ON EDITING THE POEMS OF JOHN SCOTTUS ERIUGENA

By MICHAEL W. HERREN

Using the poems of John Scottus Eriugena as a case study, the author aims to show that glossaries that preserve the lemmata and glosses of a text in the same order as that of a codex unicus *of the work can be used to construct the common exemplar from which the entries of the glossary and the text of the codex unicus derive. Thus, at least for Medieval Latin texts, glosses can be an essential component of the* recensio codicum. *The author argues further that where a dating order of poems can be established (as in the case under consideration), such constitutes evidence of editorial management on the part of the author or an associate.*

This essay takes up an unusual methodological problem in editing a poetic corpus. A group of ten poems by John Scottus Eriugena is supported by two witnesses of roughly the same date. One (siglum R) contains the Latin texts of ten poems, which are complete (with one exception) plus glosses to the numerous *graeca* in the poems. The other (siglum L) consists entirely of the Greek lemmata and glosses for all ten poems transmitted in R, a selection of lines (with their glosses) composed entirely in Greek that are transmitted by R, plus the texts of seven additional poems written entirely in Greek with their Latin glosses; most of these have inscriptions attributing the poems to John Scottus. The Greek lemmata and glosses in R closely match those in L, allowing for transliteration by R. One suspects that at least poems 1–10 bear witness to a common exemplar. Yet how can one be sure that R did not simply copy its glosses from L, or L take its glosses from R? And how can one be sure that the Greek poems in L are not just a selection of verses that L thought that it would be nice to add?

In two editions of the poems (in which the poems have identical numbering), I put forward the hypothesis that all seventeen poems descend from a common exemplar.[1] However, the poems also constitute an anthology compiled by the author or a friend, as first argued by Ludwig Traube, who edited the poems in

---

[1] *Iohannis Scotti Eriugenae Carmina*, ed. M. Herren, Scriptores Latini Hiberniae 12 (Dublin, 1993), 18–20 (hereafter SLH edition); and *Iohannis Scotti Eriugenae Carmina*, ed. M. Herren and A. Dunning, CCCM 167 (Turnhout, 2020), ix–xc and 1–66, at xxi–xxiii (hereafter CCCM edition).

doi:10.1017/tdo.2024.2

the *Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini* series of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*.[2] That the collection of poems was also compiled in dating order was shown by Paul Dutton and augmented in my *Scriptores Latini Hiberniae* edition.[3] The poems in that collection, with a few exceptions, concentrate on the activities and the aspirations of Charles the Bald and his wife Irmintrude, beginning with Charles's war against his brother Louis in 858 and ending with his coronation at Metz in 869, the same year in which Irmintrude died. John was Charles's chief eulogist, indeed, "the royal poet," as Paul Dutton called him.[4] John wrote a number of other poems, some of them epigrams, others dedicatory verses to his own writings or translations, but these require a grouping separate from the anthology. I accommodated these divisions in both editions: (1) John's poems attested as genuine by inscriptions (1–19) and connected by transmission; (2) other genuine poems attested by inscriptions, written in the hand of "i¹" (Eriugena himself), or written as poetic prefaces to genuine works by John; and (3) poems that had some claim to be considered his work, but did not meet the criteria of sections 1 or 2.[5]

Two reviews of the CCCM edition by respected scholars challenged its editorial principles and the tripartite division of the poems.[6] The main thrust of the reviews is directed against the hypothesis of an authorial anthology and the existence of an archetype. Another point of discussion concerned the unity of one of the two principal witnesses, siglum *R*, which was copied into two different manuscripts. Both reviewers appear to agree that the transmission of Eriugena's poems was a somewhat serendipitous affair. For example, Professor Contreni concludes his review of the *Carmina* portion of his review article: "The few observations made here suggest that Eriugena's poems were disseminated in multiple ways in the ninth century and call into question the existence of a putative Ur-collection such as Ω put together by the author."[7] Professor Chiesa's conclusion is similar: "… gli unici elementi communi a più di una parte sono sostanzialmente alcuni vocaboli greci, per lo più estrapolati. In una situazione così vaga, è difficile farsi un'opinione sulla consistenza di Ω, che rischia di essere una chimera."[8] Neither reviewer, however, comes to grips with the methodological issue raised by the *recensio codicum*, nor addresses the fact that glosses constitute a vital part of the text tradition and must be accounted for in the *recensio*.

---

[2] *Iohannis Scotti Carmina*, ed. L. Traube, MGH, *Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini* 3 (Berlin, 1896), 523.

[3] P. Dutton, "Eriugena the Royal Poet," in *Jean Scot Écrivain: Actes du IVe colloque international, Montréal, 28 août – 2 septembre 1983*, ed. G.-H. Allard (Montreal, 1986), 51–80, at 62–76; and *Carmina* (SLH edition), ed. Herren, 135–61. Dates for poems (where possible), along with the dating evidence, are provided in the commentaries to the individual poems. See *Carmina* (SLH edition), 135–61. Poem 1, written in 859, laments the battle fought by Charles against Louis in November 858.

[4] Dutton, "Eriugena the Royal Poet," 51–52.

[5] É. Jeauneau, *The Autograph of Eriugena* (Turnhout, 1996).

[6] J. J. Contreni, "Review Essay: An Eriugenian Diptych," *Journal of Medieval Latin* 31 (2021): 289–301; and P. Chiesa, "Review," *Filologia mediolatina* 28 (2021): 352–56.

[7] Contreni, "An Eriugenian Diptych," 298.

[8] Chiesa, "Review," 354.

I would not have responded to the reviews (which make some helpful points) were it not for the question of methodology raised, namely, the challenge to the hypothesis that John compiled or approved an anthology of his poems addressed to Charles the Bald composed in the years 859–869. I contend that an archetype for poems 1–17 can be established which presents the poems *with authorial glosses* in dating order. I shall address this question first by demonstrating the existence of an archetype based on the close agreement of the two witnesses on the glosses to the *graeca* and whole lines written in Greek and a list of *errores communes* in the Latin poems 1–10, followed by a demonstration that neither witness copied from the other. Next, I shall show that the glosses to the poems were not compiled by a scribe, but by John himself. Finally, I shall discuss the dating order of the poems.

The poems of group 1 are preserved in two principal witnesses: siglum *R*, which is divided between Vatican City, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. Lat. 1587 and Reg. Lat., 1709, both believed to have been written by the same hand in western France (Fleury?) in the third quarter of the ninth century;[9] and siglum *L*, the famous Laon, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 444, a Greek dictionary and glossary copied by Martin of Laon before 875 (the year of Martin's death).[10] Fols. 294v–98r of *L* contain Greek lemmata drawn from John's poems (including *all* the poems in *R*) with Latin glosses; lines and couplets in Greek with their glosses that also occur in the poems transmitted in *R*; and short poems and prayers written in Greek, also attributed to John with the exception of poem 16. These too contain Latin glosses, some of which are arranged as Latin verses.

Following Traube, I have divided *L* into *L1*, the list of glossed Greek words that correspond to the Greek words transmitted in the order in which they occur in *R*, and *L2*, which contains whole lines in Greek corresponding to those in *R*, plus seven poems and prayers written entirely in Greek. Together *L* (*L1* and *L2*) and *R* account for all the genuine poems numbered 1–17 (plus 3 fragments) in both editions.[11] These were all composed between 859 and the end of 869 and constitute what, in my opinion, was an anthology compiled or overseen by John. The two

---

[9] *Iohannis Scotti Carmina*, ed. Traube (n. 2 above), 523–24; B. Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen)*, 4 vols. (Wiesbaden, 1998–2017), 3:440 (no. 6786) and 3:442 (no. 6798, with cross reference to the folios in no. 6786 that contain the poems of John Scottus); and M. Mostert, *The Library of Fleury: A Provisional List of Manuscripts* (Hilversum, 1989), 284 and 287 (nos. 1511 and 1531).

[10] See the edition by E. Miller, "Glossaire grec-latin de la bibliothèque de Laon," *Notices et extraits* 29 (1880): 1–230.

[11] Poems 1–17 belong to the first section of the edition (in both the SLH and CCCM versions), but the entire first section also includes poems 18 and 19 because they are attested by inscriptions. Professor Contreni ("An Eriugenian Diptych," 294) took the contents of Ω to include the epigrams nos. 18 and 19. However, Ω was restricted to the Latin poems transmitted by *R* (including the fragments) and the Greek poems transmitted by *L2*, as stated in the CCCM edition (xxi–xxii). Moreover, a glance at the *stemma codicum*

epigrams that are printed in part 1 (nos. 18 and 19) are certified by an inscription and have a remote stemmatic connection to siglum *L*, but do not belong to the anthology. The poems in sections 2 and 3 are transmitted independently of poems 1–17 (which I call the anthology).

It is highly probable that the Greek lemmata and glosses in Latin poems 1–10 in *R* and *L1* were copied from a common exemplar that contained a few corrections. *L1* consistently presents lemmata in Greek characters, while *R* often transliterates them, albeit accurately. *R* very occasionally omits glosses found in *L1* and adds a few of his own (from another source?), but the vast majority of lemmata and glosses are identical, as will be shown by viewing the complete list of Greek lemmata and glosses provided in the appendix at the end of this article. A careful look at *R*'s lemmata will reveal that *R* had an alphabetical knowledge of Greek. His transliterations of the Greek are nearly always correct and occasionally show a knowledge of Greek morphology. For example, the very last entry (10.19) where *R* renders ΘΙΑΣΟΤΟΝ as *thiasotum* shows that he recognized the ending -ΟΝ (for ΩΝ) as a genitive plural. Crucially, however, *R* did not copy the Greek lemmata and their glosses from *L1*. At 2.13 *R* has the correct ΠΝΥΞ, while *L1* gives the meaningless ΤΠΝΥΞ. At 3.25, where the name Isis is used as a metonymy for Egypt, both manuscripts give ΙΣΙΔΑΜ, a mistake for the wanted accusative ΙΣΙΝ. *R*, however, adds the marginal gloss ΙΣΙΔΑ, a "learned error" based on the supposed genitive — ἰδος. Unless *R* had advanced to the knowledge of third-declension dental-stem nouns, we may infer that he got his marginal gloss from a correcting hand in his exemplar. Another possible appearance of a correcting hand in the exemplar is found at 8.21. There we have a division between ΑΚΡΟΙ *R* and ΑΚΡΟΣ *L1*, glossed *summi* and *summus*, respectively. *R*'s readings are the correct ones, but they are right because he chose the reading of the correcting hand rather than the original. At 3.45 *L1* has ΔΑΛΜΑΤΑ, while *R* has *id almata*, which is closer to the archetypal ΙΔΑΛΜΑΤΑ, glossed *imagines* (*R L1*).[12] At 8.34, where both *R* and *L1* read ΟΝΤΑ, *R*'s gloss is *qui est quae sunt*, but *L1* gives only *quae sunt*.[13] In the *L2* section, we find the full gloss for ΟΝΤΑ, suggesting that *L2* returned to the glosses in the common exemplar. Given *L*'s shaky knowledge of Greek (see below) and the fact that he did not consult *R* (as demonstrated below), *L* could not have made this correction independently. A rare omission of a gloss by *R* occurs at 2.71 ΜΕΛΠΟ, glossed *canto* in *L1*. The line belongs to a subscription to the poem in which the author complains of his patron's parsimony.[14] However, the presence of

---

(xxiii) shows that *V* does not descend directly from Ω, but uses glosses from *L*, which descends directly from Ω; thus, *V* belongs to the tradition indirectly.

[12] ΙΔΑΛΜΑΤΑ for correct ἰνδάλματα.

[13] The two-part gloss accounts for the participle ὄντα as an accusative masculine singular and a nominative and accusative neuter plural.

[14] John inserted four-line subscriptions at the end of poems 1, 2, and 6 complaining of the king's failure to reward him for his efforts.

the entire subscription in *R* and the gloss to ΜΕΛΠΟ only in *L1* argue that both manuscripts were copied from an exemplar that contained the authorial subscription with a gloss. Where, then, did *L1* find his gloss, since it is not in *R*?

Further proof that *R* and *L1* were copied from a common exemplar is given by *errores communes* that occur in the *graeca*:

> 2.67. A spondaic foot was omitted at the end of this line in both *L2* and *R*. This was successfully restored by Floss, an earlier editor.
> 2.68. ΣΟΒΡΟΝ for ΣΟΦΡΟΝ in *L1* and *R*. This word was given correctly by *L2* at 17.9, and is thus not an authorial error.
> 3.14. *Osana* (*R*) and ΟΣΑΝΑ (*L1*) represent a common error for *oscina* in place of correct *oscines*, which does not scan. The gloss word is *aues* in *R* and *L1*.
> 3.45. *Id almata* (*R*) and ΔΑΛΜΑΤΑ (*L1*) point to archetypal ΙΔΑΛ-ΜΑΤΑ, which should be written as one word.
> 8.20. ΙΣΤΙΛΒΟΝ (*RL1-2*) for ΣΤΙΛΒΟΝ, given correctly at 12a.5 = 12a.3 (*SLH*) and 12b.1.
> 8.20. The omission of -ΦΟΡΟΣ in ΦΟΣΦΟΡΟΣ by *L* (*L1* and *L2*) and *R*.
> 8.35. ΜΟΡΦΩ for ΜΟΡΦΩΝ in *L* (*L1* and *L2*) and *R*. The error was corrected independently (?) by *R*.

These errors can be explained in one of two ways: either both witnesses are copied from a common exemplar, or else one of them is copied from the other. Let us begin with the second possibility. It is impossible that *L* was copied from *R*, or to put it more exactly, that *L* copied its lemmata and glosses from *R*. In the list of Greek lemmata (*L1*) many Greek words occur that have no match in *R*. The omitted words constitute what I label Fragments 1–3, which represent missing poems, and two of the poems preserved in *L2* (12a–b and 13). *L1* could not have got his glosses from *R* because the poems whose existence is indicated by Fragments 1–3 are not given in *R*. Therefore, *L1* cannot have been copied from *R*. *R* cannot have been copied directly from *L1* for the obvious reason that the Latin texts are wanting. But there is a possible *tertium quid*. Could *R* have got his Latin text from an unknown source — unless we are to suppose that he wrote the poems himself and claimed Eriugena's authorship — and taken the glosses from *L1*? Possible, of course, but then where did *L1* get *its* list of lemmata with glosses, since he did not get them from *R*? The most logical explanation, and the most economical, is that *R* and *L* were copied from a common source that had both text and glosses, that is, Ω. I surmise that there was a correcting hand in Ω from which *R* entered corrections, and which *L1* first ignored, then implemented in *L2*. I conclude that there existed a common exemplar that explains both the near unity of the glosses and the mistakes common to *L* and *R* in the Latin poems 1–10. The same common exemplar was

arguably written in the author's lifetime since the date of *L* can be reckoned between 869 (date of the last poem) and 875 (death of the scribe Martin of Laon).[15]

However, we must still account for the absence of the Greek poems 11–17 in *R* and the poems represented by the glosses preserved by *L1* for Fragments 1–3 in *L1*. *R* also omits two short Greek poems, the texts of which are preserved in *L2*, with lemmata and glosses preserved in *L1*. The following selection of entries in *L1* displays the omissions by *R* in more detail:

> ΠΝΥΞ ΜΕΛΟΔΗΜΑ ΒΟΑ (fol. 296r, col. 1): Three entries from Greek poem no. 13 are preserved in *L1*, but the poem is not preserved in *R* (entire poem given in *L2*).

> ΤΡΙΑΔΙΣ – ΔΙΧΗ (fol. 296r, cols. 1–2): Twenty-three entries of Fragment 1 (*graeca* with glosses) are preserved in *L1*, but the poem is not preserved in *R*.

> ΚΑΚΟΣ – ΣΥΜΠΛΕΡΑΣΜΑ (fol. 296r, cols. 1–2): The entries for Greek poems 12a–b (*graeca* with glosses) are preserved in *L1*, but the poem(s) is (are) not preserved in *R* (both versions are preserved in *L2*, 12a, albeit imperfectly).[16]

> ΘΕΟΣ – ΔΟΥΛΟΥΣ (fol. 296v, cols. 1–2): Twenty entries (*graeca* with glosses) of Fragment 2 are preserved in *L1*, but the poem is not preserved in *R*.

> ΔΟΣΕΙ – ΦΡΟΣΚΕΙΟΣ (fol. 296v, col. 2): Entries (*graeca* with glosses) of Fragment 3 are preserved in *L1*, but the poem is not preserved in *R*. In *L1* this is followed by the autograph subscription of Martin of Laon: ΕΛΛΗΝΙC ΓΡΑΨΕΝ ΜΑΡΤΙΝΟC ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ ΑΥΤΑ. *L2* commences immediately thereafter.

As noted, *R* preserves phrases, whole lines, and couplets in Greek that occur in the *Latin* poems. It does not, however, preserve any freestanding poem written entirely in Greek. That applies to the poems mentioned above (12a–b and 13, both with *graeca* in *L1*), Fragments 1–3, and the Greek poems recorded in *L2*. Is it reasonable, then, to infer that *R* also omitted the poems represented by Fragments 1–3 (which occur *within* the group of Latin poems 1–10) *because* they were written entirely in Greek? The answer is no. While in one case (poem 12a), it is possible to restore missing lines from Greek entries in *L1* that, when read in sequence,

---

[15] See *Carmina*, ed. Herren (CCCM edition), lxxvii–lxxviii for evidence arguing that John lived at least to the year 876.

[16] Poems 12a and 12b are differing versions of a poem addressed to Hincmar of Laon. They share many words, but 12a is longer. Using the lemmata of *L1*, I endeavoured to construct a fuller version of 12a in the *CCCM* version than that printed in the *SLH*.

construe as verses, this does not hold for Fragments 1–3. Some themes do indeed emerge, but whole verses cannot be extracted from them. Thus, Fragments 1–3 were in all likelihood *Latin* poems that contained *graeca*. The total number of entries for the *graeca* recorded by *L1* for Fragments 1–2 amounts to twenty-three and twenty, respectively, suggesting that the poems were of comparable length to some longer Latin poems preserved in *R*. Why, then, did *R* omit them?

It will be noted that, with the exception of Fragment 3, the omitted material is clumped together at the end of Latin poem 8, the last poem recorded in the Vat. Reg. lat. 1587 portion of *R*. Fragment 3, which has but six entries for the *graeca*, is also missing from the group, but given that it is the last item in *L1*, it was probably meant to follow Latin poem 10. The scribe writing in Vat. Reg. lat. 1587 left off his copying of the poems at the end of Latin poem 8, resuming his work in Reg. lat. 1709 by transcribing Latin poems 9 and 10. He may have decided to exclude Greek poems 12a–b and 13 on the grounds that they were short and written entirely in Greek, but why did he omit the apparently substantial Latin poems represented by Fragments 1 and 2? The list of Greek words recorded for Fragments 1 and 2 are rich in Eriugenian philosophical terminology (OYCIA, ΘEOCIC) and theological allusion (CAPΞ, ΛOΓOC). It also mentions the king (ANAΞ), strongly suggesting that Charles the Bald figures in the work.[17] The first two entries of Fragment 2 give the words ΘEOC and YΠEPAΛHΘHC (glossed *superuerus*), "above or beyond reality." On fol. 298v of Laon 444, which follows poem 17, Martin wrote: "Vt Dionisius Ariopagita dicit: Deus YΠEPΘEOC est, id est superdeus et YΠEPAΓAΘOC, id est superbonus, et YΠEPAΛHΘHC est, id est superuerus." Clearly the lost poem is a testimony to the influence of Pseudo-Dionysius on Eriugena's thought.[18] The omission of the text of both poems is a serious loss.

The transcription of Latin poems 1–8 in Vat. Reg. lat. 1587 ends on folio 64v. This is the end of the quire. The next page recto-verso is blank except for the inscription on the recto in a humanist hand *Cato maior de senectute*, and on the verso in a Carolingian hand *Cato de senectute cum Macrobio*. The scribe had come to the end of his allotted space for the poems. When the same scribe looked for another book in the same scriptorium that offered space to complete the poems, he found it in a booklet of what became Vat. Reg. lat. 1709 between fol. 16v and fol. 18r. He skipped over the short Greek poems 12a–b and 13 and the longer Latin poems represented by Fragments 1 and 2, and entered poems 9 and 10 (a poem of only twenty lines). Poem 10 does not seem to be complete, even though there was space for it on fol. 18r. On fol. 18v, the same scribe, or a scribe

---

[17] For Greek and Latin words used by John to mean 'king' or 'ruler,' see the CCCM edition, lxxvii–lxxviii.

[18] J. J. Contreni, *The Cathedral School of Laon from 850 to 930: Its Manuscripts and Masters* (Munich, 1978), 86, points out that a copy of John's commentary on Pseudo-Dionysius' *Celestial Hierarchy* (lost) was at Laon.

with a very similar hand, commenced writing the Augustinian treatise *Quomodo Sancta Trinitas et sempiterna atque incommutabilis facillime possit intellegi.*[19] The scribe of the poems apparently faced the choice of what to include and was reduced to counting lines of works that would fit the space. It is important to note that poems 9 and 10 continue the dating order of poems 1–8. However, if there was not enough space to transcribe potentially weighty Latin poems such as we find represented by Fragments 1–2, it is no wonder indeed that the short Greek poems transmitted only by *L2* were omitted.

At this point, we can conclude that poems with their glosses 1–10 in *R* and *L* descend from a common exemplar, and, though *R* alone preserves the Latin texts of the poems, *L* is a more reliable guide to the contents of the poems dedicated to Charles the Bald and record his actions in the years 858–869. Indeed, the scribe Martin was at pains to distinguish between the *Graeca ad uersus* on fol. 294v, col. 1, and the *Graeca que est* [sic] *in uersibus Iohannis Scotti* ("Greek words which are in the verses of John the Irishman"), which is the starting point of the *graeca* with glosses of poems 1–10 (*L1*), the *graeca* with glosses for Fragments 1–3 (*L1*), and the transcriptions of poems 11–17 (*L2*). The *graeca ad uersus*, a list of 36 Greek words with their glosses, belong to a different group of poems from that of the *Graeca que est in uersibus Iohannis Scotti*. However, the selected words under the former rubric give the telltale signs of being poems written by John. For example, in col. 1, we find a list of Greek headwords in this order preceding ΒΑCΙΛΕΥC ("king"): ΘΑΥΜΑCΤΟC ("wondrous"), ΕΞΑΡΧΗC (as two words, "from the beginning"), ΕΠΙΛΕΚΤΟC (for ἐκλεκτός, "elect," "chosen"?), ΔΙΚΑΙΟC ("just"), ΑΓΑΘΟC ("good"), ΜΕΓΑΛΟC ("great"), ΤΙΜΙΟC ("honored"), ΦΡΟΝΙΜΟC ("prudent"), and ΑΚΡΟC ("exalted"). Some of these descriptors are attested in poems 11–17. There, we find ΜΕΓΑΛΟC (12a), ΦΡΟΝΙΜΟC (12b), ΕΚΛΕΚΤΟC (14.2), ΘΑΥΜΑCΤΟC (17), ΑΓΑΘΟC (17), ΑΚΡΟC (17), and ΔΙΚΑΙΟC (Fragment 2.12). In col. 2 of the *Graeca ad uersus* we find ΚΛΕΟΡ, a mistake for κλέος ("fame"). This mistake occurs in 14.1 and 15.1, and seems to be a shibboleth of Eriugenian composition.[20] I think it likely that the entries under *Graeca ad uersus* point to the existence of other poems written by John that were not intended for the group of poems 1–17. But even if these *uersus* were not written by John, they point to Martin's concern for preserving intact only those poems intended for that collection.

---

[19]   For an edition, see F. Dolbeau, "Le liber XXI sententiarum (CPL 373): Édition d'un texte de travail," *Recherches augustiniennes* 30 (1997): 113–65. According to Dolbeau, the treatise represents a posthumous edition of Augustine's "papiers" datable to the years 386–95, discovered at Hippo after 430.

[20]   A plausible explanation for the mistake is that John learned the word in transliterated form and misread the final *s* as an *r*.

We now turn to Greek poems 11–17, preserved only in *L2*. The notion expressed by one reviewer that Martin collected a miscellany of Greek poems for teaching purposes and not for producing an edition will not bear scrutiny.[21] They are prefaced on fol. 297r by the inscription ΣΤΙΧΟΙ ΙΩΑΝΝΙΣ GLORIOSO REGI ΚΑΡΟΛΟ ("Verses of John to glorious King Charles"), which indicates continuity with the poems preserved in *RL¹*. However, it remains to examine the question of the archetypal character of the poems preserved in *L2*. They occur in this order:

ΖΕΣ ΝΥΝ ΖΗΣ (fol. 297r): Greek poem 11 with glosses

Nam ΚΑΚΟΣ atque ΑΓΑΤΟΣ (fol. 297r): Greek poem 12a with glosses in metrical form (*graeca* with glosses also in *L1*)

ΙΔΗ ΒΑΘΟΥ (fol. 297v): Greek poem 13 with glosses (some *graeca* with glosses also in *L1*)

ΕΡΗΝΗ ΠΙΣΤΩ (fol. 297v): Greek poem 14 with glosses in metrical form

ΛΑΜΠΡΟΤΑΤΟΣ ΚΗΡΥΞ (fol. 297v): Greek poem 12b with glosses in metrical form (*graeca* with glosses also in *L1*)

ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥ ΔΗΜΟΥ (fol. 297v): Greek poem 15 with glosses in metrical form

ΦΙΛΑΞΟΝ Ω ΘΕΟΣ (fol. 297v): Greek prose 15* with glosses

Ω ΚΥΡΡΙΕ ΒΟΗΘΗΣΟΝ (fol. 297v): Greek prose 15* with glosses

Subscription in the hand of Martin of Laon: ΣΤΙΧΟΣ ΠΡΕΠΟΣ ΔΙΔΑΣΚΑΛΟΥ ΜΑΡΤΙΝΟΥ

ΕΙΣΧΡΗ ΑΝΑΓΝΟΣΤΗΣ (fol. 298r): Greek poem 16 with glosses

New inscription: ΤΩ ΚΥΡΡΙΩ ΚΑΡΟΛΩ ΙΩΑΝΝΗΙΣ ΧΑΙΡΕΙΝ

ΘΑΥΜΑΣΤΩ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙ (fol. 298r): Greek poem 17 without glosses

While problems of authenticity affect two cases (poems 15 and 16), the archetypal character of *L2* remains to be discussed. Was it simply a grab bag of random poems carelessly put together by Martin for use in the classroom or the continuation of an authorial anthology? I did not reprint in either edition (nor did Traube in his) the couplets in Greek drawn from the long Latin poems that Martin

---

[21]   Contreni, "An Eriugenian Dyptich" (n. 6 above), 298.

inserted at the head of *L2*, as their readings and glosses were accounted for (with corrections) in the text and apparatus of Latin poems 1–10. These are two- and three-line Greek verses drawn from poems 2.67–68, 5.49–50, 8.20–22, 8.34–35, and 8.85–86 (numbering according to CCCM edition). Since the Greek lines and their glosses are also attested by *R* (Vat. Reg. lat. 1507), they are undeniably archetypal.[22] It should be fair to assume that poems 11–14 are authentic and archetypal, as there is no change of inscription until the "Martin inscription" before poem 16. Poem 11 is authenticated as a poem of John's by the inscription ΤΟΙ (for ΤΟΥ) ΙΟΑΝΝΟΙ (for ΙΟΑΝΝΟΥ) ΤΩ ΚΙΡΡΙΩ ΚΑΡΩΛΩ ("[Verses] of John to the Lord Charles"). Moreover, two poems (12a-b and 13) are verifiably archetypal, as there are entries for both in *L1*.[23] Poem 14 is a prayer for Charles and contains the characteristic misspelling ΚΛΕΟΡ. The authenticity of poem 17 is guaranteed by a new inscription on fol. 298r: ΤΩ ΚΥΡΡΙΩ ΚΑΡΟΛΩ ΙΩΑΝΝΗΣ ΧΑΙΡΕΙΝ ("John sends greetings to Lord Charles"). Although they display only the notation *prosa*, there would be little reason to think that the two prose prayers (15*) — one for Irmintrude, the other for Charles — were composed by someone else. Poem 14, prose 15*, and poem 17 are securely datable. All were written late in the year 869, as will be shown below. Poems 14 and 17 allude to Charles' ascent to the kingship of Lotharingia in that year and crowning at Metz (9 September 869), while the first of the prose pieces (15*) is a prayer for the *salutem* of Irmintrude, who died on 6 October 869.

Traube, however, doubted the authenticity of poem 15, which does not address or mention the king and refers to *Iohannes* in the third person. He also understood the inscription before poem 16 to indicate Martin's authorship. Accordingly, he printed both poems in an appendix to volume III.2 of the *Poetae Latini*, which he labelled "Carmina Scottorum Latina et Graecanica," as XII.3 and XII.5, respectively.[24] Poem 15 honors a certain Liuddo, who was thought to be a pupil of Martin's at Laon.[25] I cite my translation from the SLH edition:

> ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥ ΔΗΜΩ ΙΩͰΑΝΝΗΣ Η ΚΛΕΟΡ ΕΣΤΙΝ,
> ΕΛΛΗΝΩΝ ΕΛΛΗΝ ΛΑΜΠΕΙ ΝΥΝ ΛΙΥΔΔΩ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ.
> Romani populi Iohannes gloria constat:
> Graecorum Graecus fulget nunc Liuddo colendus.
>
> John remains the glory of the Roman people;
> Now brilliant Liuddo should be revered as a Greek of the Greeks!

---

[22]   There are no two- or three-line Greek verses in poems 9 and 10, transmitted by Reg. Lat. 1709.

[23]   The entries in *L1*, though specific to poem 12a, also incude 12b.

[24]   *Iohannis Scotti Carmina*, ed. Traube (n. 2 above), 697.

[25]   Contreni, *The Cathedral School of Laon* (n. 18 above), 136–37.

Could Martin have written it? Liuddo? No, it is John's. The Greek word for "glory" in the first verse is ΚΛΕΟΡ, an obvious error for κλέος ("fame, glory"). John made the same mistake in the first line of genuine poem 14: ΕΡΗΝΗ ΠΙΣΤΩ ΔΗΜΩ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙ Η ΚΛΕΟΡ ΑΚΡΩ ("May there be peace for a faithful people and glory to its king on high"), where κλέορ should be κλέος and the article should be τὸ. As we noted above, the spelling κλέορ is a *Merkmal* of John's composition. Other Greek words in the epigram appear in John's genuine poems: ΔΗΜΩ ("to the people") appears in no. 14, ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ ("revered") at 8.29. Words connected to ΛΑΜΠΕΙ ("shines") are favored in John's poetry. ΛΑΜΠΡΟΣ ("brilliant") occurs at 17.12, ΛΑΜΠΡΟΤΑΤΟΣ ("most brilliant") at 12a.2 and 12b.1. We have here an example of Eriugenian irony: John yields the field of Greek composition to Liuddo, the brilliant student of Martin's, contenting himself to be a mere Latinist. But there is more to it. Note that the poem precedes the satire on the doddering teacher with the inscription ϹΤΙΧΟϹ ΠΡΕΠΟϹ ΔΙΔΑϹΚΑΛΟϹ ΜΑΡΤΙΝΟΥ, which is either "the beautiful verse(s) (*uersus pulcher*) by Martin" or "verse(s) befitting Martin," which would make Martin the object of the satire. Why does John think Liuddo to be so brilliant? Could it be that it was Martin's own student who wrote the clever spoof on Martin? Of course, this is not demonstrable.

What I think is demonstrable is that John wrote the gloss to this poem and to all the glossed poems 1–16.[26] Versions a and b of poem 12 have a metrical gloss, as do poems 14 and 15. If we grant that the near unity of the glosses in poems 1–10 is due to a common exemplar in which Greek glosses were written above the *graeca* in the Latin poems, and that these glosses are authorial or were at least vetted for accuracy by the author, is it likely, or even possible, that Martin glossed the rest of the poems independently? We get a chance to test Martin's ability at Greek from his inscriptions. Take, for example, the two consecutive inscriptions on fol. 297r:

ΤΟΥ ϹΤΙΧΟΙ ΙΟΑΝΝΟΥ ΤΩ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙ ΚΑΡΟΛΟ
The (?) Verses of John to King Charles

ΟΙ ϹΤΙΧΟΙ ΙΟΑΝΝΟΥ ΤΩ ΚΙΡΡΙΩ ΤΟΥΤΩ ΑΝΑΚΤΩ ΚΑΡΟΛΩ
The verses of John to his (?) Lord, King Charles

Leaving aside orthographical variation such as omega for omicron and vice-versa (common in the remnants of Carolingian *graeca*), there are elementary mistakes. Both lines exhibit morphological errors. In the first, we see ΤΟΥ for ΟΙ.[27] In the second, ΤΟΥΤΩ looks like a mistake for ΗΕΑΥΤΟΥ (ἑαυτοῦ, "his"),

---

[26] Inexplicably, there is no gloss for poem 17.
[27] It is possible that ΤΟΥ was meant to go with ΙΟΑΝΝΟΥ, as the use of the article before a name can denote a familiar person or friend, or well-known person. However, the two elements are invariably adjacent to each other.

and ΑΝΑΚΤΩ should be ΑΝΑΚΤΙ ("to the king," lit. "leader"). Another inscription by Martin is found at the end of *L1* on fol. 296v:

> ΕΛΛΗΝΙϹ ΓΡΑΨΕ ΜΑΡΤΙΝΟϹ ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ ΑΥΤΑ
> I Martin, a Greek (?), wrote these letters

ΕΛΛΗΝΙϹ is a mistake for ΕΛΛΗΝ, the classical form still attested as correct in the Byzantine period, though ΕΛΛΗΝΙϹ is attested for a Greek woman in the New Testament.[28] ΓΡΑΨΕ is missing its augment, although there are examples of its disappearance in the *Volkssprache*.[29] If Martin meant to say that he wrote the foregoing letters, the Greek should be ταῦτα τὰ γράμματα. Note that in the inscription to poem 16 Martin wrote πρέπος for πρέπων. Carlotta Dionisotti makes the following assessment of Martin's Greek:

> But the nature of his [Martin's] Greek studies remains, to me at least, pretty mysterious. Virtually the whole of the book [namely, Laon 444] is clearly a transcription from previously existing exemplars. In theory, Martin might still have been the author or compiler of some of the texts with this manuscript representing a fair copy made from his originals. But, in fact, the evidence of the other witnesses and the nature of the mistakes largely exclude this possibility. For instance, if Martin had himself found the meanings of the Greek words in John the Scot's poems (item 16), he would not have written ΤΕΧΑ *quae*/ΡΑΚΤΗΡ (Miller, p. 196; cf. Traube, p. 539.35): he is misinterpreting *an already glossed copy of John's poems* [emphasis mine]. And what seems to be his own additions to items 5, 8, 21, do not suggest that he ever himself handled any Greek text apart from John's poems, not even any bit of the Bible. Nor is there anything to suggest that he either could or did teach Greek, beyond perhaps the alphabet and a few noun declensions.[30]

When one considers the general accuracy of the glossing throughout the poems, including glosses to lines arranged as Latin hexameters (a notable feat), the author of the glosses was someone fairly competent in Greek and able to write acceptable Latin poetry. I know of no Latin poems written by Martin. John Scottus himself

---

[28] E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100*, 2 vols. (New York, 1900), 1:451.

[29] M. Herren, "Evidence for 'Vulgar Greek' from Early Medieval Latin Texts and Manuscripts," in *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks: The Study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. M. Herren and S. A. Brown (London, 1988), 57–84, at 72.

[30] A. C. Dionisotti, "Greek Grammars and Dictionaries in Carolingian Europe," in *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks*, ed. Herren, 1–56, at 47.

emerges as the compiler of the glosses to his poems. This being the case, even where the authorship of a poem is contentious, as with poem 16, the glosses to it were written by John and justifies the inclusion of the poem in the anthology.

Poem 16, a witty epigram on a doddering teacher, was thought by Traube to be the work of Martin, to whom the inscription ΣΤΙΧΟΣ ΠΡΕΠΟΣ ΔΙΔΑΣΚΑΛΟΥ ΜΑΡΤΙΝΟΥ refers. The poem makes fun of an elderly teacher, whose student is no longer prepared to listen to him:

ΕΙΣΧΡΕ ΑΝΑΓΙΝΟΣΤΗΣ, ΕΝΤΕΥΘΕΝ Δ'ΥΠΑΓΕ, ΦΕΥΓΕ,
ΜΗΔ' ΕΛΕΛΥΘΑ ΛΟΓΩ ΣΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΤΑΧΑ ΜΗΔΕ ΠΟΡΕΥΩ.
ΑΡΝΕΤΕ ΣΕ ΗΛΙΚΙΑ ΚΡΟΤΑΦΩΝ ΑΠΑΛΩΝ ΤΕ ΝΕΩΝ ΤΕ.
ΙΔΕ ΛΑΛΕΙΝ ΤΙΘΟΜΑΙ, ΝΥΝ ΩΣ ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΕΤΕ, ΠΕΡΑΝ.
ΝΥΝ ΛΗΓΕ, 'ΝΕΑΝΙΣΚΕ', ΛΕΓΕΙΝ 'ΔΟΣ ΔΕΣΜΑΤΑ ΧΙΛΣΙΝ.'[31]

Abusive tutor, depart from here, get out!
Neither have I come for your talk, nor shall I leave soon.
The flower of youth and soft temples disowns you.
Look, I am putting a stop to prattle, just as you bid;
Now cease to say, "Put locks on your lips, young man!"

In fact, a glance at the facsimile of *L*, fol. 297v (plate II of the CCCM edition) shows that the verse or verses under the inscription were erased. I assumed that given its lowly place at the bottom of the folio in the left margin it had been squeezed in by Martin and was not meant to interrupt the series of verses by John, and therefore the epigram on the teacher, the first item on the following folio (fol. 298r), was John's own work. However, Carlotta Dionisotti noted the exceptional quality of the Greek poem; indeed, she says, "…the constructing and phrasing, with lively dialogue, humour and vivid imagery in lines 3 and 5 seem to me superior to any other Carolingian Greek poem."[32] The wit is worthy of John; however, the Greek is too good for him, never mind Martin. Indeed, there are a number of words that do not occur in any of Johns's other Greek verses, and there is a nice word-play in the last verse: ΛΗΓΕΙΝ with eta and ΛΕΓΕΙΝ with epsilon: "to cease" and "to speak." John avoids 'complicated' verb forms such as ἐλήλυθα (perfect indicative, active voice) and τιθῶμαι (present subjunctive, middle voice) that occur in this poem (lines 2 and 4, respectively). One must conclude that the Greek poem is by an anonymous writer; the Latin gloss is by John. In general, poem 16 is well glossed, but there are a few errors, notably on the words that do not occur in John's poems. For example, in line 2 he gives the wrong meaning for ΤΑΧΑ (gl. *forsan*), here meaning "swiftly" rather than "perhaps." In line 3, ΚΡΟΤΑΦΩΝ is mistranslated as *puerorum* ("of

---

[31]   SLH edition, 102–103.
[32]   Dionisotti, "Greek Grammars and Dictionaries," in *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks*, ed. Herren, 48.

the boys"), when in fact it means "of the foreheads"; ΑΠΑΛΩΝ does not mean *rudium* ("of the uncultivated"), but rather "of the soft" or "tender." It is possible that John inserted this clever parody into a group of his genuine serious poems as a little prank on Martin.

We may conclude from the above that six of the seven poems given in *L2* were genuine and all were glossed by John save poem 17. Nearly all the poems are addressed to the king or his wife, mention them, or relate to them in some way, including even 12a-b, which sides with the king in his dispute with Hincmar of Laon. Two poems (12a-b and 13) are attested by glosses in *L1* and, therefore, are archetypal. There is nothing to suggest, as Dionisotti has pointed out, that Martin did anything else than to copy what was put before him, allowing for the inscriptions discussed above. At this point, I believe it fair to say that *L (L1 + L2)* gives a good account of the number and order of the poems that were in the archetype.

I turn now to the dating order of the poems, which is identical in poems 1–10 in *R* and *L1* (allowing for the poems omitted by *R*). The dating of poems 1–17 is based on the notes in Traube's edition, work by Dutton, and my own researches. Poem 1, probably written in 859, celebrates Charles' victory over his brother Louis the German in 858, thereby preserving his kingdom.[33] At the other end is the Greek poem, no. 17, celebrating Charles' coronation at Metz in 869. Poem 4, *Haec nostram dominam*, dedicated to Charles' first wife Irmintrude, can be dated to 864, as it alludes to the donation of an ornamental garment woven by the queen to the church of San Paolo fuori le mura in Rome.[34] Poem 10, *Graculus Iudaeus*, marks Charles' donation of gold and jewels to Saint-Denis and his assumption of the lay abbacy in 867.[35] I think that we can date poem 8, *Si uis ΟΥΡΑΝΙΑΣ* also to the year 867. It celebrates two feasts, the Annunciation and the Redemption, that is, Good Friday. The Annunciation always falls on March 25, and, as Easter fell on March 30 in that year, Good Friday would have occurred on March 28. Charles attended Easter that year at Saint-Denis.[36] Poem 8 is addressed to the king according to the Greek inscription, and the poet strongly implies that he is present. The verbal allusions to the *Periphyseon* may serve to mark the completion of John's masterpiece in that year. The fact that the great poem *Aulae sidereae* (no. 25) does not appear in *R* and no glosses are recorded by *L* is an indication that it was written too late for inclusion in the collection. Indeed, it is likely that it was composed in 870.[37]

---

[33] Dutton, "Eriugena the Royal Poet" (n. 3 above), 73–75.

[34] Dutton, "Eriugena the Royal Poet" (n. 3 above), 67–68.

[35] See the SLH edition, 148–49.

[36] *Annales Bertiniani*, a. 867, ed. G. Waitz, MGH, *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum* 5 (Hannover, 1883), 86. *The Annals of St-Bertin*, trans. J. Nelson (Manchester, 1991), 138.

[37] M. Herren, "Eriugena's 'Aulae Sidereae,' the 'Codex Aureus,' and the Palatine Church of St. Mary at Compiègne," *Studi Medievali* n.s. 28 (1987): 593–608.

In addition to poem 17 celebrating Charles' coronation at Metz, other Greek poems at the end of the collection might also be dated to 869. Poem 14, which begins ΕΡΗΝΗ ΠΙΣΤΩ ΔΗΜΩ ("Peace to your faithful people"), tells that God has set Charles before all other kings. Again, we may have a reference to Charles' new or impending position as king of Lotharingia and his coronation at Metz as king of both Francia and Lotharingia. The poem concludes with a prayer asking God to subjugate the barbarous races to Charles. After his coronation at Metz, Charles had troubles with both the Saracens and the Northmen (that is, the Vikings). Charles did not come off well against either group and ended up paying a ransom to one and peace money to another.[38] Another item likely datable to the waning months of 869 are two short prose pieces, which are included in the collection of short Greek poems. I marked them with an asterisk in the CCCM edition to note that they are not poems. The first is a prayer for the safety of Irmintrude and for her eternal salvation. Irmintrude died on 6 October 869; thus, the prayer may have been composed when she was *in extremis*, or shortly after her death – in which case the Greek *soterian* would refer to her spiritual safety.[39] The two versions of poem 12 (12a and 12b) addressed to Hincmar, doubtless Hincmar of Laon, support the king in his dispute with that bishop that began on 1 December 868 and continued into 869.[40] The poems are packaged by two 'bookend' pieces: Poem 1 (written in 859), which celebrates Charles' victory over his brother Louis in 858; and poem 17, which rejoices in Charles' ascension to the throne of Lotharingia on the death of his nephew Lothair II. John Scottus or a close associate compiled an anthology of these poems arranged in dating order, which John proficiently glossed, and gave to an assistant to be copied. From that copy (Ω), *R* and *L* were compiled, reproducing Ω's errors and making new errors of their own.

A future editor is free, of course, to arrange the poems in a different configuration. For example, as suggested by one reviewer, the epigrams might be grouped together. However, there will continue to be nagging problems of authenticity, such as those surrounding the notorious epigram (now in four recensions) addressed to one of the Hincmars, claiming that the only good thing he did was to die.[41] Some compartment of a future edition will be needed to 'house' works of unproven authorship until convincing new evidence is found. However, it would be a mistake to disrupt the integrity of the anthology (poems 1–17), which provides a record in verse of Charles

---

[38] *Annales Bertiniani*, a. 869, ed. Waitz, 106-107; *The Annals of St-Bertin*, trans. Nelson, 163–64.

[39] *Annales Bertiniani*, a. 869, ed. Waitz, 107; *The Annals of St-Bertin*, trans. Nelson, 164.

[40] *Annales Bertiniani*, a. 868–69, ed. Waitz, 97; *The Annals of St-Bertin*, trans. Nelson, 152 (a. 868 *ad fin.*) and 152–53 (a. 869 *ad init.*).

[41] Three of these recensions were published in the SLH and CCCM editions (Appendix 9 in both). A fourth recension was recently discovered and published by Adrian Papahagi, "In the Margins of the Predestination Controversy: The Manuscript Context of the Hincmar Mock Epitaph," *Catholic Historical Review* 105 (2019): 53–75, at 55.

the Bald's triumphs, setbacks, and continuing challenges in the years 858–869 and, perhaps, the best information we have regarding John Scottus Eriugena's personality and his relationship with his king. The foundation established by Traube remains, on inspection, as strong as it was when it was laid in 1896, and leaves little room for constructing *res novae*. The editorial situation described in detail above is unusual, possibly unique. However, it does hold a lesson for editors of glossed texts. While not all glossed texts contain authorial glosses, texts transmitted in multiple copies may contain a common gloss. The glosses in each witness need to be collated with the glosses in the others as a regular part of the *recensio codicum*.

York University and Centre for Medieval Studies, University of Toronto
aethicus@yorku.ca
Michael.Herren@utoronto.ca

APPENDIX

The following list comprises all the lemmata with their glosses deriving from poems 1–10 in *R* and *L*. The crucial point is the agreement of *R* and *L1*. In the section transmitted by *L2* alone, *L2* copied the couplets in Greek that occur in poems 1–10, repeating glosses from *L1* but sometimes adding a gloss, and very occasionally changing the gloss of *L1* as a result of re-reading the common exemplar. The lemma words in Greek characters, when not noted otherwise, are those of L^I. Where no variant from *R* is given, the single reading in Greek characters is the reading of both witnesses.

POEM 1

6 ΜΑΧΑΣ, machas *R*] pugnas *R* L^I
32 Stygis L^I *R*] palus inferni *R* L^I
33 ΕΚΛΥΨΙΣ, Eklypsis *R*] defectus L^I
39 ΟΠΛΙΣΤΕΣ, oplistes *R*] armatus *R* L^I
74 Sedulius] $R^{in\ marg.}$

POEM 2

3 Neptunumque] oceanum *R*
6 Stygin *R* L^I] paludem inferni *R* L^I, tristitia inferni $R^{in\ marg.}$; *cf. 1, 32*

13 ΠΝΥΞ *R*, ΤΠΝΥΞ *L*^{I}] ecclesia *R L*^{I}

20 septa] claustra *R*

23 ΕΡΥΤΡΕΑΣ, Erytreas *R*] rubeas *R L*^{I}; Eritryum mare .i. rubrum mare *R*$^{in\ marg.}$

32 ΣΙΜΒΟΛΙΚΑΣ, ΣΥΜΒΟΛΙΚΑΣ *R*] significatiuas *R L*^{I}

40 toli] testudines *R*

43 ΑΛΑΛΑΓΜΑ, alalagma *R*] hymnus victoriae *R L*^{I}

44 ΠΑΡΑΔΟΞΑ, paradoxa *R*] miracula *R L*^{I}

49 ΧΑΛΚΕΥΣ, Chalceus *R*] aeneus *R L*^{I}

53 ΚΑΙΠΥΡΙΚΟΥΣ (*ex emend.*)] ortulanos *R*, ortulanus *L*^{I}; caepos ortus. caeparius ortulanus *R*$^{in\ marg.}$

62 autum non (*sic*)] *R*$^{in\ marg.}$

67 ΟΡΘΩΔΟΞΟΣ] recte credens *R L*$^{I–II}$

ΑΝΑΞ] rex *R L*$^{I–II}$

ΕΥΣΗΒΗΣ] pius *R L*$^{I–II}$

ΕΝΚΛΥΤΟΣ] gloriosus *R L*$^{I–II}$

68 ΣΟΒΡΟΝ (*i. q.* ΣΩΦΡΩΝ)] temperans *R L*$^{I–II}$

ΧΡΙΣΤΟΦΟΡΟΣ] Christum ferens *R L*$^{I–II}$

ΚΙΡΡΙΟΣ] dominus *R L*$^{I–II}$

Ω] ipse *R L*$^{I–II}$

ΚΑΡΟΛΟΣ] Karolus *L*$^{I–II}$

71 ΜΕΛΠΟ, melpo *R*] canto *L*^{I}

Poem 3

10 ΛΑΧΑΝΙΣ, lachanis *R*] herbis *R L*^{I}

11 ΝΕΡΕΑ, nerea *R*] beluas *R* (*super* Neptunum) *L*^{I}

limbus] orbis *R L*^{I}

12 cerula] unda *R L*^{I}

14 oscina (*ex emend.*)] aues *R L*^{I}

24 ΟΦΙΣ, ophis *R*, ΟΦΙΣ *R in marg.*] serpens *R L*^{I}

26 ΙΣΙΔΑΜ, Isidam *R*, ΙΣΙΔΑ *R in marg.*] Aegyptum *L*^{I}, Egyptum *R*

33 Erythreas] rubeas *R*; *cf. 2.23*

39 ΑΜΜΟΝΙΑ, ammonia] arenosa *R L*^{I}

45 ΙΔΑΛΜΑΤΑ *ex emend.*, id almata *R*, ΔΑΛΜΑΤΑ *L*^{I}] imagines *R L*^{I}

Poem 4

10 ΙΝΔΥΣΙΑΣ, indusia *R*] indumenta *R L*^{I}

11 arachnos] aranea *R*, *om. L*^{I}

26 anax] rex *R*; *cfr 2.67, om. L*^{I}

POEM 5

47 ΠΡΟΣΕΥΧΙΣ] *lemma sine glossa apud L^I*
49 ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ] regis *R L^II*
ΚΑΡΟΛΟΙ] Karoli *L^II*
ΗΜΩΝ] nostri *R L^II*
ΣΥ] tu *R L^II*
ΒΟΕΘΕΙ] faue *R L^{I–II}*
50 ΩΣ] ut *R L^II*
ΚΛΕΙΡΕΙΣΘΕ] possidere *R L^{I–II}*
ΧΟΡΟΙΣ] choros *R L^II*
ΔΙΝΑΤΟΣ] possit *R L^{I–II}*
ΟΥΡΑΝΙΑΣ] caelestes *R L^II*; cfr *L^I* ad 8.1.
Poem 8
ΟΙ ΣΤΙΧΟΙ] uersus *R*
ΚΥΡΡΙΩ] domino *R*
ΑΙΤΟΥ *R*,] suo *R*
ΑΝΑΚΤΟ] regi *R*
1 ΟΥΡΑΝΙΑΣ] caelestes *R L^I*
glauciuido, ΓΛΑΥΣΙΥΙΔΟ *L^I*] noctiuido *R L^I*
5 ΝΟΕΡΟΣque, noerosque *R*] intellectus *R L^I*
ΛΟΓΟΣ, logos *R*, sc. λόγους] rationes *R L^I*
6 ΓΝΟΦΟΣ, gnofos *R*] caligo *R L^I*
ΚΟΡΥΦΕΝ, ΚΟΡΥphΕΝ *R*] uerticem *R L^I*
7 ΘΕΣΜΟΝ] legem *R L^I*
ΜΟΥΣΕΑ, moysea *R*] .i. moysaica *L^I*
8 ΘΑΡΣΟΝ] planta pedis *R L^I*
10 ΠΤΕΡΥΓΑΣ] alas *R L^I*
11 ΠΟΛΙΜΟΡΦΟΤΑ, polymorfota *R*] multiformia *R L^I*
ΖΩΑ] animalia *R L^I*
14 ΚΡΟΝΟΣque, cronosque *R*] tempora *R L^I*
ΤΟΠΟΣque, sc. τόπους, toposque *R*] locos *R*, locus *L1*
17 ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΑ, pneumata *R*] spiritus *R L^I*
18 ΑΙΓΛΕ, aigle *R*] claritas *R L^I*
20 ΦΟΕΒΗ] luna *R L^{I–II}*
ΚΑΙ] et *R L^II*
ΣΤΙΛΒΟΝ (*ex emend.*, ΙΣΤΙΛΒΟΝ *R L^I*)] mercurius *R L^I*
ΚΑΙ] et *R L^II*
ΦΟΣ<ΦΟΡΟΣ> (ΦΟΣ *R L ^I*)] lucifer *R L^{I–II}*
ΗΛΙΟΣ] sol *R L^{I–II}*
ΑΡΗΣ] mars *R L^{I–II}*

21 ΦΟΕΤΟΝ] iouis R L^{I-II}

ΚΑΙ] et R L^{II}

ΣΤΙΛΒΩΝ (*ex emend.*, ΙΣΤΙΛΒΩΝ R L^{I-II})] mercurius R L^{I-II}

ΦΟΣ<ΦΟΡΟΣ> (*ex emend.*, ΦΟΣ R L^{I-I})] lucifer R L^{I-II}

ΦΑΙΝΟΝΟΣ] saturni R, saturnus L^{I}

ΑΚΡΟΙ R L^{II}, ΑΚΡΟΣ L^{I}] summi R L^{II}, summus L^{I}

ΠΕΡΙ] circum R $^{I-II}$

ΚΛΙΜΑΤΑ] plagas R L^{I-II}

ΠΑΧΝΗΣ (*ex emend.*, ΠΑΧΝΗ R L^{I-II})] pruina R L^{I-II}

22 ΕΞΗΣ R L^{II} (ΕΞΙΣΤΟΥ $L1$)] deinde R L^{I-II}

ΚΟΣΜΟΥ] mundi R L^{I-II}

ΚΕΝΤΡΟΝ] medium R L^{I-II}

ΤΕΘΙΣ] oceanus R L^{I-II}

ΑΣΧΕΤΟΣ] inmensurabilis R L^{I-II}

ΑΛΑΣ] salum R L^{I-II}

23 ΕΝΝΕΑΠΤΟΝΓΟΣ, enneaptongus R] nouenus sonus R L^{I}

ΧΕΛΙΣ, chelis R] cithara (cyth- L^{I}) R L^{I}

ΩΤΑΣ] aures R L^{I}

27 ΖΩΗ] uita R L^{I}

34 ΩΝ] ens R L^{II}[42]

ΤΕΛΟΣ] finis R L^{I-II}

ΑΡΧΗ] principium

ΠΑΝΤΟΝ] omnium R L^{I-II}

ΟΝΤΑ] qui est quae sunt R L^{II}, quae sunt $L1$

ΤΑ ΕΙΣΙΝ] quae subsistunt R L^{I-II}

35 ΩΝ] ens R L^{II}

ΑΓΑΘΟΣ] bonus R L^{I-II}

ΚΑΙ] et R L^{II}

ΚΑΛΟΣ] pulcher R L^{I-II}

ΚΑΛΛΟΣ] pulchritudo R L^{I-II}

ΜΟΡΦΩΝ] formarum R L^{I-II}

ΤΕ] que (quae $L1$)] R L^{I-II}

ΧΑΡΑΧΤΗΡ, ΚΑΡΑΚΤΗΡ R] exemplar R L^{I-II}

37 ΑΝΤΡΩΠΟΣ, antropos R] homo R L^{I}

39 ΠΡΟΓΟΝΟΣ, progonos R] auus R L^{I}

ΣΠΕΡΜΑΤΕ, spermate R] semine R L^{I}

40 ΛΥΤΡΩΤΗΝ R L ^{I}, ΛΥΤΡΟΤΗΝ *corr.* R] redemptorem R L^{I}

49 ΝΟΥΣ] animus R L^{I}

ΤΕ^{1}] que R

ΛΟΓΟΣ] ratio R L^{I}

---

[42]   Where this lemma recurs in the same line, the gloss is not repeated.

TE^2] que *R*
50 ΣΑΡΚΙΚΑ] carnales *R L^I*
ΦΙΣΙΣ] natura *R L^I*
ΑΥΓΑΣ] claritudines *R L^I*
61 ΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ] uirgo *R L^I*
62 ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΕ] spiritu *R L^I*
63 ΓΑΣΤΕΡ] uenter *R L^I*
64 ΣΟΜΑΤΕ, somate *R*] corpore *R L^I*
67 ΑΝΔΡΑ, ANdra (*sic*) *R*] uirum *R L^I*
72 ΦΙΣΙΝ, ΦΥΣΙΝ *R*] naturam *R L^I*
73 ΦΙΣΙΣ *scripsi*, ΦΥΣΙΣ *R*, om. *L^I*] *glossa deest*

I printed the couplet ΖΩΗΝ ΑΟΙΝΙΟΝ ΔΩΣΕΙ ΣΟΙ ΠΑΝΤΟΤΕ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ. ΚΥΡΡΙΕ, ΖΗΣ ΠΟΛΛΟΥΣ ΕΝΙΑΥΤΟΥΣ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΕΙΣ as lines 85–86 of the CCCM edition. The lemmata with glosses are given by *L1* and the lines rewritten with their glosses in *L2*. The lines do not occur in *R*, and on that account Traube printed them as a separate poem (Traube, ed., p. 545).

POEM 9

4 ΑΔΗΝ, om. *R*] infernus *L^I*
23 ΣΑΡΞ (*edd.*, *om. L^I*, sarx *R*) *glossa deest*
49 ΣΤΑΥΡΩ (ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ *L^I*, *om. R*) crux *L^I*

POEM 10

12 ΣΥΜΜΑΧΕ *scripsi* (symmache *R*, ΣΥΜΜΑΧΟΣ *L^I*)] adiutor *L1*
15 ΤΕΚΝΙ, tekni *R*] filii *R L^I*
ΛΕΙΨΑΝΑ, aeiΨΑΝΑ (*sic*) *R*] reliquias *R L^I*
19 ΘΙΑΣΟΤΟΝ, thiasotum R] deum laudantium *R L^I*