fo. 35v for 3.3.11-2, Leipzig fo.56r-v for 3.10.43, Köln fo.113v for 3.12.8, fo. 114v for 3.13.1, fo. 116v for 3.3.12, fos 118v-9v for 3. 8. 6-7a, 3. 8. 9; fo. 140 for 3. 10. 53; fo. 151 for 3. 10. 50; fos 153v-4v for 3. 9. 23; fo. 158v for 3. 27. 15; fo. 167r-v for 3.15.1, 3.15. 4b,fo. 169r-v for 3.15.5b, 3. 15. 17, 21, 22; fo. 173 for 3. 15. 79; fo. 178v-9 for 3. 16. 8, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18; fos 179v-80 for 3. 16. 26. Further, sample collation of the Trip. A texts included shows that these were taken from the later state of the text, including 1.14.14. and 1.38.26a, peculiar to the later form. Though the editorial activity here is of considerable interest, it is most unlikely that the variants of the manuscript take one behind the text of more conventional copies.

Be Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Fragm. 135 (a pastedown covering A 2. 28. 23-41 med.). This has the rubrics, numbering of canons and characteristic readings of the later form. The verso is very badly damaged, and much there is barely legible. s. xii, ? German. Dolezalek, 'Seckels Handschriftenfragmente' in *Ius Commune* iv 297 n.13 [PN note]

Fr Frankfurt, Max Planck Institute, ms 3. Three leaves, much damaged. The recto of the second covers 3. 2. 18-23, the recto of the third ends with 3. 29. 32 (Dolezalek, 'Seckels Handschriftenfragmente' 296ff) [PN note]

[Lambach Stiftsbibliothek fol. 107 to Carthage V only. The unpublished catalogue shows this ms ending at precisely the same point as K. It cannot now be found at the abbey, and is probably identical with K, given the known losses from Lambach in the last century.]

Extracts from Part B in Admont mss 43 and 48 are described by Winfried Stelzer in *Gelehrtes Recht in Österreich*, 22-44; cf <http://www.ksbm.oeaw.ac.at/lit/frame.htm>.

Affiliations of copies

Of the first version copies J and Z are very closely related in their variants, by the presence of 1.4.8B, and sometimes alternate between marginal rubrics and rubrics in the text in a similar way. They are also the two copies which are commonly nearest the shared ancestor of all the second version copies. For the passages they have in common T has some readings in common with J, but others in which it is nearer OA. A is an erratic text, with a number of readings (some of them bizarre) which are also found in O, though O has been extensively corrected and lacks many of the more manifest errors of A. G has very few of the distinctive readings which separate HQ from ZJTOA, but appears to be independent of all the others, for it has a number of

idiosyncratic variants. It does have some primitive features in A 1.1. HQ are clearly a pair, linked by numerous variants and the apparent disorder of their archetype in A 2.2-3 and 26, though both resolve this rather differently, and Q has been erratically corrected, apparently against another version. Q also has a number of transpositions of word-order, rarely noted here, which are of little significance except that they seem to preclude any possibility of H being copied from it, or *vice versa*. Some, but not all, of the dislocation in HQ was present in the ancestor of A, which otherwise shows no significant agreement with them; the nature of the dislocations was recognised by the scribe of A but not in HQ. It is a misfortune that the clearest indicators of the inter-relationships between the manuscripts of the earlier version are in A 1.1 and B 29, which have been lost from several copies.

Although this may prove an illusion on further work, it *seems* as if there is little manuscript evidence (apart from the revision which issued in the various forms of the second version) to elucidate the stages of growth of the text. Some duplicate canons in A 1, found in all copies of the first version which now contain it, are easier to understand as surviving from the first stages of compilation than as later additions, for they are apparently related to **Br**, which provided the Preface as well as a few Pseudo-Isidore forms, and to Paris, BN lat. 13368 (Tc in the apparatus). Structurally J preserves more of the *Decretum* source than any other copy. The excision of some of the repetition this involved in all other copies is the earliest discernible stage of revision in the surviving manuscripts. The best evidence of an early change of plan is at the end of A 2. The odd rubric at the beginning of A 2.50, which stands in every known copy which covers it, applies much better to the B section than to the *Sententiae* which immediately follow, and this might suggest that it stood originally before B (to which it could reasonably refer) - which now begins with no clear mark of a break in any copy. If so, A 2.50 is an early addition (and it is notable that only 2.50.7-9 passed in this form into Ivo's *Decretum* -not necessarily from here - whereas the other sections are exploited much more fully). Even if this is true, 2.50 had been inserted before any surviving copy was taken. Physically, the break is most clearly marked in S.

All the second version copies must ultimately descend from a single exemplar. They agree in providing numbered *capitulationes* to (most) sections which incorporate larger rubrics than those of the first version, and in re-arranging the canons of Trip. B in a way which departs further from the order of the *Decretum* than the first version did. They all also lack some text found in the earlier version, sometimes by scribal error, sometimes apparently by deliberate choice (as in A 2 50), and agree in a number of minor textual variants against all mss of the earlier version. It is noteworthy that none of the collections which have been associated with Ivo, Trip., Dec. or Pan. in their earliest discernible form seems to have had the kind of detailed *capitulatio* found in these later forms of Trip.

In its first visible state, represented by BPV, this revised version lacked the last Calixtus canon in A 1.14 and the beginning of the Innocent canon A 1.38. 26, as do all the first version copies. In a later form these had been added. This form is found in W; though W has more of the revisions characteristic of CLRSXKNDM than BPV do, and its readings in detail rarely agree with BPV against any other witness, yet these four copies all share some readings with the earlier form against CLRSXKNDM. W and B are also linked by their conclusion, where they share a series of extracts from *Panormia* 1.41-140. Apparently later still, some additions were made after B 9.2, which occur in CLRSXN (but not the abbreviated DM), and more surprisingly in V (but not WBP) also.

The copies of the latest discernible state fall into two groups. NDM (and probably the incomplete K too) seem to have a common ultimate ancestor which ended at B. 20.58, There is no obvious reason to stop there, suggesting that this common ancestor may have been damaged. So far as it went this must have represented a late stage of the transmission, where most of the alterations characteristic of CLRXS against WBVP had already been made, but the presumed ancestor had many idiosyncracies not found in CLRXS, and several which link it with WBPV in detail against them. KN must be descended independently from this ultimate ancestor, and DM only through an intermediate abbreviated exemplar, though DM lack the additions in B 9 which are found in N.

C, L, R, X and S are also closely related, though in a curious way. C and R sometimes share readings otherwise found only in LX, and more strikingly both have been heavily corrected, usually in exactly the same way and at the same points, mostly from a text of the 'A' type, C chiefly by erasure, R by interlineation. However, there are a number of points where CL agree against RX - sufficient to require that they have a common ancestor which was not R. It is far from clear how the shared corrections of C and R arose. S is a true eccentric, possibly to be explained as copied from an exemplar which was originally very close to CLRX but which had been collated in detail with a copy of the H tradition of the first version (and it is notable that S and H are the only copies to incorporate the Ivonian Prologue). The process resembles that which occurred in CR in principle, though the corrected readings here are distinct, in the main text, and much more extensive and systematic.

The most material point is that the manuscripts can be classified loosely into groups, but that the detailed readings of the manuscripts show few clear and consistent stemmatic relationships. With the possible exceptions of JZ, HQ, KN, DM and RX no two copies appear to have a single ancestor. It seems that this has to be explained either by hypothesising a very large number of lost manuscripts or by a great deal of horizontal corruption and correction, or more probably both. The widespread evidence of collation of a second exemplar, particularly visible in C, R, V and O, and readily inferred for the ancestor of S, illustrates the extent to which these horizontal lines of connection could flourish.

More detailed examination of the manuscripts which have not been systematically collated may show that these conclusions need fundamental revision, and the origins of W and G in particular need further study.

Principles for an edition

An edition of the first version should therefore rest on J, supplemented in its missing section by Z, for these lack the perturbations found in HQA, and are both more complete and less idiosyncratic than TGO. In practice of course there is great merit in the readings of several of the incomplete MSS.

The second version is much more complex, for there are the materials for an edition of several different states of the text. An edition of the earliest state would rest pre-eminently on BV, compared as necessary with the incomplete and eccentric P; W suggests a second stage, in which 1.1.14 had been integrated in the text but the additions after B 9.2 had not been made; an edition of the last state would rest chiefly on RX, noting the shared eccentricities of CL and of S. KNDM form another eccentric compact group, as well as being incomplete.

Method of construction of this draft

In its essentials this draft text is a version of the CLRXS text, the latest discernible. This is partly the result of two connected accidents, the decision to start with C, and Fournier's choice of C as the basis for his description - for no obvious reason beyond convenience. However, there are two further points. The Friedberg edition of Gratian depends for the *Trip.* partly on Theiner's notes, which were often taken from R, though Richter/Friedberg also knew S, which sometimes led them to an inconvenient and misleading numbering of the sections, particularly in *Trip.* B. Both R and S are rather similar late versions. The earlier literature, and the subdivisions of the text usually used, depend therefore essentially on a C type text. The outstanding convenience of this later version is that the *capitulationes* and lay-out provide an (almost) unambiguous medieval subdivision, while the 'A' form is far harder to break up according to any consistent plan - there is very little unanimity in indicating where the extracts begin and end in these, though that is itself an important fact in assessing the contribution of *Trip.* to later collections, up to and including Gratian.

Correspondingly, since not even the incomplete J copy of the first version has consistently superior weight, any new subdivision of the text based on the first version would be a mere construct, even more arbitrary than the divisions of the second form, without sufficient warrant in the MSS and difficult to use in the context of earlier scholarship. The later form is therefore used as the framework for the text, but it should be remembered that the consensus of first-version readings in the apparatus often represents a much better guide to the original form of the text than that presented here. In general, the readings which appear late in the sequence in the apparatus are in some sense earlier than those which appear first.

The transcription below is, then, based on a microfilm of C for historical reasons, but this is unsatisfactory in several ways. The film is often unclear, and the binding is tight, so this is a very provisional text; further C has been so heavily corrected, often by erasure, that the visible text is heavily contaminated. There are a number of cases where one may suspect that C has been altered by erasure, but where the microfilm does not make this certain, or even probable. K, N, B, Z, T, H and A are fully collated throughout the sections they cover, and in some cases G has been consulted, but the notes which cite its readings are usually random. However G has been collated more systematically from A 1.1 to the beginning of O, throughout the Pelagius section, for the gap between the end of K and beginning of T, and in B 1-2. All G's readings need re-checking, since they have been done against the MS in short stretches (and the positive apparatus is very incomplete, even where it has been collated). Similarly RX have often been used as a control on the eccentric readings of C or L, and R is collated fully for Part B. L (and sometimes S) has usually been consulted where C appears otherwise idiosyncratic, but less often elsewhere. W has only been sampled, though it is collated through A 1.59-60. O is fully collated from its beginning at A 1.5.4 to the end of A 2, but only selectively in B, where it is used as a check on A. Readings from other mss. are entered more or less at random, except that D is usually checked where K and N divide, or where KN agree against the consensus, and M is used as an occasional control on D. P is similarly used as a control for the distinctive readings of B (and V similarly where P or B fails). Q is used as a control on the eccentric readings of either H or A, and J collated as a control on Z. The effect of these procedures is that the collation excludes most of the idiosyncratic readings and corrections peculiar to L, X, S, W, M, D, P, V, J, G and Q, and gives a misleadingly favourable view of their text. I have preserved a modest

adaptation of the traditional numeration and subdivision of the sections, even where this seems absurd (particularly in A 2), for the reasons set out above.

The punctuation is almost completely random, and consciously sparse. I worked on the assumption that no published text would rest on C, which seems a relatively poor copy, and certainly a long way down the stemma. In creating a publishable text, when a firm choice of base manuscript had been made, some future editor could weigh the merits of its punctuation against the requirements of the reader with more purpose.

The apparatus is also full to the point of folly, but at this stage it seemed important to preserve even the most bizarre readings and all evidence of subsequent correction in the manuscripts collated in their entirety; these may, and sometimes do, point to significant relations between the manuscripts (as with CR, V or OA); alterations to other copies are noted more or less at random, as they came to notice. Similarly, although it is tedious, I have made it largely a positive apparatus, recording most agreements of the fully collated mss with C in variants (except in some trivial cases of freakish readings, particularly from the erratic copies N and A), as well as every departure. As the other copies have been collated very selectively this is an essential interim measure. The reader should be clear that if any manuscript except CKNBZHA (and O in A 1-2, R in B) is not cited in the apparatus, this means that it has not been checked, not that it agrees with the main text. If the collation is ever completed for all copies, the great bulk of this positive annotation should be dropped, but not yet.

Throughout the text there are some oddities of spelling, e.g. the variation between 'hii', 'hi' and 'ii', which are most imperfectly recorded; in principle this (and one or two others) might affect the sense, but in practice the scribes seem not to have been conscious of the fact (the case is similar even for more substantial alternative forms such as 'amissa/admissa' or, more rarely, 'iusta/iuxta', which are noted).

Since the use of C as the base ms. is so provisional, this laborious procedure is useful, and could be essential. Usually I have been reluctant to abandon C's reading in the text, however silly, except where it is only supported by L, R or X. In all mss I have reduced the occasional diphthong or tailed 'e' to plain e, and have not bothered much with the 'c'/t' distinction; in C and elsewhere it is often invisible. The spelling is based slavishly on C, or on Z where the canon does not occur in C.

I have used single letter sigla partly out of habit, but also because the convention of numbering mss. with a letter for their point of deposit is not always very instructive, particularly with the string of Paris mss. Few users will readily distinguish P³ from P⁵ say. It is also a major nuisance if one uses the convention (e.g.) C for the main hand, or for a correction by the main scribe, C² for a later corrector, C³ for a much later one. This helps to keep text-notes brief, and I find it very convenient, though my use of it is not consistent, and some corrections are in their nature difficult to attribute to one hand rather than another, particularly when working from microfilm.

In the apparatus the variants refer only to the immediately preceding word unless it is explicitly said otherwise. An entry such as 'C?' means that this looks like C's reading, but may not be; '? C' etc mean that the reading was indecipherable in my copy – whether from the quality of the film, from its being hidden in the gutter or pure ignorance.

Nature of notes on sources and derivatives

The added references are highly provisional, but work in this way. Firstly, the notes on sources refer almost exclusively to likely formal sources; virtually no effort has been made to identify their material origin. Secondly, the notes on later collections dependent on *Trip.* are confined to Ivo's *Decretum*, the *Panormia* and Gratian. In principle the cross-references to Gratian and Ivo's *Decretum* are over-generous, erring on the side of folly; where it is pretty certain that *Trip.* is not their source you are sometimes warned by a 'cf' or a 'var.', but this is a very summary piece of work. It should be reasonably comprehensive where Gratian or Ivo's *Decretum* preserves a text which begins in a form close to *Trip.* but must omit many cases where the parallel is found within *Trip.*'s text, or where one may suspect that a Gratian text taken from elsewhere has been modified in the light of *Trip.*'s readings. Canons which are not found in the earlier form of Gratian as described by Winroth and Weigand are preceded by a '+', except that *De consecratione*, being entirely absent from the first version, is not also marked. When a canon in Gratian is said to be (e.g.) 'as BD' this is shorthand; it means merely that the form is similar, not that Gratian's text is derived from Burchard. The *Panormia* has been treated in the same way as the *Decretum*. Here, and throughout, citation of a canon followed by a lower case letter, e.g. '2a', indicates a part of the text; references to a canon followed by an upper case letter, e.g. '1.50A' indicate a canon omitted in the edition but found in at least some manuscripts. Descriptions of these added canons in *ID* or *IP* can be found on the relevant web-sites.

Among the potential formal sources Pseudo-Isidore, the 'Collection of Sémur', the *Collectio Britannica* and the *Quadripartitus* have been noted fairly fully. All other parallels are only cited where I have noticed some potentially interesting convergence; they are mere notes, not conclusions. More urgently, there are few cross-references from Part A to Part B, and possibly not enough from Part B to Part A. In fact the overlap is very much less than might be supposed from Fournier's analysis, so modest indeed as to suggest that the B collection was indeed designed largely as a supplement of essential material omitted from the A – a conclusion which Fournier rejected. The relationship between parts A and B is set out in tabular form in the Concordance to the *Decretum* elsewhere on the site.

Though any firm decision is premature, it seems as if Ivo's *Decretum* depends on a copy of the first version in Part A, though I have not identified which - not however an HQ form. The similarities are found both in text and rubric. In the apparatus below some cases where the consensus of the *Decretum* transmission agrees with one reading against another are marked with an asterisk; in general this consensus is treated as that of Molinaeus' edition with the *Decretum* mss C and P, though variants from other copies are sometimes treated as overthrowing this consensus. A superficial study of the readings of *Trip.* B compared against Ivo's *Decretum* shows no clear alignment with the earlier or later forms. It should be remembered that the function of these asterisks is reversed between Part A and Part B. In Part A they are signposts towards the form of *Trip.* used in the *Decretum*; in Part B they suggest the nature of the *Decretum* from which the compiler of *Trip.* was working.

Gratian, on the other hand, commonly follows a second version text, though it is not clear to me which branch of the transmission he used. His rewriting of the rubrics deprives one of a test which can be used for Ivo. Some readings in later copies of *Trip.* agree more closely with Gratian than others. Whether this shows that they are closer to his source, or that they have been altered to conform to his text, remains unclear.

Fuller information on the readings of Ivo's *Decretum* and of the *Panormia* can be found in the relevant sections of the site.

Unpublished sources

An abbreviated Pseudo-Isidore, with distinctive prefaces to the decretals and to the councils, survives in two manuscripts, Bruges, BM 99 and London BL Cotton Cleopatra C viii (collectively **Br**). This has the preface which is found at the head of most copies of the *Tripartita*, but is much more appropriate to a collection which ends with Gregory I, as **Br** does, rather than to the *Tripartita*. Further, in some cases the Bruges/Cotton texts are *catenae*, which reappear in *Trip.* in that form, as do other brief excerpts, particularly in the earlier sections of A1. Usually, however, the *Tripartita* has longer excerpts than **Br** does, contains much that is not there at all, and omits a few texts which are there. It appears that **Br** provided a starting point for the compiler of A 1, but one which was soon abandoned for a much fuller set of excerpts. Traces of its early influence can be found in some doublets which occur in several manuscripts of the first version of *Trip.* but were apparently rejected for redundancy in later copies. In the list of possible formal sources **Br** is occasionally noted, but only where there is a close coincidence between the two excerpts. There are a large number of cases where **Br** has some of the *Trip.* text but is not so recorded.

Dr Fowler-Magerl first called attention to another collection in Paris BN ms. lat. 13368 (**Tc**). This contains much of the Gregory I material in A 1 55 more or less exactly as it appears in the first version of *Trip.* see too her study of the *via francigena* (2009). Dr Fowler-Magerl's view that Tc represented a copy of *Trip.*'s source here, and possibly elsewhere, has been confirmed in a more detailed study by Dr Christof Rolker, published in *ZRG* 2005, and his subsequent work. The cross-references to **Tc** in the apparatus are derived from his analysis. I am grateful for his permission to use his results, as well as for many further observations and corrections.

Date of the text

An early state of *Trip.* A clearly lies behind Ivo's *Decretum*, which seems to have existed in some form by 1094-5. However the precise topography of this early state remains uncertain, since no copy of it without the B section now survives. Given the absence of substantial elements of the two sections of *Sententiae* in A 2 in the *Decretum*, their aberrant character in context, and the oddity of the rubric to 2.50, it is possible that these were later additions, even perhaps made after the composition of the *Decretum*. The collection in the earliest surviving form as we have it, however, is clearly later than the *Decretum*, of which the B section can only be an abbreviation, but how much later remains uncertain. The place and date of the major work of revision, seen first in BPV, has not yet been determined either, though there are persuasive arguments for P having been written before 1118, and very probably by 1110 (see above). Fournier suggested that 1.14.14 is from an unidentified council of Calixtus II, and the general thrust of the text can readily be paralleled in the surviving legislation of his councils of Toulouse and Reims in 1119, and in I Lateran of 1123. If so, then all the copies from W to the end of the text's development should be placed an uncertain time after *c.* 1119, possibly long enough for the canon's true origin to have been forgotten. The Calixtus canon is only otherwise reported in Cambridge, Corpus Christi Coll. 442 p. 98, an unpublished collection copied in the early to mid-twelfth century in England (or possibly N. France), which shows no other irresistible evidence of dependence on *Trip.*

Select bibliography and abbreviations

The following list is only a simplified list of works cited, or directly relevant to the textual transmission, not an attempt at a comprehensive bibliography on the work, let alone on Ivo. In general, and for further detail, see Lotte Kéry, *Canonical collections of the early middle ages (ca. 400-1140)*, History of Medieval Canon Law i (Washington 1999), 244-50

74T: *Diversorum patrum sententie siue Collectio in LXXIV titulos digesta* (MIC, Series B. Corpus collectionum 1 (Vatican 1973), and see Fowler-Magerl, *Clavis canonum*

AL: *Anselmi episcopi Lucensis Collectio canonum* ed. F. Thaner (Innsbruck 1906-15) to 11.14 only; for the end see Cushing below.

Ans. ded.: *Collectio Anselmo dedicata*, as analysed in Fowler-Magerl, *Clavis canonum*

Ars. 713: Paris, Bibl. de l'Arsenal ms 713B, for which see Somerville (1996), Brett (1997), Austin (2012) below

BD: Burchard, *Decretum* in PL 140

Bishops, texts and the use of canon law around 1100: Studies in honour of Martin Brett, Bruce C. Brasington and Kathleen G. Cushing (eds) (Aldershot 2008)

Blondel: D. Blondel, *Pseudo-Isidorus et Turrianus vapulatus* (Geneva 1628)

Br: Bruges, Bibl. de la ville, ms 99 (see above)

B. Branch, 'Willermus peccator et les manuscrits de Fécamp, 1100-1150', *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*. 26 (1983), 195-207 [ms B, with photographs of details from the book as pll 2-3]

Bruce C. Brasington, 'Glossing strategies in two manuscripts of pre-Gratian canonical collections' in *Grundlagen des Rechts* 155-162 [ms S]

'Notes from the edge: marginalia and glosses in pre-Gratian canonical collections', *Bishops, texts and the use of canon law* (2008) 165-81 [mss H,S]

and see IP, Prol.

Martin Brett, 'The Berkeley *Tripartita*', *BMCL* 16 (1986), 89-91 [ms K]

'Urban II and the collections attributed to Ivo', *Proceedings San Diego*, MIC, Series C, Subsidia 9 (Vatican 1992) 27-46

- ‘The *Collectio Lanfranci* and its competitors’, *Intellectual life in the middle ages* ed. Lesley Smith and Benedicta Ward (London 1992) 157-74 [ms Bodl.]
- ‘The sources and influence of Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal ms 713’ in *Proceedings Munich*, MIC, Series C, Subsidia 10 (Vatican 1997) 149-67
- ‘Editions, manuscripts and readers in some pre-Gratian collections’, *Ritual, text and law. Studies in medieval canon law and liturgy presented to Roger E. Reynolds* edd. Kathleen C. Cushing and Richard F. Gyug (Aldershot 2004) 205-224 [with a plate from ms Z]
- ‘Margin and afterthought: the *Clavis* in action’ in *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) 136-73 [mss DLM] and see ID, IP
- Zachary N. Brooke, *The English Church and the papacy* (Cambridge 1931, repr. with add. n 1989), esp. 242-4 [mss GO]
- CB: the *Collectio Britannica*, London, British Lib. Add. ms 8873, for which see Ewald, Somerville (1996) below, Fowler-Magerl’s *Clavis canonum* and Rolker (2008)
- CCL: *Corpus Christainorum, Series Latina* (Turnhout 1953-)
- Coll. in 2L: Vatican ms Vat. lat. 3832, for which see Fowler-Magerl, *Clavis canonum*
- Coll. Lanf.: the *Collectio Lanfranci* in Cambridge, Trinity College ms B 16 44 (James 405) as numbered in Fowler-Magerl, *Clavis canonum*. A detailed study and edition by Nicolás Álvarez de las Asturias is in preparation
- Coll. Sem.: the Collection of ‘Sémur’, Sémur, BM ms 13, for which see Fowler-Magerl, *Clavis canonum*
- Constitutum Constantini* ed. Horst Fuhrmann (MGH Fontes iuris Germanici antiqui 10, 1968)
- CSEL: *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* (Vienna 1866-)
- Kathleen G. Cushing, *Papacy and law in the Gregorian revolution. The canonistic work of Anselm of Lucca* (Oxford 1998) esp. 179-200 for the last two books of Anselm.
- DA: *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*
- Pierre David, ‘Un disciple d’Yves de Chartres en Pologne – Galon de Paris et le droit canonique’ in *La Pologne au VII-e Congrès international des sciences historiques*, (Warsaw 1933) 1. 99-113.
- Dd; *Die Kanonensammlung des Kardinals Deusdedit* ed. Victor Wolf von Glanvell (Paderborn 1905 repr. Aalen 1967)
- Gero Dolezalek, ‘Seckels Handschriftenfragmente’, *Ius commune* 4 (1972) 294-7
- Ep. Ioh: *Fragmenta registri Iohannis papae* [VIII] ed. E. Caspar in MGH *Epistolae* 7 (1928) 273-312, - which collates ms S.
- Ep. Leo: *Epistolae selectae Sergii II., Leonis IV., Benedicti III.* ed. A. de Hirsch-Gereuth in MGH *Epistolae* 5 (1899) 585-609 - collating mss H and S
- Ep. Nich.: *Nicolai I papae epistolae* ed. E. Perels in MGH *Epistolae* 6 (1925) 257-690 – collating ms S
- Ep. Pel.: P.M. Gassò and C.M. Batlle, *Pelagii papae epistulae quae supersunt*, *Scripta et documenta* 8 (Montserrat 1956), esp. xli-xliii for mss RSJM.
- Ep. Steph.: *Fragmenta registri Stephani V. pape* ed. E. Caspar in MGH *Epistolae* 7 (1928) 334-53 – collating ms S
- P. Ewald, ‘Die Papstbriefe der Britischen Sammlung’, *Neues Archiv* 5 (1880), 275-414, 503-96
- Paul Fournier, ‘Les collections attribuées à Yves de Chartres’, *Bibliothèque de l’École de chartes*, 57-58 (1896/97), 57, 645-98; 58, 26-77, 293-326, 410-44 and 624-76, esp. 57.646-98; repr. in *Mélanges de droit canonique* ed. T. Kölzer, Aalen 1983, i. 451-678.
- Paul Fournier and Gabriel Le Bras, *Histoire des collections canoniques en Occident depuis les Fausses Décrétales jusqu’au Décret de Gratien* 1-2 (Paris 1931-1932 repr. Aalen 1972), 2. 58-68, 99-114.
- Linda Fowler-Magerl, *Clavis canonum: selected canon law collections before 1140*, with CD ROM (MGH Hilfsmittel 21, 2005)
- ‘The collection and transmission of canon law along the northern section of the *Via Francigena* in the eleventh and twelfth centuries’, in *Bishops, texts and the use of canon law* (2008) 129-39 [ms Sb, and Tc]
- Horst Fuhrmann, *Einfluß und Verbreitung der pseudoisidorischen Fälschungen* (MGH Schriften 24, 1972-3), esp. 2. 542-4, [with detailed bibliography of the earlier studies on the Polish manuscripts P and N], 3. 776-1018

- John Gilchrist, *Canon law in the age of reform, 11th-12th centuries* (Aldershot 1993)
 ‘Die *Epitola Widonis* oder Pseudo-Paschalis: der erweiterte Text’ *DA* 37 (1981) 574-604
 ‘The manuscripts of the canonical collection in Four Books’ *ZRG* 69 (1983) 64-120,
and see 74T
- Grundlagen des Rechts; Festschrift für Peter Landau zum 65. Geburtstag* ed. Richard M. Helmholz,
 Paul Mikat, Jörg Müller and Michael Stolleis (Paderborn etc 2000)
- H: *Decretales pseudo-Isidorianae et Capitula Angilramni* ed. P. Hinschius (Leipzig 1863, repr. Aalen
 1963); see too *M* below, and the web-text there cited.
- Hispana; Collectio Hispana* ed. G. Martínez Diez and F. Rodríguez, *Monumenta Hispaniae sacra, Ser.
 canónica* 1-5 (Madrid 1966-92)
- ID: Ivo, *Decretum* in PL 161, 59-1022, with additions and omissions as described by Landau (1984).
 The *PL* text has been partially checked against the *editio princeps* by Molinaeus (here from the
 issue at Louvain, 1561) and the principal mss, which have the following sigla. IDb = Paris, BN
 3874, IDc = Cambridge, Corpus Christi Coll. 19, IDd = Vatican Pal. lat. 587, IDp = Paris BN lat.
 14315, IDR = London, BL Royal 11 D vii; IDs = Sigüenza, Archivio de la Catedral 61; IDv =
 Vatican, Vat. lat 1357. See further the annotated version of Migne elsewhere on the site.
- IP: Ivo, *Panormia* from the draft text by Brasington and Brett elsewhere on the site
- JK, JE, JL: *Regesta pontificum Romanorum* ed. P. Jaffe, revised ed by K. Kaltenbrunner, P. Ewald, and
 S. Loewenfeld (Leipzig 1885 repr. Graz 1956)
- Kanones J: see* Linda Fowler-Magerl, *Clavis canonum*
- Peter Landau, ‘Das Dekret des Ivo von Chartres: Die handschriftliche Überlieferung im Vergleich zum
 Text in den Editionen des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts’, *ZRG* 70 (1984) 1-44
 ‘Überlieferung und bedeutung der Kanones des Trullianischen Konzils im westlichen
 kanonischen Recht’ in *The Council in Trullo revisited* ed. George Nedungatt and Michael
 Featherstone, *Kanonika* 6 (1995) 215-27 [on 2.10A, 11]
 ‘Kanonesammlungen in der Lombardei im frühen und hohen Mittelalter’, *Atti dell’ 110
 congresso internazionale di studi su;ll’ alto medioevo, Milano 26-30 ottobre 1987* (Spoleto 1989)
 425-57, esp. 451 [ms H]
 ‘Wandel und Kontinuität im kanonischen Recht bei Gratian’ in *Sozialer Wandel im Mittelalter.
 Wahrnehmungsformen, Erklärungsmuster, Regelungsmechanismen* ed. Jürgen Miethke and Klaus
 Schreiner (Sigmaringen 1994) 215-33 [esp. on the transmission of the *Britannica*]
 ‘Das Register Papst Gregors I. im Decretum Gratiani’ in *Mittelalterliche Texte, MGH
 Schriften* 42 (1996) 125-40
 ‘Das “Dominium” der Laien an Kirchen im Decretum Gratiani und in vorgratianischen
 Kanonesammlungen der Reformzeit’ *ZRG* 83 (1997) 210-22
- Lib. diurn.: Liber diurnus Romanorum pontificum* ed. Hans Foerster (Bern 1958)
- Lib. pont.: Le Liber pontificalis* ed. L. Duchesne (Paris 1884-92, 1957)
- Libelli de Lite*, MGH (1891-7)
- M: Tomus primus quatuor conciliorum generalium* [etc] ed. J. Merlin (Paris 1524 repr. in *PL* 130.7-
 1178). This profoundly unsatisfactory edition is the only published text of those parts of Pseudo-
 Isidore drawn from the *Hispana*, which Hinschius simply reprinted from the edition of Gonzalez.
 However, in an extremely welcome initiative, there is now a web-version of the text based on solid
 ms authority, and under continual development: Karl-Georg Schon’s *Projekt Pseudoisidor*,
www.pseudoisidor.mgh.de
- MGH: Monumenta Germaniae historica
 MIC: Monumenta Iuris Canonici
 Mon. Mog.: *Monumenta Moguntina* ed. P. Jaffe (Berlin 1866)
- Przemysław Nowak, ‘The manuscripts of the *Collectio Tripartita* in Poland’, *Bishops, texts and the
 use of canon law* (2008) 91-109
 ‘Das Papsttum und Ostmitteleuropa (Böhmen-Mähren, Polen, Ungarn) vom ausgehenden 10.
 bis zum Beginn des 13. Jahrhunderts’, in *Rom und die Regionen. Studien zur Homogenisierung der
 lateinischen Kirche im Hochmittelalter*, edd. Jochen Johrendt and Harald Müller (Abhandlungen
 der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, NF 19; Studien zu Papstgeschichte und
 Papsturkunden [4]), Berlin/New York 2012, 331-369
- E. Perels, ‘Die Briefe Papst Nikolas’ I. B. Die kanonistische Überlieferung’, *Neues Archiv* 39 (1914)
 43-153

Johanna Petersmann, 'Die kanonistische Überlieferung des *Constitutum Constantini* bis zum Dekret Gratians', *DA* 30 (1974), 356-449, esp. 404-5

PL: J-P. Migne, *Patrologiae Latinae cursus completus*

Marian Plezia: 'Księgozbiór katedry krakowskiej wedle inwentarza z r. 1110', *Silva rerum* ns (Krakow 1981) 16-29 [not seen]

Pol.: the *Polycarpus* as analysed in Uwe Horst, *Die Kanonessammlung Polycarpus des Gregor von S. Grisogono*, MGH Hilfsmittel 5 (1980) and Fowler-Magerl, *Clavis canonum*. See now the web text based on a draft edition by C. Erdmann at <http://www.mgh.de/polycarp/>

Prol: the prologue of Ivo of Chartres, as edited by Bruce Brasington in *Ways of Mercy*, *The Prologue of Ivo of Chartres*, Vita regularis. Ordnungen und Deutungen religiösen Lebens im Mittelalter. Editionen 2 (Münster 2004)

Quad.: *Quadripartitus = Antiqua canonum collectio qua in libris* [etc] ed. Aemilius L. Richter (Marburg 1844), and see further Kéry, 167-9

Reg.: Register (for Gregory I, from CCL 140-140A; for Gregory VII from ed. E. Caspar, MGH *Epistolae selectae* 2, 1920-3)

Reg. P.: *Reginonis abbatis Prumensis libri duo de synodalibus causis* [etc] ed. Friedrich. G. A. Wasserscheben (Leipzig 1840 repr. Graz 1964)

Timothy Reuter, 'Zur Anerkennung Papst Innocenz II.' *DA* 39 (1983) 395-6 [ms L]

Christof Rolker, 'Genesis and influence of the canon-law collection in BN 13368', *ZRG* 91 (2005), 74-105

'The earliest work of Ivo of Chartres: the case of Ivo's Eucharist florilegium and the canon law collections attributed to him', *ZRG*. 93 (2007) 109-27

'History and canon law in the *Collectio Britannica*; a new date for London, BL Add. 8873', *Bishops, texts and the use of canon law* (2008), 141-52

Canon law and the letters of Ivo of Chartres (Cambridge 2010)

Witold Sawicki, 'Zbiór prawa dla ludzi świeckich w krakowskim rękopisie "Zbioru Troistego (Collectio Tripartita)" (Drogi wpływu praw obcych na prawo państwa Piastów w pierwszej połowie XII wieku) = Collection de droit pour les laïques dans la "Collection Tripartite (Collectio Tripartita)" du manuscrit de Cracovie', *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curiae-Sklodowska*, Sectio G 7 (1960, ed. Lublin 1961), 295-342 with 6 plates and summaries in Russian (343-347) and in French (347-352) [ms P]

'Wpływ niektórych praw obcych na ustrój prawny państwa pierwszych Piastów (wiek XI-XII) = Influence de quelques sources étrangères sur le droit polonais aux XI-e et XII-e s.', *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curiae-Sklodowska*, Sectio G 11 (1964, ed. Lublin 1965), 29-61, with summaries in Russian (61-62) and French (62-63). [mss P, N]

Schneider: *Die Konzilsordines des Früh- und Hochmittelalters* ed. Herbert Schneider, MGH *Ordines de celebrando concilio* (1996)

Robert E. Somerville with Stephan Kuttner, *Pope Urban II, the Collectio Britannica, and the Council of Melfi* (Oxford 1996)

Statuta ecclesiae antiqua ed. C. Munier, CCL 149, 342-54, cf CCL 148, 162-88

Winfried Stelzer, *Gelehrtes Recht in Österreich von den Anfängen bis zum frühen 14. Jahrhundert*, *MIÖG Erg.* Bd 26 (1982)

Szalbolcs Anzelm Szuromi, 'A snapshot from the process of the textual development of Ivo's works (comparative analysis of Angers, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 399 with BAV Reg. lat. 973 and other textual witnesses)', *Ius Ecclesiae* 18 (2006) 217-38, on R

'Some observations on the textual development of the *Tripartita* (a comparative analysis of Paris, Bibliothèque nationale lat. 3858 with other Ivonian manuscripts), *Ius Ecclesiae* 19 (2007) 369-83, on J, Q and Z (suggesting that Q is South Italian, 372-4, and Z also Italian, 370)

From a reading book to a structuralized canonical collection: the textual development of the Ivonian work (Berlin 2010)

Tc: Paris BN lat. 13368, for which see Rolker (2005) above and Fowler-Magerl, *Clavis canonum*

A. Theil, *Epistolae Romanorum pontificum genuinae* [etc] (Braunsberg 1868)

Augustin Theiner, *Disquisitiones criticae in praecipuas canonum et decretalium collectiones* (Rome 1836)

Adam Vetulani, 'La bibliothèque de l'église cathédrale de Cracovie d'après le catalogue de 1110', in: *Mélanges Joseph de Ghellinck*, (Gembloux 1951) ii 489-507

Le plus ancien inventaire d'une bibliothèque polonaise (Krakow 1971)
Friedrich G. A. Wasserschleben, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der vorgratianischen Kirchenrechtsquellen*
(Leipzig 1839)
Rudolf Weigand, 'Chancen und Probleme einer baldigen kritischen Edition der ersten Redaktion des
Dekretes Gratians, BMCL 22 (1998), 53-75
Anders Winroth, *The making of Gratian's Decretum* (Cambridge 2000)
ZRG: Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonistische Abteilung

The work is made available under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike
3.0 Unported license , details of which may be found at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/>
MB mbr110@gmail.com, Robinson College, Cambridge, 2012