

AN OFFPRINT FROM

# SPECULUM

A JOURNAL OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

VOL. VIII

OCTOBER - 1933

NO. 4

081  
B 660/3  
no 1  
cop. 1

*gremet*

---

## THE MANUSCRIPT TRADITION OF THE *SPECULUM* *STULTORUM*

A. BOUTEMY

*Veris*  
*I*

---

THE MEDIAEVAL ACADEMY OF AMERICA

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.



## THE MANUSCRIPT TRADITION OF THE *SPECULUM STULTORUM*

By ANDRE BOUTEMY

THE articles of Mr J. H. Mozley on the manuscript tradition of the *Speculum Stultorum* (*SPECULUM*, IV, 430–442 and V, 251–263) were particularly welcome to mediaevalists. The author has rendered thereby a notable service to mediaeval Latin philology, the extent of which is apparent when one considers the mediocrity of previous editions of the *Speculum*: (1) those of the fifteenth through the seventeenth centuries, prepared on the basis of the contemporary (and now somewhat superannuated) principles for the edition of ancient texts; and (2) Th. Wright's modern edition of 1872. The latter might naturally have been expected to offer a satisfactory text of a work of which fully half the manuscripts, and the best ones, are preserved in Great Britain. Unfortunately, however, Wright's edition falls far short of fulfilling the requirements of the philologist. Indeed, it represents an entirely unsatisfactory collation of manuscripts. Only three — less than a tenth of those extant — were used by the editor: (1) *Harleianus* 2422 (thirteenth century) = *A*; (2) *Arundelianus* 23 (fifteenth century) = *B*; and (3) *Cotton. Titus A xx* (fourteenth century) = *C*. Wright failed to examine the indispensable manuscripts of the Bodleian, thus restricting himself to the *codices* found in the British Museum; and he even neglected two of the latter. To the manuscripts employed Wright added an old edition which he never used for the establishment of his text,<sup>1</sup> and which is a simple incumbrance in the critical apparatus. It was doubtless employed solely to facilitate the editor's reading of the manuscripts.

Beside numerous erroneous readings (cited by Mr Mozley), Wright's edition exhibits an unfortunate lack of logic and coherence. For example, the same word (especially in the case of proper names) appears in various forms. But, more serious still, this defect extends to the choice of the basic text. After following almost without exception the *A* text, apart from extremely rare cases where it is genu-

<sup>1</sup> Except for v. 3867 and the rubrics, though he puts the latter in brackets when they are supplied by the edition.



inely unacceptable, the editor, when eventually confronted with a lacuna in *A* (which ends at v. 3524), suddenly abandons the tradition of *A* and *C* (though the latter has the text complete), and thenceforward adopts the readings of *B*, relegating the readings of *C* to the *apparatus criticus* to which he had previously consigned the readings of *B*.

The difficulty of using a text so constituted is obvious. Mr Mozley has carried his examination of the text tradition much further: he has supplied a practically complete list of the manuscripts preserved in Great Britain and elsewhere, and has completely collated both the manuscripts of the United Kingdom and some on the Continent (including two at Brussels). I mention this fact because there are certain additions — some of them fairly striking — to be made to Mr Mozley's collation. While engaged myself in a similar study on Nigel, I made use of works of certain older scholars (Leyser, Fabricius, Tanner, etc.) who mention a certain number of manuscripts of the *Speculum Stultorum*. Several refer to a manuscript known as *Francisci Bernardi 32*, the existence of which is apparently unknown to Mr Mozley, though cited in the *Catalogi* of Ed. Bernard and extant (strangely enough) in the Sloane collection (1831 *B*) at the British Museum. Beside the manuscript *Titus A xx*, the Cotton collection also has a second manuscript (*Vespasianus E xij*) in which Nigel's work is attributed to John of Salisbury. Among continental manuscripts, we should add to the list *MS. 23820* of the Latin collection in the library at Munich, beside noting that *MS. 237* of the same library (mentioned by Manitius, *Gesch. der lat. Lit. des Mittelalters*, III, 812) contains an important fragment of the work under discussion. Finally, *MS. 3196* of the Bibliothèque de Sainte-Geneviève (Paris) — a sort of small anthology of ancient and mediaeval Latin poets — contains some thirty verses of the *Speculum Stultorum*. The examination of libraries is doubtless as yet still unfinished, and the list of manuscripts of the *Speculum* still incomplete, but it has thus seemed advantageous to register these few additions.

A few notes on the manuscripts mentioned seemed appropriate. *Sloane 1831 B* (fifteenth century) is badly mutilated. It contains vv. 1039 to 3842 (fols. 1<sup>r</sup> to 47<sup>v</sup>), with two lacunae in this section of the text: between fols. 25<sup>v</sup> and 26<sup>r</sup> there is a lacuna from v. 2336 to v. 2663, and likewise between fols. 38<sup>v</sup> and 39<sup>r</sup> vv. 3341–3394 are lacking. The presence of the explicit formula after v. 3842 attaches *Sloane 1831 B* to group *BH*, where the text ends at the same point.

The lacunae deserve some explanation. Fol. 1 also carries the older designation 13, and the numbering as 14, 15, 16, etc. continues on subsequent sheets, thus justifying the supposition that twelve leaves have been lost. It so happens that this number corresponds to the number of leaves in each gathering.<sup>1</sup> The manuscript thus appears to have lost one gathering. Since the codex averages 26 lines to a page, this loss would bring us approximately to v. 414. But we nowhere encounter the primitive lacuna which would result from this loss, and besides, the 400 missing verses would fill about eight sheets. Now, by counting the letters in the prologue, we learn that the latter could be transcribed on four sheets of this

<sup>1</sup> This conclusion is drawn from certain photostats which I have before me, but has not yet been confirmed by the British Museum.



manuscript. It is thus by no means rash to affirm that *Sloane 1831 B* lost its first two gatherings on two separate occasions, as may be concluded from the old numbering juxtaposed with more recent figures. The lacuna vv. 3341–3394 (54 verses) is easily explicable by the loss of one sheet (the last two verses could have been omitted because of the *homoioteleuton*). Since the lost sheet was the first of a gathering (fols. 39–48), and since the text appearing on fol. 48<sup>v</sup> is incomplete, it would seem that the original gathering has lost its outside sheet. It remains to discuss the lacuna between fols. 25<sup>v</sup> and 26<sup>r</sup>. If, as I believe, the gatherings are composed of 12 sheets, it must be assumed that in fols. 25 and 26 we have only the outside of a quaternion, and that ten sheets have been lost. Yet only 328 verses are lacking to permit a reconstitution of the text of the majority of the manuscripts of the *Speculum*. The absence of 520 verses at this point can hardly be explained except by the presence, in the lost sheets, of one of the additions mentioned by Mr Mozley, viz., that of 198 verses which is found in *G* and *I*. This is merely a suggestion of some probability. In any case, *Sloane 1831 B* seems originally to have contained 36 more sheets than it comprises at present.

Below will be found a few notes on the text of this manuscript<sup>1</sup>

Fols. 1<sup>r</sup> to 5<sup>r</sup>.

- v. 1065 followed by 1066 in *Sl. A*; in *GHI* two verses are interpolated.
- v. 1095 fatuumque pararat *Sl.*; tardumque parauit *C* (parabat *A*).
- v. 1133 quod si deliret pariter quisquamque senescat *Sl.*; et si deliret quisquam pariterque senescat *A*.
- v. 1143 in urbem *Sl. A*; ad urbem *GH*.
- v. 1162 separated from 1163 by 3 verses *Sl.*; by 5 verses *GH*; followed by 1163 *A*.

In *Sl.*, after 1169, the order of the verses is: 1172, 1171, 1170, 1173, 1174, then four verses inserted, then 1175, etc.

- v. 1178 accrescet *Sl.*; accrescat *A*.
- v. 1186 audentes *Sl.*; audaces *A*.
- v. 1211 aue *Sl. H*; ait *A*.
- v. 1241 causa possit *Sl.*; causa magnum *A*.

Between 1262 and 1263, two verses are inserted in *Sl.*, but lacking in ~~Sl.~~ *A*.

These verses are:

Ira furore minus modico distare uidetur  
Cum nimis excederet in grauitate modum.

Fols. 38<sup>v</sup> and 39<sup>r</sup>

- v. 3327 et dicens *Sl. AH*; hec dicens *I*; — comes ipsa libenter *Sl.*; comesque libenter *A*.
- v. 3337 ut pedibus uti posset propriisque reuerti *Sl.*; ut pedibus niti propriis possetque reuerti *A*.
- v. 3395 illam *Sl.*; eam *A*.
- v. 3396 quicquam *Sl. B. H.*; quiquam *A*.
- v. 3421 istud *Sl.*; illud *A*.

By these indications derived from the leaves which I have had a chance to collate it will be observed that the text of *Sl.* quite often diverges from *BH* in passages where the provenience of the manuscript might be apparent. Although these elements are insufficient to permit basing any theory upon them, is it not

<sup>1</sup> The readings of *Sl.* are here compared with those of *BHGI* (according to the data of Mr Mozley) and *A* (after Wright's edition).

permissible to suppose that the conclusion of the text with verse 3842 ('incurrit facti conditione sui') was common to a group of manuscripts larger than that to which *B* and *H* belong?

Let us now pass to an examination of *Vespasianus E xij*. The *Speculum* is presented as follows in the catalog of the Cotton Collection: '*Speculum Stultorum*, libellus compositus a Johanne Sarisberiensis, S. Theol. Doctore eximio ad Wilhel mum Nigellum, cum praefatione de ratione et vindicatione tituli, quibusdam videbatur esse ridiculus.' This notation is doubtless based upon a remark inserted by the scribe on the verso of fol. 13 between the prose preface<sup>1</sup> and the verse text (fol. 14<sup>r</sup>): 'Libellum istum qui dicitur *Speculum Stultorum* composuit Saresberien- sis Sacre theologie doctor eximius sicut patet in Epistula blesensis directa Sares- buryensi Regracians sibi pro libello quem composuit de nugis Curialium et iste Saresburiensis morabatur cum (?) Thoma cantuariensi.' Oudin had already pointed out the mistake in the catalog which misled Mr Mozley.<sup>2</sup> This manu- script, fols. 10<sup>v</sup> to 77<sup>r</sup>, contains the complete text of Nigel's work. At the close we find the following addition of six verses:

Christe vagas asini nugas crimenque drian,  
A nobis tenebras mentis et ammoveas.  
Ac de pressura mundi nos sorteque dura,  
Salvos custodi regnaque redde poli.  
Burnelli dicta multo moderamine ficta,  
Spernere qui querit, semper Asellus erit.

The verses are followed by the formula: 'Explicit *Speculum Stultorum*. Amen.' A much more recent hand — seventeenth-century at the latest<sup>3</sup> — has inclosed these six verses in a bracket accompanied by the note: 'Hexastichon istud non habet Codex Camdenianus, nec in exemplaribus impressis reperitur.' On fol. 76<sup>r</sup>, opposite verse 3826, of which the last words 'inficiatur opus' are underlined, the same hand has written: 'rege iubente suo ms. Camd.'

What is this *MS. Camdenianus* here referred to? We know that William Cam- den's manuscripts were inherited by his friend Sir Robert Cotton. Now there are only two manuscripts of the *Speculum* in the latter's collection. This fact would guide our attention to *MS. Titus A xx*, which corresponds to the marginal notes of *Vespasianus E xij*. Although the *Titus A xx* shows no traces of having been in Camden's library, it appears that its presence there may be affirmed.

The text in *Vespasianus E xij*. (which is complete) has a mixed character which renders its classification impossible until the British manuscripts containing the *Speculum* have been examined in detail. While comparing the text of this manu- script with the passages indicating the double tradition  $\alpha$  (A-N) and  $\beta$  (E-I) as given by Mr Mozley, I have arrived at the following results: (1) in the preface, *Vesp.* associates itself with group  $\beta$ ; (2) in the text corresponding to pp. 11-65 of Wright's edition, our manuscript agrees in 31 cases with group  $\alpha$  and in 16 cases with group  $\beta$ ; (3) then a marked change occurs; as against eight agreements with

<sup>1</sup> It ends on fol. 13<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> C. Oudin, *Commentarius de Scriptoribus Ecclesiae Antiquis* (Leipzig, 1722), II, 1507, 1654.

<sup>3</sup> Is it perhaps that of Sir Robert Cotton?



α group β, there are thirty with group β in the section of the *Speculum* corresponding to pp. 66–124 of Wright; (4) in general, the sequence conforms to the *BH* tradition against *EFL*. It should be noted that when *Vesp. E xij* agrees with group β, it is most often association with the *BH* family, and when it supports the a tradition, it frequently accords with the *DK* family.

My fragmentary acquaintance with the British manuscripts precludes my explaining as yet the textual complexity of our manuscript.

Not having as yet collated the Munich manuscript, lat. 23820 (1462), I am not able to comment upon it at this point. In it the *Speculum* occupies fols 243–282.

The fragments which appear in *MSS 237* and *14529* of the same library present only slight variations. The two codices give the text of the list of religious orders: *Monac. 237*, fols 218<sup>r</sup>–220<sup>v</sup>, contains vv. 2037–2468, and *Monac. 14529*, fol. 154<sup>v</sup>, vv. 2457–2468, and fols 160<sup>r</sup>–166<sup>r</sup>, vv. 2037–2450. Of these manuscript fragments, the first belonged to Hartmann Schedel, and was copied by him at Leipzig while studying at the university in 1460, as is attested by the numerous notes which he added to the manuscript. The owner and scribe of the second was the monk Johann Tegernpeck, who likewise made his copy while studying at the University of Leipzig in 1466. The *Querela Brunelli* was transcribed between January 28 (the date appears in the explicit of the *Brunellus de tribus animalibus*, fol. 154<sup>v</sup>) and the Saturday before the festival of St Scholastica (cf. the explicit of *Martinus Dumiensis de quatuor virtutibus*). The second fragment is posterior to the latter date, but before St Matthias's Day (February 25), on which the transcription of the subsequent work was completed.

The texts of these two manuscripts belong to group β.<sup>1</sup> They are very closely related, as will appear from the following list of passages:

- v. 2049 miles quia *M<sup>1</sup>M<sup>2</sup>*, Miles ne *A*.
- v. 2051 saltidinus *M<sup>1</sup>* saldidinus *M<sup>2</sup>*; salodinus *A*.
- v. 2058 flamellus *M<sup>1</sup>M<sup>2</sup>*; profinellus *A*.
- v. 2078 solis *M<sup>1</sup>M<sup>2</sup>*; satis *A*.
- v. 2091–92 given by *M<sup>1</sup>M<sup>2</sup>* *E-I*; omitted by *A*.
- v. 2095 culpa *M<sup>1</sup>M<sup>2</sup>*; culpam *A*.
- v. 2117 aut uolat *M<sup>1</sup>M<sup>2</sup>*; que uolat *A*.
- v. 2131–32 given by *M<sup>1</sup>M<sup>2</sup>* *E-I*; omitted by *A*.
- v. 2137–8 omitted by *M<sup>1</sup>M<sup>2</sup>* *A*; given by *E-I*.
- v. 2139 magis agis *M<sup>1</sup>M<sup>2</sup>*; magis, magis *A*.
- v. 2146 debet nam *M<sup>1</sup>M<sup>2</sup>*; frater habet *A*.
- v. 2200 trilustralis *M<sup>1</sup>M<sup>2</sup>* *A*; claustralis *EFL*.
- v. 2245 non spernunt *M<sup>1</sup>M<sup>2</sup>* *E-B*; non semper *A*.
- v. 2279 tegebat *M<sup>1</sup>M<sup>2</sup>* *E-B*; protexit *A*.
- v. 2303 lex est licitumque *M<sup>1</sup>M<sup>2</sup>* *E-B*; lex noua lutumque *A*.
- v. 2394–5 omitted by *M<sup>1</sup>M<sup>2</sup>* (2393–4 omitted by *ALGI*); given by *EFBH*.
- v. 2403–4 given by *M<sup>1</sup>M<sup>2</sup>* *E-H*; omitted by *AGI*.
- v. 2462 mihi ferre solent *M<sup>1</sup>M<sup>2</sup>* *B*; me nocere solent *A*, etc.

In spite of the great resemblances which they present, these two texts (*M<sup>1</sup>* and *M<sup>2</sup>*) do not seem to derive one from the other, but rather from a common source.

<sup>1</sup> They are designated below as follows: *M<sup>1</sup>* = *Monac. 237*; *M<sup>2</sup>* = *Monac. 14529*.

Might not this source be a course at the university, since the two manuscripts are the work of students?<sup>1</sup> Researches along this line and perhaps also an examination of *Monac.* 23820 will doubtless cast some light on the question.

To conclude the enumeration of manuscripts unused by Mr Mozley, I offer some details on the Sainte Geneviève codex. It belonged to one François Pynart, a monk of the Clairvaux order whom I have been as yet unable to identify otherwise. It contains the charming description of springtime (vv. 503-536) which figures in this anthology, fols 115<sup>r</sup>-116<sup>r</sup>. The text conforms to *A* with only orthographical variants.<sup>2</sup>

But apart from the manuscripts of the *Speculum*, it is by no means superfluous to consider the texts of its various editions, even of those of the seventeenth century. As a proof of this contention I cite only the Frankfurt edition of 1602, in which the *Speculum* is published after the *Praxis Jocandi* and other pieces under the following title: *Ad Asinum altioribus ac doctoratui propemodum inhiantem Digressio lepidissima.*

The text of this edition, which supports group  $\beta$ , offers a lacuna not elsewhere observed in any of the known manuscripts of the *Speculum Stultorum*: p. 488, after vv. 3219-3220, is read the following distich:

Talia dicenti Nisi de nare sinistra  
Frigidus erupit sanguis et ipse levis (vv. 3441-42).

From verse 3441 to the end (3878) there is no important lacuna to be noted.

Now this edition of the *Speculum* is not dependent upon an older edition, but has been established on the basis of a manuscript, as is indicated by the first page: '*Ad Asinum . . . lepidissima, nunc primum ex manuscripto Regii cujusdam Goraddivi Italogermani in lucem edita.*' I have not yet been able to find this manuscript, which appears related to the Munich codices. It therefore seems interesting to cite some characteristics of the text it contains in the Frankfurt print. The prose preface is lacking and the poetic text shows clear signs of corruption. While preserving the characteristic features of group  $\beta$ , it offers a very large number of variants due to faulty readings, transpositions of verses and words, etc. In thirty-one instances distichs which appear in *A* are lacking in the number of one, two, three, or even four, to a total of 76 verses.

The edition described by Hain under No. 16217 (Proctor 2904, Copinger 6585) exhibits the same characteristics as the Frankfurt print, but the attractive and natural hypothesis of a common origin must be rejected in the light of quite considerable differences. In the first 200 verses, I have noted a number of variants which give ample indication that our two editions are based on different manuscripts, though the latter are quite closely related.

The text of this incunabulum is slightly more complete than that of the Frankfurt edition, since it contains vv. 201-202, 435-436, 1953, and 2449-50, which are absent in the latter.

<sup>1</sup> Born in 1440, Hartmann Schedel was twenty years old when he copied *Monac.* 237.

<sup>2</sup> In connection with this manuscript it may be noted that the author of the catalog was unable to identify the text on fols. 40<sup>v</sup>-43<sup>v</sup>, which is no other than Horace, *Ep.* II, to Lollius.



In spite of the mistrust inspired by these editions in view of the absence of vv. 3843-78 in the manuscripts of group  $\beta$  noted by Mr Mozley, it seems desirable to supply here the readings of the editions in question which differ from Wright's text at this point:

- v. 3844 qui *Fr. Ed.* (Hain 16217); quod *Wr.*
- v. 3845 isti *Fr. Ed.*; ipsi *Wr.*
- v. 3848 gratuito corde quam tenuisse manu *Fr. Ed.*; Corde libenti, quam detinuisse manum *Wr.*
- v. 3849 proque bonis meritis *Fr. Ed.*; maxime pro meritis *Wr.*
- v. 3852 etcaue ne tandem clamet *Fr. Ed.*; mane quod hinc non sit clamor *Wr.*
- v. 3855 cum *Fr. Ed.*; dum *Wr.*
- v. 3858 quamque notastis ita *Fr. Ed.*; nam docet auctor ita *Wr.*
- v. 3860 discretus lector denotat illa sibi *Fr. Ed.*; scrutetur lector caute quid ipsa uelint *Wr.*
- v. 3861 et cum signarit *Fr. Ed.* (signauerit *Ed.*); designare sibi *Wr.*
- v. 3865 quidam *Fr. Ed.*; qui dum *Wr.* circa uana *Fr. Ed.*; talia certe *Wr.*
- v. 3866 atque *Fr. Ed.*; saepe *Wr.*
- v. 3868 recte *Fr. Ed.*; illud *Wr.*
- v. 3869 quum (qui *Ed.*) fuit ineptus *Fr. Ed.*; quaesiuit inepta *Wr.*
- v. 3871 tantum (tutum *Ed.*) aliena pericla cauere *Fr. Ed.*; felix aliena pericula cautum *Wr.*
- v. 3872 nequeunt flecti uel *Fr. Ed.*; faciunt formant et *Wr.*
- v. 3874 sufficiunt *Fr. Ed.*; sufficient *Wr.*
- v. 3875 quod *Fr.*; quid *Wr.*
- v. 3877 pia *Fr.*; pie *Wr.*
- v. 3878 atque pio Nato sit cui laus et honor *Fr. Ed.*; felici nato quod roget omnis homo *Wr.*

We may now rectify two points in Mr Mozley's second article. (1) It would be an anachronism to date Richard James's manuscript *No. 15* as of the eighteenth century, since a description of this manuscript appears in Bernard's *Catalogi*. (2) In the case of *MS. 1701-4* at Brussels (*No. 180* in Van den Gheyn's *Catalog*), Mone's transcription, which Mr Mozley used, is incomplete. The *Speculum* appears as follows in this manuscript: (a) fol. 122<sup>v</sup>, 2nd col., vv. 1-54; (b) fols. 123<sup>r</sup>-136<sup>r</sup>, 1st col., vv. 667-3878; (c) fols. 136<sup>r</sup>, 2nd col.—137<sup>v</sup>, 2nd col., vv. 205-594; (d) fol. 138<sup>v</sup>, vv. 2854-3083, which also appear under (b). If we use (c) to fill out the lacuna found between (a) and (b), it is reduced to 150 verses (55-204) plus 72 (595-666), i.e., 222 verses instead of 460.

But these are minor details, and I wish to raise the more essential question: how should we reconstitute the original text of Nigel's work? At the outset, I am somewhat surprised at Mr Mozley's attitude toward stemmata, the construction of which he views primarily as a *jeu d'esprit*. We may well view the matter in another light: possessing as he does a profound knowledge of the British manuscripts and having information on the continental manuscripts at his disposal, Mr Mozley was particularly well equipped to show in a stemma the relations prevailing among the various manuscripts of the *Speculum* bequeathed to us by the fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries. Even if it were impossible to get back to the main line of descent, which had perhaps split at a point close to its beginning, it would still be possible, by minute classification, to define its course



in spite of its more than thirty branches, and thus to clarify an *apparatus criticus* otherwise comparatively dense.

Rejecting this system of established utility, Mr Mozley goes back to the system of using the best manuscript as often practised by Romance scholars. I do not wish to stir up once more the perennial and seemingly futile debate on methods of text establishment, but I must confess that the use of the best manuscript (which usually varies according to the editor and even from edition to edition with the same editor) seems to me deficient in scientific severity. Particularly in the case before us, Mr Mozley's choice is curious and even illogical. His respect for the antiquity of *A* induces him to adopt this manuscript as the basis for his text. Yet he finds in the readings of group  $\beta$  older elements than those which appear in *A*; he admits the frequent superiority of the readings of  $\beta$  over those of *A*, and proposes to use them (rather than the readings of other representatives of group  $\alpha$ ) to correct *A* where the latter is faulty. Obviously he is thus making  $\beta$  the base for his text without saying so. In this sense I am quite in agreement with Mr Mozley, and this is also, I believe, the opinion of W. B. Sedgwick<sup>1</sup> who, though having only Wright's edition at hand, observes that the readings of  $\beta$  are frequently, and perhaps almost invariably, preferable.

Adding to Sedgwick's notes those supplied by Mozley, we shall no longer hesitate to give our preference to group  $\beta$ . Finally, I wish to add one more probative argument connected with the story of the Cistercian Fromondus and his dogs. (a) In vv. 1045-6, Burnellus imposes on Fromondus the killing of his dogs as a condition for peace. (b) Vv. 1073-74 celebrate the death of Grimbaldus and the other molossians. (c) Burnellus comes back to the death of his dogs in v. 1233 when recounting his adventures to his traveling companion Arnoldus.

One question immediately arises: when were the dogs killed? We must admit that *A* offers no explanation. The other manuscripts of group  $\alpha$  regarding which I have been able to obtain information also offer no aid (*CD\*OP*).<sup>2</sup> In all of them (along with variants of no interest) we find in the passage which should offer the solution:

Nec mora, Fromundus, correptis fuste molossis,  
Disponit socium fallere fraude suum.

If the dogs do not die in  $\alpha$ , such is not the case in the manuscripts of group  $\beta$  (*EFGHIST*), the edition described by Hain under no. 16217, and the Frankfurt edition, which give for this passage the following reading:

Nec mora, Fromundus, correpto fuste, molossis  
Omnibus extinctis, acceleravit iter,

or a text closely approximating this (*MS. Sloane 1831 B* stands between the two traditions by giving v. 1057 in the form 'Nec mora, correptus Fromundus morte

<sup>1</sup> 'The Textual Criticism of Mediaeval Latin Poets,' *SPECULUM*, v (1930), 288 ff.

<sup>2</sup> For my information on the foreign manuscripts which I have not been able to collate I am indebted to the kindness of the Custodian of the Breslau University Library, of Mr F. Marsh of Dublin, and particularly of Messrs A. J. Collins and E. G. Millar of the British Museum, and to Mr O. E. Hillowe of the Bodleian. I take this opportunity of expressing my gratitude for their assistance.



molossis' and v. 1058 as in *A*). The reading of group  $\beta$  is manifestly preferable. Adding this argument to those of my predecessors, I believe there is reason, in establishing the text of the *Speculum Stultorum*, to reject resolutely *A*, its descendants, and its collaterals in favor of the members of group  $\beta$ .

I am as yet unable to fix the choice of a base manuscript; but in spite of the lacunae in the manuscripts of group  $\beta$ , it ought to be possible to constitute a less confused text and one decidedly preferable to that proposed by Mr Mozley.

BRUSSELS, DECEMBER, 1931.

#### ADDITIONAL NOTES

Since writing the above article, I have had an opportunity to study *Monacensis* 23820 which, far from presenting an original type, belongs simply to the category of manuscripts in which v. 2587 ff. are lacking.

My researches have led me to discover the existence of a relative of this manuscript in the library at Gotha. My attention was attracted to this copy of the *Speculum Stultorum* by a perusal of E. Voigt, 'Kleinere lateinische Denkmäler der Thiersage.'<sup>1</sup> Voigt alludes to a prose prologue to the *Speculum* printed by Jacobs in his *Beiträge zur älteren Literatur*,<sup>2</sup> which gave, however, only a description of the manuscript, and the author reproduced only an excerpt from the prologue.<sup>3</sup>

The manuscript *Chartaceus* B. 517 dates from the fifteenth century, and the *Speculum* occupies in it fols 136<sup>r</sup> to 195<sup>v</sup>. At the end of the preceding work we read: 'Anno domini mcccc<sup>o</sup> decimo octavo finitus ante diem palmarum quinta feria, etc.' It is therefore probable that the transcript of Nigel's work is slightly posterior to that date. The poem is preceded by the prose prologue (occupying 8½ pages) and begins in the middle of fol. 140<sup>r</sup>. It ends with the distich 'Munera . . . nephanda tegunt' (vv. 2585-86), which associates it with the manuscripts *T*, *V*<sup>2</sup>, *V*<sup>3</sup>, *V*<sup>4</sup>, *V*<sup>7</sup>, and *Monacensis* 23820.

Observing that the Munich Latin manuscripts 237 and 14519 had been copied by students at Leipzig, I asked the director of the University Library in the latter city whether there were any copies of the *Speculum* in his collections. My hopes were not disappointed: *Codex* 1591 at Leipzig actually does contain Nigel's poem. It is a small volume of 62 paper folios with a transcript dating from the fifteenth century. The *Speculum* fills the whole volume, though incompletely, since the prose is lacking, as well as vv. 3861-78 of Wright's edition. This copy belongs to the same group as those which served as base for the Leipzig edition (Conrad Kachelofen: Hain 16217) and the Frankfurt edition (G. Draud), though it does not show the characteristic lacuna at vv. 3221-3440. The absence of vv. 3861-3878 is due to the loss of either the last folio or a <sup>very</sup> considerable part of the manuscript.

<sup>1</sup> *Quellen und Forschungen*, xxv (1878), 28.

<sup>2</sup> Fr. Jacobs and F. A. Uckert, *Beiträge zur älteren Literatur und Merkwürdigkeiten der herzogl. öffentl. Bibl. zu Gotha* (Leipzig, 1835-38), III, 59-61.

<sup>3</sup> Here I preserve a terminology which is traditional but, in my opinion, erroneous, for it seems evident that the prose prologue is nothing more than an explanatory letter (doubtless an open letter) addressed by Nigel to his friend Guillaume de Longchamp, to whom he had previously sent his poem. I plan to emphasize this observation in a later study.



I add a few notes on the Prague fragments. *MS. III.D.17* (No. 469) of J. Truhlář's catalogue contains no more than one sheet of the *Mirror of Fools*, but this sheet is valuable because it offers vv. 2530–86 of the poem, the last verse being followed by the formula: 'Explicit Brunellus Domini Wenceslay, etc.' The copy belongs to 1397 or a previous year.

The other Prague fragment (*X.D.9* = No. 1888 of the catalogue) is longer: it includes the whole prose text followed by the first two verses of the poem. The prose presents the same characteristics as in *MS. 23820* at Munich, which would associate it with the family *T*, *V*<sup>2</sup>, *V*<sup>3</sup>, etc.

A thorough study of the *codex* (the details of which are too long for enumeration at this point) has made it possible for me to establish with certainty, I believe, that four gatherings of 12 sheets have been torn out at the end of the volume. Of these 48 sheets, 13½ were occupied by Geoffroy de Vinsauf's *De Statu Curiae Romanae*, which is still mentioned in an old table of contents attached to the cover. In view of the average number of lines on the pages of the volume (38), the remaining 34½ sheets could not have contained more than a text of some 2600 lines. This conclusion confirms the hypothesis concerning the relationship of the manuscript with those containing 2586 verses.

The two *Pragenses* are thus two of the most ancient, if not absolutely the most ancient, representatives preserved of the group *T*, *V*<sup>2</sup>, *V*<sup>3</sup>, etc.

*Parisinus 16529* presents many affinities with the codices just described: the prose appears in the same abbreviated form and the text often agrees with that of *Monac. 23820* as against that of the British manuscripts of group *β*.<sup>1</sup> It is therefore probable that the majority of the manuscripts of the *Speculum* preserved in continental libraries and belonging to group *β* derive from one archetype older than the close of the fourteenth century (since the *Parisinus* is dated 1391 and some *Pragenses* go back respectively to about 1394 and 1397), the origin of which may perhaps yet be determined. Thus an interesting part of the history of Nigel's text would be established: the introduction and the diffusion of the *Speculum Stultorum* on the Continent.

BRUSSELS, DECEMBER, 1932.

<sup>1</sup> An easy explanation is possible of the final lacuna in the *Parisinus* (the text of which does not go beyond v. 2508, but is manifestly incomplete in its present form, since an advertisement at the bottom of the last page announces v. 2509 to be read at the beginning of the following quaternion): after v. 2508, 78 verses remained to be copied, and there may have been added to the manuscript a sheet folded in two in order to finish the transcript. It is this sheet which is now lost.