Title	**Work, Version, Text and Scriptum: High Medieval Manuscript Terminology in the Aftermath of the New Philology**

Author	Tjamke Snijders

Affiliation	Postdoctoral Fellow of the Research Foundation-Flanders (FWO)
	Ghent University, Department of History
	Sint-Pietersnieuwstraat 35
	B-9000 Ghent, Belgium

	T	(0032) 933 10 228
	F	(0032) 933 10 299
	E	Tjamke.Snijders@UGent.be

Abstract This article reviews the terminological framework to describe manuscripts. The Lachmannian terminology allows scholars to classify manuscripts as *versions* or *variants* of a *work* on a purely textual basis, but lacks a rigid designator to indicate a (part of a) manuscript as a unit of text and material considerations. Conversely, scholars who adopt Dagenais' solution to renounce the work and concentrate on the material *scriptum* gain a rigid designator, but threaten to lose the ability to classify manuscripts at all. Proceeding from a case study, the article argues that the twelfth-century view of a work's ontological status enables medievalists to keep classifying their scripta on both textual and material grounds. It explores the possibility of using Dagenais' scriptum as the foundation for a Neo-Lachmannian terminological framework that allows scholars to study manuscript variance and materiality without losing the ability to classify them.

Work, Version, Text and Scriptum: High Medieval Manuscript Terminology in the Aftermath of the New Philology

There is an increasing consensus in medieval studies that manuscripts need to be studied from a material perspective. It is argued that scholars should analyze manuscripts in terms of their parchment or paper support, binding structure, quires and layout, because this material view constitutes the necessary foundation for any form of textual analysis.[1] However, one basic requirement for this form of material analysis has not yet been met: a clear and unambiguous terminological framework.

The absence of clear terminology in the field of manuscript studies has everything to do with a conceptual problem that has haunted manuscript scholars since the days of Karl Lachmann (1793-1851). In the wake of his editions, of which the 1850 publication of Lucretius' *De rerum natura* has become the most famous, philologists largely agreed that their job was to study the work of an author as it was preserved in hand-written (and therefore defective) manuscripts.[2] If two or more manuscripts contained the exact same error, it was assumed that they shared a common ancestor

[1] See for example *Speculum* 65.1 (1990); John Dagenais. *The Ethics of Reading in Manuscript Culture: Glossing the Libro De Buen Amor.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994. Print; Ezio Ornato et al., eds. *La face cachée du livre médiéval: L'histoire du livre vue par Ezio Ornato, ses amis et ses collègues.* Rome: Viella, 1997. Print; Michiel Verweij. "La matérialité des manuscrits: Conséquences pour l'histoire et pour les éditions critiques." *L'écrit et le manuscrit à la fin du Moyen Age.* Eds. Tania Van Hemelryck and Céline Van Hoorebeeck. Turnhout: Brepols, 2006. 367-377. Print.

[2] *T. Lucreti Cari de rerum natura libri sex.* Ed. Karl Lachmann. Berolini: Reiner, 1850. Print.

that introduced that particular mistake. By tracing these errors back to their sources, philologists could try to reconstruct an ideal 'Urtext' or 'Archetype' of the text they were studying. This urtext was considered to be the text as the author had meant it to be, without the noise introduced by the scribes.[3]

To this day, the terminology that medievalists use to describe manuscripts derives from this Lachmannian model. It posits that a particular author (such as Lucretius) produced an urtext or work (such as *De rerum natura*), which was subsequently copied by various scribes into manuscripts, which were then copied by still other scribes into new manuscripts, and so on. The preserved manuscripts are classified according to the closeness of their relation to the author's original work. For example, a manuscript that was produced by very conscientious scribes and remained very close to the urtext would be called a 'variant' of *De rerum natura*, whereas a severely modified text (with, for example, the addition of some extra chapters) would be called a new 'version' of that work.

This model of manuscript analysis always had its share of critics. It was first challenged by Bédier's 'best text'-approach, and then quickly evolved into a more flexible Neo-Lachmannism.[4] Yet the (Neo-) Lachmannian method was only seriously called into question in the 1990s, when *Speculum* published

---

[3] This method is generally ascribed to Karl Lachmann (1793-1851), although he never succinctly formulated 'his' method himself – see Sebastiano Timpanaro. *Genesi del metodo del Lachmann.* Firenze: F. L Monnier, 1963. Print. English trans. by Glenn W. Most. *The Genesis of Lachmann's Method.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005. 115-118. Print. The best exposition of the Lachmannian method is generally considered to be Paul Maas. *Textkritiek.* Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1950. Print. The idea of a scribe introducing noise to the author's message is based on the famous model of communication by Shannon, who modeled it on the working of a phone (Claude Elwood Shannon. "A Mathematical Theory of Communication." *Bell System Technical Journal* 27 (1948): 379-423, 623-656. Print.) For a discussion of the term 'work', see note 26.

[4] Joseph Bédier. "La tradition manuscrite du *Lai de l'Ombre:* réflexions sur l'art d'éditer les anciens textes." *Romania* 54 (1928): 161-196, 321-356. Print; also see Timpanaro.

a special theme number that introduced the *Material* or *New Philology*.[5] This movement was inspired by Bernard Cercquiglini's observation that medieval manuscripts cannot be neatly classified as variants (or versions) of one work or another, but display an inescapable and at times overwhelming amount of variance.[6] Spearheaded by Stephen G. Nichols, the New Philologists maintained that philologists now needed to abandon their attempts to create urtext editions and return instead to the study of manuscript materiality. They further argued that 'errors' in a manuscript do not obscure the author's message, but are valuable additions by a scribe who took on the role of an author.[7] As the traditional distinction between author, scribe and reader became blurred, the ideal of the urtext edition was replaced by an expressively voiced wish to study all manuscripts as absolutely unique objects of equal merit.

In spite of these various critiques, the Lachmannian terminology to classify manuscripts has remained firmly in place. The present article aims to re-evaluate that terminology as a tool to

---

[5] *Speculum* 65.1 (1990). The New Philology based itself on the ideas of scholars such as Paul Zumthor. *Essai de poétique médiévale.* Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1972. Print; and Bernard Cerquiglini. *Éloge de la variante: Histoire critique de la philologie.* Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1989. Print.

[6] Cerquiglini 111: « L'écriture médiévale ne produit pas des variantes, elle est variance. »

[7] Rupert T. Pickens. "The Future of Old French Studies in America: The 'Old' Philology and the Crisis of the 'New'." *The Future of the Middle Ages: Medieval Literature in the 1990s*. Ed. William D. Paden. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1994. 53-86. Print. and others have noted that the New Philology codified and popularized long-standing philological practices. The difference between medieval authors and scribes had been discussed in A.J. Minnis. *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*, 2nd ed. Aldershot: Wildwood House Ltd., 1988. Print; An evaluation of New Philology's contribution to medieval studies can be found in Freimut Löser. "Postmodernes Mittelalter? 'New Philology' und Überlieferungsgeschichte." Eds. Jochen Conzelmann, Arthur Groos and Hans-Jochen Schiewer. *Kulturen des Manuskriptzeitalters: Ergebnisse der Amerikanisch-Deutschen Arbeitstagung an der Georg-August-Universität Göttingen vom 17. bis 20. Oktober 2002.* Göttingen: V&R Unipress, 2004. 215-236. Print.

describe high medieval manuscripts. Its starts with a short case study of manuscript layout that can serve to further illuminate the nature of the terminological framework. The article then switches to a broader theoretical discussion of that terminology. It argues that scholars are forced to describe manuscripts in Lachmannian terms even though they might not subscribe to that paradigm. One radical solution to this problem has been to completely abandon the existing terminological framework, from the urtext to the work, the version, the variant and the copy. As this seems to create an unpalatable terminological vacuum, some kind of compromise needs to be found. The final section will propose that for medievalists, the most sensible way to approach this problem lies in a return to medieval practices. Instead of trying to reason our way out of modern and quite complex debates on the nature of a work, we ought to pay close attention to the high medieval views on the relation between universal ideas (such as the work) and the material unicity of particular objects (such as a manuscript). The theories of Peter Abelard (1079-1142) can be used to establish an alternative conceptualization of the work, which could lead to a re-conceptualization of the terminological framework that is linked to it.

1. THE ROLE OF LAYOUT IN THE CONCEPTUALIZATION OF A WORK: A CASE STUDY BASED

ON CHAPTER TITLES

For the monastery of Marchiennes, near the present-day city of Douai in Northern France, the year 1024 marked a turning point. On the orders of the Bishop of Cambrai and the Count of Flanders, Benedictine monks now replaced the women who, according to hagiographical legend, had inhabited the monastery since the seventh century.[8] The new monks immediately occupied themselves with

---

[8] Karine Ugé. *Creating the Monastic Past in Medieval Flanders.* York: York Medieval Press, 2005. 97-141. Print; Steven Vanderputten and Tjamke Snijders. "Echoes of Benedictine Reform in an Eleventh-Century Booklist from Marchiennes." *Scriptorium* 63.1 (2009): 79-88. Print.

the expansion of their monastic library, which would eventually grow into one of the more important book collections in the region.

The pictures below show two of the manuscripts that were produced by these monks. Both of them are Passions of St Lucia.[9] The manuscript on the left, Douai *Bibliothèque Municipale* (henceforth: BM) 867 was written in the eleventh century, and the one on the right (Douai BM 838) in the late twelfth or thirteenth century. The text in both manuscripts is (roughly) identical so that it is reasonable to assume that the Douai BM 838 was directly copied from Douai BM 867.[10] (Note that I use the word 'text' here and henceforward to indicate the physical alternation of letters and punctuation marks on a piece of parchment, and not in any of its broader meanings). Even though the text of the Passion of St. Lucia is very similar in Douai BM 867 and Douai BM 838, the layout of the two Passions looks profoundly different. Douai BM 838 is laid out in columns, contains significantly more words per page and is almost twice as large as Douai BM 867. It is also striking that the initial in Douai BM 867 is no more than six lines high, whereas the initial in Douai BM 838 measures thirteen lines.

---

[9] The Passion of St Lucia v. m. Syracusis (BHL 4992) is edited in Bonino Mombritius. *Sanctuarium seu Vitae Sanctorum*, vol. 2. Hildesheim: Olms, 1978. 107-109. Print. For the BHL-numbers, see *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina aniquae et mediae aetatis*. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1898-1901. Print.; Henryk Fros, *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina antiquae et mediae aetatis: Novum supplementum*. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1986. Print; and *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina manuscripta.* Web. Last update 9 Dec. 1998. <http://bhlms.fltr.ucl.ac.be/>.

[10] This version of BHL 4992 has been preserved in three manuscripts from the high medieval Benedictine Southern Low Countries: Douai *Bibliothèque Municipale* 867 from eleventh-century Marchiennes, Douai *Bibliothèque Municipale* 838 from twelfth- or thirteenth-century Marchiennes, and Brussels *Royal Library* II 932 from twelfth-century Saint-Bertin.

Illustration 1: the Passion of St Lucia in Douai BM 867 ff. 73v-75v (left) and Douai BM 838 ff. 176v-177r (right) (to scale)

Nevertheless, the changing layout will not have changed the interpretation of the Passion for the monks of Marchiennes, because the adjustment was not done to change this Passion in particular, but in response to much broader conventions about the proper mise-en-page of a codex. Hagiographical manuscripts that were produced around 1200 were generally larger than their eleventh-century predecessors, contained more words per page, and were laid out in columns – the mise-en-page of Douai BM 838 simply conforms to these newer standards of manuscript layout.[11]

---

[11] Tjamke Snijders. "Ordinare & Communicare: Redactie, opmaak en transmissie van hagiografische handschriften in kloosters uit de Zuidelijke Nederlanden, 900-1200." Unpublished PhD-thesis, Ghent University, 2009 (currently being prepared for publication in Brepols' *Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy* series); as well as Carla Bozzolo, et al. "Noir et blanc: Premiers résultats d'une enquête sur la mise en page dans le livre

Furthermore, the initials in both manuscripts may differ in absolute size, but relatively speaking they are both about average for their respective manuscripts. From an artistic point of view, the two initials even look somewhat alike. Even more importantly, neither Passion has been subdivided into chapters or paragraphs. They do not contain chapter titles, rubrics, lombards, or a table of contents.[12] To summarize, we should conclude that the scribe who copied Douai BM 867 adapted its layout to the most recent practical and aesthetical standards – he *modernized* the layout – but he did not attempt to *modify* it in such a way that the structure or meaning of the work was changed.

The example of St Lucia indicates that some patterns of layout could be preserved when a manuscript was copied, whereas other elements were routinely changed.[13] This presents a very interesting parallel with the conclusions that were drawn by the adherents of the New Philology in the 1990's. Working from a strictly verbal paradigm, they concluded that a scribe almost never made a 'Xerox copy' of a manuscript, but that some elements of a text would be preserved whereas others would be would usually rewrite the fragment they were interested in to a certain extent. Different ways to rewrite a story have been investigated, and scholars have found that some genres were changed or rewritten more often than others, that there were various ways of rewriting a story, and that there was a field of tension between continuity and discontinuity when a story was copied. The two passions of St Lucia indicate that a systematic study of 'layout rewrites' (or, perhaps more aptly, the 're-presenting' or 're-visualizing' of a story) could probably yield similar conceptual improvements. It may therefore be relevant to include layout as a factor in a typology of manuscript classification.

médiéval." Eds. Ezio Ornato et al. *La face cachée du livre médiéval: L'histoire du livre vue par Ezio Ornato, ses amis et ses collègues.* Rome: Viella, 1997. Print. 473-508.

[12] The letters 'I' and 'N' in the left margin of Douai *Bibliothèque Municipale* 867 f. 73v are not initials, but *Litterae Notabiliores* that were projected into the margin for aesthetic reasons. See Snijders. 2009b. 101-102.

[13] See Linda K. Nix. "Manuscript Layout and Re-Production of the Text in Anglo-Saxon England: A Preliminary Examination." *Gazette du livre médiéval* 25 (1994). 17. Print.

The dynamics of layout transmission – the way in which layout changed when a scribe copied a story – in high medieval manuscripts can illustrate how layout could be used as a way of classifying manuscripts. To really understand these dynamics would require a broad investigation that is obviously beyond the scope of this article. However, one easy way to give some preliminary answers is to investigate how often a scribe changed *the number of chapters* in the story that he was copying. A change in the number of chapters was one of the most fundamental changes a scribe could make, because it changed the *ordinatio* of a story – its subdivision into books, chapters and paragraphs. Medieval scribes considered the *ordinatio* of a tale to be its formal cause, and essential for understanding the narrative.[14] Thus, in changing the *ordinatio* of a story, they changed the way it was read. Take the *ordinatio* of the Life of Anselm of Canterbury as an example. This Life was copied by a twelfth-century monk from the monastery of Anchin, who conscientiously subdivided the story into chapters.[15] These chapters vary in length quite profoundly. The short chapters result from the scribe's desire to begin a new chapter whenever he considered a part of the story to be particularly relevant for the daily life of his fellow monks – for example, when the story explained Anselm's views on proper behavior in the oratory and during matins. If interesting fragments followed each other in

---

[14] In the words of Nicolas of Paris: "causa formalis tractatus que est ordinatio librorum partialium et capitulorum" (see Malcolm B. Parkes. "The Influence of the Concepts of Ordinatio and Compilatio on the Development of the Book." Ed. Malcolm B. Parkes. *Scribes, Scripts and Readers: Studies in the Communication, Presentation and Dissemination of Medieval Texts.* London and Rio Grande: Hambledon, 1991. 35-70. Print; John of Garland stated ca. 1240 in his *Parisiana poetica* that the formal cause of a manuscript is "per libri disposicionem et litterarum protractionem" (see Elizabeth Aubrey. "Genre as a Determinant of Melody in the Songs of the Troubadours and Trouvères." Ed. W.D. Paden. *Medieval lyric: genres in historical context.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2000. 291 n.10. Print; For the doctrine of the four causes (material, formal, efficient and final) see Aristotle. *Physics.* book II part 3 (194b17–20).

[15] Douai *Bibliothèque Municipale* 352 ff. 115r-142v. They also made a partial copy of the same work in Douai *Bibliothèque Municipale* 878, ff. 109r-112v + 114r, which contained the exact same chapter divisions.

close succession, those chapters could be very short indeed: one chapter counts only thirteen words. Yet when extensive fragments did not relate anything of particular interest in the eyes of the scribe, he did not bother to introduce chapters to it. As Anselm's Life is quite long – counting more than 26,000 words in the Acta Sanctorum edition – some of those chapterless fragments encompass more than thousand words. As a result, the *ordinatio* served as an interpretation of the scriptum, determining how quickly the monks had access to particular pieces of information, and thereby determining how the monks could approach the story. This is why medieval authorities considered the *ordinatio* of a scriptum as one of its most important characteristics. It has led Joseph-Claude Poulin to argue that high medieval readers may have regarded two manuscripts with a largely identical text but a different *ordinatio* as two very different versions of the work.[16]

Chapter divisions are not only an important aspect of manuscript layout, they are also relatively easy to study. The presence of chapters in a manuscript is easily quantifiable – one can straightforwardly count the number of initials and/or rubrics in a manuscript. Even more importantly, a scribe could freely incorporate chapters into a story without needing to apply for expensive paints, talented artists, or model books. It can thus be assumed that he could make a fairly autonomous decision about the number of chapters in a story. Compare this, for example, to the presence of miniatures or gold leaf in initials – another way of focusing a reader's attention to a specific part of a story. It is difficult to be sure that the absence of such devices was a conscious decision, and not simply due to changing economics in a monastery, or to the absence of a skilled illuminator who could assist the scribe. Such possibilities make the presence of intricate initials or the use of pigments or gold leaf a dangerous basis for an analysis of layout transmission.

---

[16] Joseph-Claude Poulin, "Un élément négligé de critique hagiographique: Les titres de chapitres." Eds. Étienne Renard, et al. *"Scribere sanctorum gesta": Recueil d'études d'hagiographie médiévale offert à Guy Philippart.* Turnhout: Brepols, 2005. 329. Print.

The following paragraphs will analyze the number of chapter titles in hagiographical manuscripts that were written in Latin between the tenth and the twelfth centuries by Benedictine monks from the Southern Low Countries – which encompassed the bishoprics of Liège, Cambrai/Arras, Tournai and Thérouanne and is roughly equivalent to present-day Belgium and Northern France.[17] Within this corpus, approximately 69 percent of the works are preserved in two or more manuscripts that show varying *ordinationes*.[18] The Life of St Anselm of Canterbury, for example, has been subdivided into 15 chapters in Douai BM 878, 53 chapters in Douai BM 840, and 71 chapters in Douai BM 352.

It can be difficult to investigate the reasons for these changes, as it is often unclear whether scribes were consciously changing the number of chapters, or whether they were simply copying a manuscript from another monastery that has not been preserved. To partially circumvent this problem, I will focus solely on monasteries that possessed two or more manuscripts of the same work (such as the Passion of St Lucia), as it can be assumed that if a monastery required a copy of a hagiographical story that they already possessed, they would actually copy that manuscript instead of travelling elsewhere. It should be noted that it was not that usual for a monastery to want to possess two largely identical copies of one hagiographical narrative: most communities preferred to fill their libraries with many different stories, and not with facsimile copies.[19] Some of the doubles in monastic libraries might therefore be the result of accidents (such as a scribe who did not realize that he was copying a work that his community already possessed) or gifts. Yet copies could be made deliberately as well, as is shown by the monastic community of St.-Sépulcre in Cambrai. At the end of

---

[17] For a more detailed investigation of this corpus see Snijders (2009b).

[18] The corpus consists of scripta that were used in high medieval Benedictine monasteries from the bishoprics of Arras/Cambrai, Tournai, Thérouanne and Liège. For a more detailed examination of this corpus, see Tjamke Snijders. "Rewriting Hagiography in High Medieval Monasteries: Towards a Quantitative Approach." Ed. Youri Desplenter, Renée Gabriël and Johan Oosterman. *Between Stability and Transformation: Textual Traditions in the Medieval Netherlands.* Ghent: Academia Press (in press). Print.

[19] See Snijders (2009a).

the eleventh century, its scribe Fulbert and his colleagues created a manuscript that contained 90 saints' lives. One century later, another scribe from St.-Sépulcre decided to copy this manuscript almost in its entirety, so that the community now possessed two manuscripts with largely identical texts.[20]

Scribes such as the twelfth-century monk from St.-Sépulcre, who copied a hagiographical legend almost word for word, also tended to copy the general structure of that legend's layout. Sixty-five percent of the legends that were copied within monasteries were largely identical in respect to both their text and their number of chapters. Reversely, when a scribe rewrote the text of a saint's life, he would usually tweak the number of chapters in the process. Obviously, this high correlation between changes in text and *ordinatio* is no coincidence. Both kinds of interventions required a profound knowledge of the legend. A scribe who was familiar enough with the tale to be able to consciously adapt it would have been able to play around with its structure as well, and vice versa. As a result, both changes must have often been elements in a larger project to rework the text.

Yet we should be careful not to equate the two working methods, as 35 percent of the legends that show a changed *ordinatio* was not accompanied by a significantly changed text. Those cases may represent Poulin's hypothesis that a changed *ordinatio* equaled a different version in the eyes of a medieval audience. In other words, wanting to change the number of chapters in a legend may have been the reason to copy that legend in the first place. For example, the eleventh-century legendary from St.-Sépulcre had incorporated most stories as continuous texts. As we say, the twelfth-century scribe who copied them did not significantly change the texts, but he did subdivide most legends into chapters.[21] Similarly, the monastery of St.-Vaast possessed two manuscripts with the life of St.

---

[20] Mss. Cambrai *Bibliothèque Municipale* 863, 809.

[21] Mss. Cambrai *Bibliothèque Municipale* 863 (1076-1092) and Cambrai *Bibliothèque Municipale* 809 (of which the different parts were produced in 1150-1200, 1170-1250, and 1234-1235 respectively). The number of chapters were changed in the lives of Bartholomaeus ap. (BHL 1002), Iacobus Maior (BHL 4057), Iacobus Minor (BHL 4094), Iacobus ap. et ev. (BHL 4320), Mattaeus ap. (BHL 5690) and Philippus ap. (BHL 6814). No changes

Maurus that showed a virtually identical text, which in the oldest manuscript was subdivided into nine chapters and in the other into eighteen.[22] Such decisions were probably made out of changing practical requirements - for example, if a new manuscript was meant for the liturgy it would not need an extensive *ordinatio*, whereas a sourcebook for preaching would benefit from the most sophisticated *ordinatio* available as this enabled the reader to thumb through the scriptum and find specific passages to illustrate some moral precept.[23] The change in *ordinatio* and the context of use that the new *ordinatio* enabled may have been an argument for these monks to copy the legend, and to have held onto both manuscripts in the centuries to follow.

It is well known that the textual transmission of hagiographical legends cannot usually be described as complete continuity (a 'Xerox copy' of a narrative) or discontinuity (a legend that is

were made to the legends of Paulus ap. (BHL 6569), Petrus ap. (BHL 6655 & 6657) and Thomas ap. (BHL 8136). The legend of Simon and Iudas (BHL 7750 & 7751) was rewritten in both text and ordinatio.

[22] Maurus discipulus S. Benedicti (ab. Glannafoliensis) (BHL 5773) in Arras BM 199 (ff. 48r-54v) and Arras BM 569 (ff. 26r-30v).

[23] The need for an *ordinatio* in matins readings is discussed in Tjamke Snijders. "Celebrating with Dignity: The Purpose of Benedictine Matins Readings." Ed. Steven Vanderputten. *Understanding Monastic Practices of Oral Communication (Western Europe, Tenth-Thirteenth Centuries)*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2011. 109-130. Print; the preaching context is discussed in Richard H. Rouse and Mary A. Rouse. "Statim invenire: Schools, Preachers, and New Attitudes to the Page." Eds. Robert L. Benson, Giles Constable and Carol D. Lanham. *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century.* Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press, 1991. 201-225. Print. This is usually called 'consultative' or 'scholastic' reading (Heinrich Fichtenau. "Monastisches und scholastisches Lesen." Eds. Georg Jenal and Stephanie Haarländer. *Herrschaft, Kirche, Kultur: Beiträge zur Geschichte des Mittelalters. Festschrift für Friedrich Prinz zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1993. 317-337. Print; Paul Saenger. "Silent Reading: Its Impact on Late Medieval Script and Society." *Viator* 13 (1982): 367-414. Print). The life of Basilius ep. Caesareae (BHL 1023, Saint-Omer *Bibliothèque Municipale* 794 ff. 76v-82v and Brussels *Royal Library* II 932 ff. 33r-45r) is edited in Gabriella Corona. *Aelfric's Life of Saint Basil the Great: Background and Context.* Cambridge: Brewer, 2006. 223-247. Print.

rewritten so profoundly that it can no longer be recognized as the same tale), but tends to hover in between the two. The challenge is to investigate this balance and understand the mechanics behind it. The very preliminary results sketched above seem to indicate that the transmission of manuscript layout may have known a similar balance. Scribes did not routinely change the entire layout of a legend when they copied it, but neither was a specific work always copied with the same layout.[24] The large majority of scribes found a balance in between the two and changed some elements of textual layout while leaving others untouched. Again the challenge is to comprehend the mechanics of that balance, which presumably resulted from a range of elements ranging from artistic talent to monastic wealth to structural components (such as the customs of a particular age or region). If we can learn to understand those mechanics, we are likely to find that layout was transmitted in much the same way as text and that medieval audiences did not only classify manuscripts based on their textual contents, but made very similar classificatory models based on their layout. Manuscript layout should therefore be incorporated as an element into the terminology to describe and classify high medieval manuscripts.

2. LACHMANNIAN TERMINOLOGY AND ITS PROBLEMS

Both text and layout are partially discontinuous, and both are likely to have played a part in the medieval classification of manuscripts. The current terminological framework, based on Lachmann's theories, is inadequate in both respects. In order to evaluate the terminology's performativity, it is necessary to delve deeper into the Lachmannian method.

---

[24] Compare the conclusions of Linda K. Nix. "Early Medieval Book Design in England: The Influence of Manuscript Design on the Transmission of Texts." Eds. Robin Myers and Michael Harris. *A Millennium of the Book: Production, Design & Illustration in Manuscript & Print, 900-1900.* Winchester: St Paul's Bibliographies, 1994. 1-12. Print; who compared a limited number of manuscripts from very different genres to one another.

Paul Eggert showed in a 1998 article that the Lachmannian method distinguishes between physically observable manuscripts and transcendent (not directly observable) works.[25] Manuscripts are directly cognizable. We can, for example, have many views of a saint's *Vita* in a high medieval manuscript, looking at one folio or another, stumbling over writing errors, examining the binding, or even counting words – yet all of these views give us but a partial understanding of what that *Vita* really is. The manuscript *Vita* is, as Husserl would say, directly knowable, but never in its entirety. The 'entire' or 'full' *Vita* can only be postulated by the mind, which gathers the memories of various partial reading experiences and merges them into one transcendent postulate. This postulate represents the text in the most ideal form possible, and hovers behind the manuscripts as if it were a Platonic form giving life to the shadows in the cave. Old-style Lachmannian researchers turn their minds towards this postulate, which they call the work. Diligently weeding as many errors as possible from the preserved manuscripts, they attempt to rise above them in order to (re)construct the work, which they understand as the original authorial intention.[26]

---

[25] Paul Eggert. "The Work Unravelled." *Text* 11 (1998): 45-46.

[26] There is no straightforward and commonly accepted term for the phenomenon that I call 'the work'. One much-cited definition is that of Jerome McGann. *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983. 52. Print. who states that a 'work' is a series of texts (or 'a series of specific acts of production'), which constitutes an assembly of texts, or a 'polytext'. D. C. Greetham. *Theories of the Text.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. 26-7. Print. reasons that 'since a text [work] may originate as a mental state in the imagination of its designer but need [sic] "performers" (actors, musicians, compositors, weavers) in order to be recognized and appreciated as a work by its intended audience, the textual theorist and practitioner must confront the question of whether this work can be said to exist independently of, or to be embodied by, its physical manifestation'. Other terms that have been used for the work are '(transhistorical) verbal text' in S. G. Nichols. "Philology and Its Discontents". Ed. W. D. Paden. *The Future of the Middle Ages: Medieval Literature in the 1990s.* Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1994. 130. Print; 'authorial literary text' in Dagenais 129; and a 'reified text' or 'objectified text' in M. Innes. "Memory, Orality and Literacy in an

This nineteenth-century approach has been criticized for many decades and from many different angles. I already touched upon the well-known objection that manuscripts should not be described in terms of 'errors' at all, because the modern distinction between authors as the composers of original pieces of writing, scribes as persons who diligently copied an author's work, and readers as persons who passively consumed the scribe's work has but little explanatory power for the study of the medieval period. It has been shown many times that medieval authors were not required to be 'original', and that medieval scribes were not limited to making faithful copies of existing texts.[27] Most authors and scribes steered a middle course between originality and straightforward copying. Monk Rainerus from the monastery of Saint-Peter in Ghent provides a concrete example. Around the year 1000, he read through the old *Vita Prima* of St Ghislain and started to expand on the existing text.[28] He added new dialogues to the story and incorporated new anecdotes about the saint, functioning as an author for all intents and purposes. The results of his efforts are usually called the *Vita Secunda.* Somewhat later, another monk added two further miracles to this *Vita Secunda*, and around 1035 Rainerus decided to rewrite his work and incorporate these new miracles into the story.

Early Medieval Society". *Past and Present* 158 (1998): 14. Print. and I. Illich. *In the Vineyard of the Text: A Commentary to Hugh's Didascalicon*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993. Print. There does not seem to have been a properly medieval term for this phenomenon.

[27] This idea derives largely from Roland Barthes. "La mort de l'auteur." *Manteia* 5 (1968): 12-17. Print. A specifically medieval perspective on authorship and originality is expounded in Minnis; and a large-scale hagiographical case study can be found in Monique Goullet. *Écriture et réécriture hagiographiques: Essai sur les réécritures de vies de saints dans l'occident latin médiéval (VIIIe-XIIIe s.)*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2005. Print. Also see Olivier Guyotjeannin. "Le vocabulaire de la diplomatique en latin medieval: Noms de l'acte, mise par ecrit, tradition, critique, conservation." Ed. Olga Weijers. *Vocabulaire du livre et de l'ecriture au Moyen Age: Actes de la table ronde, Paris 24-26 September 1987*. Turnhout: Brepols, 1989. 128-129. Print.

[28] Anne-Marie Helvétius. *Abbayes, évêques et laïques: Une politique du pouvoir en Hainaut au Moyen Âge (VIIe-XIe siècle)*. Brussels: Crédit communal, 1994. 332. Print.

Several other monks then started to make idiosyncratic compilations of Ghislain's deeds and miracles, and one monk from the monastery of Saint-Amand combined the prologue of the old *Vita Prima* with the main text of the *Vita Secunda*.[29] It is practically impossible to neatly separate these diverse monks into authors and scribes. As a result, it is highly problematic to claim that the alterations that were made to the original story by these monks are degenerative errors. On the contrary: they were conscious adaptations of the original story by author-scribes. The monk from Saint-Amand, for example, did not combine elements from the *Vita Prima* and the *Vita Secunda* by accident, but tried to communicate a different message about St Ghislain to his intended audience. As a result, it is distinctly unhelpful to regard the end result of his work as a degenerate version of either the *Vita Prima* or the *Vita Secunda*: it is an entirely new entity. Examples such as these have led scholars to argue that we ought to study every manuscript as equivalent, without projecting anachronistic judgments about authors and errors onto the material, as this is the only way to do justice to the medieval situation.

A second and far more abstract objection to the Lachmannian method is that it conceives of the work as an 'ideal object', that can be compared to a Platonic form.[30] An ideal object in a philosophical sense designates something unchanging, an object that always keeps its form, whatever the circumstances.[31] Classic examples of ideal objects are mathematical phenomena such as circles or parallelograms, which cannot change their shape without ceasing to be themselves. Ingarden and

---

[29] For the history of the development of St Ghislain's *Vita Prima* and *Vita Secunda* from a manuscript perspective, see Tjamke Snijders. "Manuscript Layout and Réécriture: A Reconstruction of the Manuscript Tradition of the Vita Secunda Gisleni." *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire/Belgisch tijdschrift voor filologie en geschiedenis* 87.2 (2009): 215-237. Print; for the textual perspective see Helvétius 213-234, 331-332, 337-339.

[30] Eggert (1998) 41-60 discusses this problem in detail.

[31] See for instance Jacques Derrida's introduction to his translation of Edmund Husserl. *L'Origine de la géométrie.* Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1961. Print.

other scholars have argued that contrary to circles and parallelograms, a work can and does change its form over time.[32] Rainerus' *Vita Secunda* is a prime example of a work that appears to alter its form as the author himself tried to improve upon his work, as did multiple other author/scribes. Yet if the *Vita Secunda* is not an ideal object, it follows that this work exists only in its readings.[33] In other words: if the *Vita Secunda* is neither physically observable nor an unchanging concept such as a circle, it follows that the *Vita Secunda* exists only as the sum of the manuscripts that are recognized as containing a text that is very close to the narrative that Rainerus has worked on. As a result, people can get a notion of some part of the *Vita Secunda* when they are reading through a manuscript, or when they are actively thinking about the manuscripts that contain it. However, that notion can be no more than an incomplete work in bits and pieces, gleaned from partial readings and existing only in a person's memory. It is practically impossible to have a complete mental image of all the manuscripts that contain the *Vita Secunda,* and it is always possible that one day, a new manuscript with a different version of the *Vita Secunda* will be discovered. This means, according to Ingarden, that a work does just not have the stability to support true statements about its nature, such as "the *Vita Secunda* of St Ghislain contains eighteen chapters" or "the *Iliad* is written in hexameter".[34]

These are only two of the many problems that haunt the Lachmannian work. They illustrate the fundamental nature of both the practical and the philosophical issues that have arisen during the last

---

[32] Roman Ingarden. *Das Literarische Kunstwerk (2., Verbesserte Und Erweiterte Auflage)*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1960. 8. Print.

[33] Ingarden 9, 14.

[34] Ingarden 12-13. Ingarden's opinions are discussed in Eggert (1998) 47, who notes that they are essentially founded on Boethius' second commentary on Porphyry's *Isagoge* (see *Patrologia Latina* 64 (1844-1849): 9-70. Print.), where he states that a universal should be common to several particulars, in its entirety, simultaneously, and that it should constitute the substance of its particulars.

century.[35] Less frequently discussed, but just as fundamental, are the problems with the terminology that derives from the idea of a work.

Although the work is no longer accepted as uncontroversial, much of the terminology to describe manuscripts still derives from it. This is best shown by means of an analysis of Denis Muzerelle's *Vocabulaire Codicologique: Répertoire méthodique des termes français relatifs aux manuscrits avec leurs équivalents en anglais, italien, espagnol* by Denis Muzerelle.[36] This is one of the most authoritative guides to manuscript terminology, and almost universally used and cited by medievalists. In the chapter 'Tradition du texte', Muzerelle defines the five most common terms to describe medieval manuscripts: *copy*, *witness*, *recension*, *variant* and *version*. Each of these terms is shown to define a relation between manuscript and work.

First of all, a *copy* is defined as "exemplaire dont le texte a été reproduit d'un autre", which can be translated as "a manuscript the *texte* of which is reproduced in another manuscript", or "every manuscript that presents the same *texte*".[37] Unfortunately, the exact meaning of the *texte* remains unclear. It does not seem to refer to a text in its most basic sense as a series of words and punctuation marks in a particular order,[38] as both New Philologists and Lachmannians subscribe to

---

[35] See also Nichols 133-144.

[36] Denis Muzerelle. *Vocabulaire codicologique: Répertoire méthodique des termes français relatifs aux manuscrits, avec leurs équivalents en anglais, italien, espagnol.* Paris: Éditions CEMI, 1985. Web. Édition Hypertextuelle. Version 1.1. 2002-2003. <http://vocabulaire.irht.cnrs.fr/vocab.htm>

[37] Muzerelle #441.07 ('Copie' or 'Copy' – "Exemplaire dont le texte a été reproduit d'un autre"). 'Exemplaire', also called 'Copy' in English, is defined in #441.01 as "Chacun des volumes présentant un même texte" and 'volume' in #143.03 as "Unité constituée par un ensemble de feuillets unis par la reliure, que cet ensemble soit homogène ou hétérogène, indépendant ou partie d'un tout".

[38] For this definition see Peter L. Shillingsburg. "Text as Matter, Concept, and Action." *Studies in Bibliography* 44 (1991): 52-53. Print; Idem. *Resisting Texts: Authority and Submission in Constructions of Meaning*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998. 72. Print.

the notion that scribes always commit errors and/or make conscious changes when they are 'copying' a text. Therefore, a 'copy' of a text in the sense of a medieval Xerox or facsimile is virtually impossible. As a result, we have to interpret the definition in the *Vocabulaire Codicologique* as "every manuscript that presents the same work". This means that the 'copy' is defined in terms of its relationship to a work. Yet in view of the fundamental problems to define a work, it is hard to pin down what it means for two manuscripts to do so.

The same objection can be raised to the other terms. First of all, a *witness* is defined as "every copy of a *texte*, considered as a stage in the transmission and transformation of a *texte*".[39] Once again, the *texte* cannot refer to a Xerox copy of the text but must refer to a work. This makes a witness virtually synonymous to a copy, with the sole difference that a witness is a copy "considered as a stage in the transmission and transformation of that work". This makes it even harder to establish its exact sense, for what does it mean for two manuscripts to present the same work, yet be a stage in that work's transformation? Secondly, the less common *recension* is defined as "all the different forms of a *texte*, as they are presented in different manuscripts."[40] As one text cannot have different forms in different manuscripts, the definition again denotes forms of one work in various manuscripts. Once again we are left with the question of how an ideal work can have different forms.

Finally, a *variant* is defined as "every reading that differs from a standard reading *(une leçon considérée)*,"[41] and a *version* is a variant that differs more profoundly or more characteristically from

---

[39] Muzerelle #442.05 ('Temoin' or 'Witness' – "Chacun des exemplaires d'un texte, considéré comme une étape dans la transmission et la transformation d'un texte").

[40] Muzerelle #442.06 ('Recension' [same in English] – "Chacune des différentes formes d'un même texte présentées par différents manuscrits").

[41] Muzerelle #443.07 ('Variante' or 'Variant' – "Chacune des autres leçons, par rapport à une leçon considérée." A 'leçon' is defined in 443.06 ("Chacune des différentes formes données à un mot ou groupe de mots, en un point du texte, par différents manuscrits").

the standard reading.[42] This 'standard reading' is the form of the text that the researcher considers to be the 'best text' or the 'copy text', usually because it is judged to approximate the intentions of the author most closely.[43] In other words, the terms 'version' and 'variant' serve to indicate how close a manuscript is to a work. A variant contains only minor variations vis-à-vis the work, whereas the word 'version' is usually reserved for a state of a work "that may be distinguished as a separate entity"[44] and is explicitly linked to discernible authorial intentions.[45] In other words, variants are written by scribes, whereas versions are created by authors. Of course, many researchers struggle to distinguish variants from versions. Hans Zeller, for example, argues that a variant can express changed authorial intentions just as well as a version, whereas others maintain that "equal valorization of variant and version [...] tends to reduce all versions to an indiscriminate continuum of intentionality that impedes rather than furthers the study of versions."[46]

Obviously, all these terms share the same, very profound problem: they do not describe a manuscript as an object in and of itself, which has a stable identity irrespective of all circumstances. A text in a manuscript is always described as a copy/recension/witness/version/variant of a work, which is to say that the manuscript is described *in terms of its relation to something external to itself*.

---

[42] Muzerelle #442.07 ('Version' – "Recension comportant des différences profondes ou caractéristiques avec le texte originel – notamment à la suite d'une traduction ou d'une adaptation").

[43] Muzerelle #443.05: 'Manuscrit de base' – "Manuscrit dont le texte est préféré par l'éditeur et dont il reproduit le texte sauf erreur manifeste, les leçons des autres exemplaires étant rejetées en variantes.")

[44] Peter Beal. *A Dictionary of English Manuscript Terminology, 1450-2000*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008. 430, 432. Print.

[45] Ibidem; Peter L. Shillingsburg. *Scholarly Editing in the Computer Age: Theory and Practice*, 3rd ed. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1996. 44-45 . Print. ('version' – a "specific form of the work" which "the author intended at some particular moment in time").

[46] For this discussion see John Bryant. *The Fluid Text: A Theory of Revision and Editing for Book and Screen*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002. 72-75. Print.

To give an analogy: imagine that it would not be possible to refer to human beings by their proper names, but that we could only describe them in relational terms such as 'a brother', 'a father' or even 'a clone'. Instead of calling someone 'J. Smith', we would have to label him 'a brother', describing him in terms of his family ties. Quite apart from the moral implications, this would be problematic because the applicability of words such as 'brother' or 'father' is subject to change. To give an example: Smith might have a baby and subsequently undergo transgender surgery. Smith has now transformed from 'a brother' into 'a sister and a mother'. To borrow a term from Kripke: 'brother' and 'father' are no *rigid designators* that refer to a stable object, whatever happens to it and 'in all possible worlds', in the same way that a name always refers to the same person.[47] This is the problem that haunts designations such as 'witness' or 'version': they do not rigidly designate a specific part of a manuscript, whatever its relation to the rest of the manuscript, other manuscripts, or ideological constructs. Instead, the meaning of these terms is related to our knowledge of other manuscripts that contain a similar text. In other words, the entire manuscript terminology serves to *classify* manuscript texts within a tradition, instead of *designating* them as objects.

---

[47] To paraphrase Kripke's famous example: the name 'Otto von Bismarck' stably refers to one person and there is nothing that can change that – even if history would have been very different, the word would still refer to the same person. Say that Bismarck suffered from severe hallucinations, or that he died as a young man and never had significant power in the German Empire; still the name 'Otto von Bismarck' would refer to the same person. Therefore, the name 'Otto von Bismarck' is a *rigid designator*. On the other hand, the phrase 'The first Chancellor of the German Empire' does not refer to Otto von Bismarck in all possible worlds. If, for example, Bismarck was put away in a mental institution or had died in his twenties, the phrase 'the first Chancellor of the German Empire' would no longer refer to Bismarck, but (in all probability) to someone else. Therefore, 'the first Chancellor of the German Empire' is a non-rigid or flexible designator. Similarly, terms such as 'copy', 'version' or 'witness' are flexible designators. See Saul Kripke. *Naming and Necessity.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1980. Print.

This terminological framework is not satisfactory for three separate reasons. First of all, because it forces researchers to treat manuscripts as the physical manifestations of a work, so that it is all but impossible to discuss a manuscript without implying an intertextual relation between the object of research and the notion of a ideal work.

A second, well-known problem is that the terminology forces researchers to *compartmentalize* manuscripts, whereas Cerquiglini and others have argued that medieval manuscripts are characterized by 'variance' and therefore unsuited to rigid classifications.[48] Consider the *Vita Secunda* of St Ghislain, or the common example of a manuscript with paragraphs of inserted and/or rewritten text that effectively makes it dangle between two works.[49] Such 'variance' is fundamentally at odds with the existing terminology. Of course, ad-hoc solutions can always be found, so that the manuscript in question could be designated as 'a version of two works' or similar, but this does not solve the fundamental problem that our manuscript technology serves to negate manuscripts' essential variance.

Last but not least, the existing terminology is exclusively *text-based*. As we saw, manuscripts are classified on the basis of their textual similarities; whereas considerations of layout or codicology have no role whatsoever in this Lachmannian system.[50] Yet we have also seen that medieval intellectuals considered a narrative's *ordinatio* as that narrative's formal cause, and an essential

---

[48] Cerquiglini; *Speculum* 65.1 (1990).

[49] A prime example of such a manuscript from the period under discussion is Douai *Bibliothèque Municipale* 857 (see Tjamke Snijders. "Handschriftelijke productie in tijden van hervorming: De kloosterbibliotheek van Sint-Gislenus in het tweede kwart van de elfde eeuw." *Jaarboek voor Middeleeuwse Geschiedenis* 13 (2010): 6-32. Print.)

[50] It should be noted, however, that codicologists have their own highly developed terminological systems. See J. P. Gumbert. "Codicological Units: Towards a Terminology for the Stratigraphy of the Non-Homogeneous Codex". *Segno e testo: International Journal of Manuscripts and Text Transmission* 2 (2004): 17-39. Print; Muzerelle.

element to improve understanding. It is likely that high medieval monks had a similar attitude with respect to a manuscript's illumination and codicology. A good example is provided by two copies of the *Vita Vedasti*, the Life of the patron saint of the monastery of Saint-Vaast. The first copy is incorporated into Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale (henceforth BM) 734, which is an extravagant manuscript that is entirely dedicated to Vedastus, illuminated with full-page miniatures that are distinguished by their craftsmanship, exuberant colors and gold leaf. This codex was a highly prized possession of the monastic community of Saint-Vaast. The second copy is tucked away among the lives of multiple saints in a soberly executed codex from a neighboring monastery.[51] One could reasonably ask whether it is valid to describe these two manuscripts as 'copies' only because their text is largely identical; for it is highly likely that medieval readers would have interpreted the two 'copies' in very different ways: one was the centerpiece of an immensely important codex that was devoted to monastery's patron saint, central to the monk's daily existence and their spiritual and ideological status; whereas the other was simply a tool for the correct celebration of the liturgy. The text-based terminology makes it very hard to articulate such problems, and therefore hard to research them.

As a result, medievalists need an emended terminological framework to describe and research medieval manuscripts. Most importantly, we need a word that allows us to refer to a narrative or message that a manuscript presents as self-contained, usually because visual elements or terms such as *Incipit* and *Explicit* signal its beginning and end. The word should thus refer to a (part of a) manuscript that is defined on the basis of its physical boundaries, rather than its contents. The word can refer to a narrative such as a saint's life, but it can just as easily denote some administrative document that is presented as self-contained in the manuscript (such as a chronology of popes, or a

---

[51] Ms. Arras *Bibliothèque Municipale* 734 ff. 1v-23v (BHL 8506); Ms. Douai *Bibliothèque Municipale* 857 ff. 33r-51v (BHL 8508, corrected to BHL 8506 in 1024) – there are many other 'copies', 'versions' and 'variants' of BHL 8506 from the area surrounding the monastery of St.-Vaast.

listing of donations to a specific institution). Furthermore, this word should refer to this (part of a) manuscript as a material unity of text, layout and codicology. Finally, it should not automatically relate that (part of a) manuscript to a work, or to other manuscripts.

The importance of this physical approach to the boundaries of a narrative unit can again be illustrated with Arras BM 734, which contains three 'works' about the ninth-century miracles of St Vedastus on ff. 35v-49r.[52] Each of these works was composed at a different moment in time, yet the scribe saw them as one long text. He grouped them under the title of "On the miracles of Vedastus, saint and bishop, which were revealed at various moments in time, but were recently collected as one by a brother from this monastery".[53] Even though the scribe conscientiously distinguished between the prologue and the various miracles in his manuscript by means of rubrics and initials, he did not indicate where one work ended and another began – the works were literally 'collected as one'. Since this was an important scribal decision, the scholarly terminology should be able to honor it and refer to the end product of his efforts as a coherent whole. It should similarly be able to refer to other kinds of scribal products that are incorporated into manuscripts and are treated as internally coherent narrative units by its scribes, such as charters, bills, or lists of relics.[54]

3. FROM WORK TO SCRIPTUM: A VIABLE SOLUTION?

The most radical solution to this need has been proposed by John Dagenais, who wanted to "free the manuscript from the idea that it is a sign for something else, that it 'represents' the [work]".[55] He

---

[52] Ms. Arras *Bibliothèque Municipale* 734 ff. 35v-49r. BHL 8513, 8514 and 8515: "Miracula facta circa an. 875-880, auct. monachis S. Vedasti." *Acta Sanctorum* Feb. 1. 805-808.

[53] Ms. Arras *Bibliothèque Municipale* 734, f. 35v.

[54] It is important not to confuse this narrative unit with a production unit or codicological unit, which often encompass more than one narrative unit. See Erik Kwakkel. "Towards a Terminology for the Analysis of Composite Manuscripts." *Gazette du livre médiéval* 41 (2002): 12-19. Print; Gumbert 17-39.

[55] I substituted 'work' for 'authorial literary text', see Dagenais 129.

introduced the term 'scriptum' (pl. 'scripta') for a (part of a) manuscript and defined it as "a concrete, unduplicatable, physical manuscript together with the writing, both textual and trivial, it contains."[56]

Other words for roughly the same phenomenon have been suggested as well, such as 'document' and 'material text'. However, they tend to concentrate on the physicality of manuscripts without attempting to cut the ties between manuscript and work. The 'document' is generally used to indicate "the physical material that bears a text", and the 'material text' to denote "the text of a work as found in a document."[57] These terms do not rigidly designate a material unity of text, layout and codicology, but instead encompass the performance of a work as a material text on a document. Other scholars, uncomfortable with the harsh dividing line between document and material text, merge the two into one entity that they define as "the physical material, paper and ink". However, this does not do away with the Lachmannian terminological framework, because the material text is subsequently characterized as the place where authors, scribes and readers meet while 'translating'

---

[56] Dagenais 20.

[57] Beal 126 ('document' - "any kind of material bearing text"); Paul Eggert. "Document and Text: The "Life" of the Literary Work and the Capacities of Editing." *Text* 7 (1994): 2 n.4. Print. ('documents'- "the physical bearers of text"), the 'document' in this sense is not to be confused with Zumthor's *document* (natural and cultural primary structures such as hands, written supports and language; which is opposed to *monument*: textual and modal structuration – see Paul Zumthor. "Document et monument: À propos des textes les plus anciens en langue français." *Revue des sciences humaines* 97 (1960): 5-19. Print.) Shillingsburg (1991) 41 ('material text'- "the text of a work as found in a document"); Ibidem 52-53 ('material text' - "the evidence that a conceptual text [i.e. "the signs an author intended to inscribe"] was formed and uttered as a representation of a version of the work"). There are yet other terms for the same basic phenomenon such as the visual text, the production text, the physical text, the concrete text, the manuscript matrix, and so on. See Dagenais. *The Ethics of Reading* (note 1). 20.

or 'performing' a work.[58] As such, both definitions regard the 'material text' as the physical performance of a work, much like the witness. More precisely, the material text is the textual performance of a textual work in a material context.[59] In practice, of course, manuscripts do not invariably use text to convey a certain message. For example, Valenciennes BM 500 contains a comic-like series of miniatures that illustrate the life of St Amand on ff. 53r-68r. The drawings tell a complete story of St Amand, yet they can hardly be called 'a material text'.[60]

The word 'scriptum' evades these problems. First of all, it concentrates on the manuscript's materiality. The text (if present) gets its meaning in dialogue with elements such as the quality of the parchment, the *ordinatio,* the manuscript's codicological composition and so on. Furthermore, a scriptum does not necessarily contain text - a series of miniatures or even a blank folio can also be understood as a scriptum, as long as it has clear boundaries and there is reason to think that the scriptum was meant to convey some kind of message to the intended audience. If we define the scriptum is defined by its physical boundaries rather than by its contents, scribal decisions about the beginning and end of the scriptum take precedence over editorial practices. Finally, there is no presupposed relation between a scriptum and other scripta, or a work. One can use the word scriptum in a general sense to indicate a part of a manuscript without much further definition ('the first scriptum in this manuscript'), like one could use the word 'person' to indicate an individual within a group of people ('that person over there'). Alternatively, the word scriptum can be used in combination with a call number and folio numbers, such as 'Scriptum Arras *Bibliothèque Municipale*

---

[58] Shillingsburg (1991) 47; Eggert (1998) 56-57 ("The document, whether handwritten or printed, is the textual site where the agents of textuality meet: author, editor, copyist, typesetter, reader. In the acts of writing, copying or reading, document and text dynamically interrelate: they can be seen as a translation or performance of one another. They are, in this sense, on another's negative constituting principle. Their relationship is thus dialectical.")

[59] Muzerelle #442.05

[60] The only texts included in the miniatures are a few short labels such as 'monachus' next to the protagonists.

734 ff. 35v-49r', or 'Scriptum Valenciennes *Bibliothèque Municipale* 500 ff. 53r-68r'. Used as such, the scriptum is a rigid designator that points to a very specific part of a manuscript in much the same way that 'J. Smith' points to a particular individual. This gives researchers the chance to discuss scripta and manuscripts without presupposing intertextual relationships, an essential requirement for historians and philologists alike.

However, Dagenais never intended to coin a valuable addition to the existing terminology. He wanted to fully replace it, as he argued that every scriptum is unique and cannot be compared to other scripta, let alone be related a work – his scriptum is concrete, unduplicatable, and physical. As a result, it has been objected that Dagenais' views are far too radical and have drastic consequences for historical and philological research, "to the point where we can hardly deliberate on three extant copies of [one work] or even discuss them as three manuscript versions.[61] If we accept that the work is a fairytale, as Stackmann put it, and that an editor should do no more than publish an adequate picture of the scriptum, we are in the middle of a crisis, not only of medieval philology but of medieval history as well; for if we can no longer compare two scripta to one another without doing injustice to their unicity there is a great part of the medieval world that can no longer be studied.[62]

---

[61] Nadia Altschul. "The Genealogy of Scribal Versions: A 'Fourth Way' in Medieval Editorial Theory'. *Textual Cultures: Texts, Contexts, Interpretation* 1:2 (2006) 124. Print; see also Pickens 53-86; Jeroen Deploige, "Anonymat et paternité littéraire dans l'hagiographie des Pays-Bas méridionaux (ca. 920 - ca. 1320): Autour du discours sur l''original" et la 'copie' hagiographique au moyen âge." Eds. Étienne Renard, Michel Trigalet, Xavier Hermand and Paul Bertrand. *"Scribere sanctorum gesta": Recueil d'études d'hagiographie médiévale offert à Guy Philippart.* Turnhout: Brepols, 2005. 80-84. Print.

[62] Karl Stackmann. "Autor - Überlieferung – Editor." Ed. Eckart Conrad Lutz. *Das Mittelalter Und Die Germanisten: Zur neueren Methodengeschichte der germanischen Philologie. Freiburger Colloquium 1997.* Freiburg: Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz, 1998. 29. Print.

Dagenais himself admitted that "I frankly do not know how the concept of 'same' text will work itself out in a study of medieval literature based on scripta".[63]

An example from the monastery of Marchiennes illustrates the consequences of this approach. In the twelfth century, a scribe was copying the monastery's old Bible. He did his very best to create an almost identical copy: he imitated the style of the miniatures, the new manuscript had similar dimensions (50x35 cm versus 49x33 cm), and he copied the texts and codicological composition without many changes.[64] A radical interpretation of Dagenais and the New Philology might argue that there can be no such thing as comparing two manuscript Bibles to one another, and might judge it pointless to ask why the scribe may have wished to create an almost identical copy of an existing manuscript. Taken to such a manifestly absurd extreme, the philological movement that started out as an attempt to re-focus attention on the historical context in which medieval manuscripts functioned threatens to turn into a position that vetoes the contextualization of any manuscript.

Strong arguments against such an extreme interpretation can be found in the manuscripts themselves. As is evident from the Marchiennes Bibles, eleventh-century scribes are known to have attempted to copy an existing scriptum, even if they could never achieve a perfect copy in practice. It would seem that such an obvious attempt to create a copy is enough of a reason in itself to admit that a relation between these manuscripts exists and can be studied. Even more importantly, medieval scribes were very well aware of the difference between scriptum and work, even if the terms they used to describe them were different. An example of this awareness can be found in the twelfth-century scriptum Douai BM 840 ff. 110r-112v, which describes the life of St Juliana. Halfway through the story, a long fragment of text is copied into the margin, with the title "this was added in another scriptum" (the actual words are *hoc additum est in alio exemplari*, which may also be translated as "in another copy"). Apparently, a high medieval reader/scribe had been reading

---

[63] Dagenais 129.

[64] Mss. Douai *Bibliothèque Municipale* 3 and Douai *Bibliothèque Municipale* 1.

through Juliana's life and noticed that it lacked a paragraph of text that was present in another

scriptum which contained a very similar story.[65] This indicates that the scribe had made a mental

comparison between two scripta - in other words, the scribe had judged the scripta as two witnesses

of a work, and mentally distinguished between the physical manuscripts and the story they had in

common.

Such examples - and many more could be given - indicate that to drop the concept of a 'work' in

its entirety together with the traditional terminology that springs from it, is untenable from a

practical as well as a theoretical perspective. Therefore, the question we ask ourselves should not be:

'Was there a work in the Middle Ages?', but: 'How can a (high) medieval reader/scribe have defined a

work?'

4. TOWARDS A RECONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE WORK

The debate surrounding the Lachmannian work is perhaps one of the few issues in modern historical

research that a medieval intellectual would follow with interest, as it comes down to that most

famous of medieval discussions: the problem of universals.[66] At the turn of the eleventh century, any

medieval intellectual would have made some kind of distinction between a material object in front of

him, and that object's Idea, Nature or Essence. The debate over the ontological statute of such

essences went back all the way to Plato, but was fuelled anew as the *logica nova* grew in popularity

in the course of the eleventh century. On the one hand, bishop Odo of Cambrai (1050-1113) and

William of Champeaux (1070-1120) were arguing that universals were *essentialiter* present in every

individual of the species – applied to the matter of manuscripts, that comes down to saying that the

---

[65] The literal translation of 'exemplar' is 'copy', 'model', 'example', 'original'. Because modern definitions use

'exemplar' as synonym for 'model' and define it in terms of textual transmission, ("exemplaire dont le texte est

reproduit par le copiste"), I chose not to use 'exemplar' instead of 'scriptum'. Muzerelle #441.10.

[66] For an overview of the medieval problem of universals, see for example A. de Libera. *La querelle des

universeaux: De Platon à la fin du Moyen Âge.* Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1996. Print.

work was essentially and totally present in every scriptum that 'performed' it. Two scripta that performed the same work differed from each other in accidents, but were essentially of one nature. However, Peter Abelard (1079 - 1142) dealt a death blow to this view by explicating its absurdity - for how can one nature be in two places at once? - and proposed that a universal was no more than a name that was produced in the mind through an active process of abstraction. Basing himself on Aristotle, he reasoned that the human mind focuses on one aspect that multiple manuscripts (or other material things, such as humans, trees, or houses) have in common. For example, two or three manuscripts might be very much alike in their textual aspects, though they might be very dissimilar in layout. By focusing on one such aspect, the mind forms a vague and somewhat confused image that can be applied to multiple manuscripts. In other words, the work is not a different thing from a scriptum *(non aliud)*, but it is the scriptum viewed from a different perspective *(sed aliter)*.[67]

This high medieval conceptualization of the relation between the universal (the work) and the particular (the scriptum) can be highly valuable to medievalists, because it can be used to reconsider the Lachmannian terminological framework. Of course, there must necessarily be a difference between the present-day understanding of a medieval work (such as the *Vita Secunda* of St Ghislain) and the medieval concept of that work. A researcher in the digital era has the means to compare

---

[67] It should be noted that Abelard did subscribe to the thought that universals (such as works) existed as more than just concepts of the human mind, because they must equally be the objects of the divine mind. As such, they are quasi-things that exist independent of human mental activity and are the reason for the likeness between individual objects. However, Abelard did not think this has important ramifications for the way humans construct their universal concepts. See De Libera 148-158; Abelard most concisely explained his views on universals in Peter Abelard, *Peter Abaelards philosophische Schriften. I: Die Logica 'Ingredientibus'.* Ed. Geyer Bernhard. Münster: Aschendorff, 1919. 1-109. Print; I took the non aliud/sed aliter description from Jos Decorte. *Waarheid als weg: Beknopte geschiedenis van de middeleeuwse wijsbegeerte.* Kapellen/Kampen: DNB/Uitgeverij Pelckmans/Kok Agora, 1992. 107. Print. Also see Brigitte Miriam Bedos-Rezak. "Medieval Identity: A Sign and a Concept." *The American Historical Review* 105.5 (2000). 1499-1502. Print.

pictures of multiple scripta. (S)he can use critical editions and lists with *incipits* and *explicits* to help define a scriptum as one work or the other. The present-day scholar is able to collect all these reproductions and tools on a desk, and base the definition of a work on them, delimiting its boundaries quite clearly. In contrast, the average medieval scribe was probably forced to recognize works from memory, realizing that one scriptum looked or sounded similar to something he previously read or heard. The process of recognition is certainly the same, but the conception of a work will have been less clearly delimited in medieval times. For a medieval scribe, we could assume that every new scriptum of the *Vita Sedunda* that he encountered over the course of his career - which could span 30 years or more[68] – would cause him to subtly adjust the work he had in mind. As a result, the medieval work was no less real then ours, but certainly less stable.

As we saw earlier, Ingarden would object that the idea of a work that exists only in its readings results in a work that is fundamentally unstable, so that it cannot support true statements about its nature (such as 'the *Iliad* is written in Hexameter'). Yet I would argue that this objection is valid only from a very radical point of view that presupposes that only ideal objects such as circles have the stability that support a true description of their essence. This almost Platonic philosophical position was not that of Abelard and his many followers, who would define the work as the recognition of similarity between multiple scripta. Hypothetically, they could have looked at a number of scripta that were all written in hexameters and told a story about Achilles' grudge during the Trojan War. They would have recognized the similarity between these scripta, and the hexameters would have been one of the aspects that caused this recognition. As a result, the hexameters would have been an essential part of Abelard's mental definition of this work. As such, the statement that 'this work,

---

[68] The length of high medieval scribal careers is discussed in Michael Gullick. "How Fast Did Scribes Write? Evidence from Romanesque Manuscripts." Ed. Linda L. Brownrigg. *Making the Medieval Book: Techniques of Production. Proceedings of the Fourth Conference of the Seminar in the History of the Book to 1500, Oxford, July 1992.* Anderson-Lovelace: The Red Gull Press, 1995. 43. Print.

called the *Iliad,* is written in hexameter' becomes a statement as necessarily true as 'this circle is round'.

Proceeding from this essentially medieval conceptualization of the work, the terminological framework that we rejected earlier can be re-built, with one crucially important difference. In a Lachmannian context, the work was an ideal object that was at the basis of the entire terminology. A work could be subdivided into versions, which could be subdivided into more or less authentic variants, and so on. However, if we proceed from a high medieval point of view, it is the *scriptum* and not the work that is at the basis of it all. Everything starts with the scriptum, the material object in front of a reader/researcher. The scriptum can, if so desired, be broken down into a 'text' with a 'layout' and 'illuminations' on a 'document', and these analytical elements can be further compared to another scriptum's text, layout, illuminations, parchment, and so on. Based on such comparisons, it becomes possible (though not always necessary) to judge them as relatively similar to one another on a textual level (as 'variants' or even attempted 'copies') or as more profoundly or characteristically different from one another on the textual plane ('versions'). If, in the end, it is concluded that the text of a small group of scripta is profoundly similar, there is no objection to designate these scripta as witnesses of a work; as long as the work is not unduly idealized and its remains the very last step in the heuristic method. Next to the text of these scripta, their layout and codicology could equally cause recognition of similarity. For example, seven of the high medieval scripta from the Southern Low Countries with a Life of St Agnes present the story as a continuous text, whereas two others subdivide the story into three chapters.[69] It could be argued that those two

---

[69] Agnes v.m. Romae, BHL 156. Manuscripts from Benedictine monasteries (10th-12th centuries, bishoprics of Arras/Cambrai, Thérouanne, Tournai and Liège) that present this work as continuous, are Arras *Bibliothèque Municipale* 178 (St.-Vaast, ca. 1095-1105), Arras *Bibliothèque Municipale* 569 (St.-Vaast, ca. 1100-1180), Brussels *Royal Library* 9810-14 (St.-Laurent, ca. 1125), Brussels *Royal Library* 14924-34 (Lobbes, ca. 1095-1110), Cambrai *Bibliothèque Municipale* 863 (St.-Sépulcre, 1076-1092), Douai *Bibliothèque Municipale* 840

present a different version with respect to the layout of this story – perhaps we ought to call this a 'material version' of the Life.

A cursory glance over this redefined terminology might give the impression of a meek return to Lachmannian views; but in fact it is not. By putting the scriptum as the terminology's central element and foundation, researchers gain the critical opportunity to discuss scripta without being obliged to classify them on the basis of their textual similarity to an urtext. The word scriptum serves as a rigid designator that allows researchers to look at scripta as material objects, unhampered by a-priori assumptions about textual relationships. Simultaneously, the twelfth-century view of the ontological status of a work enables modern scholars to keep classifying their scripta, either on textual or on material grounds. Future research might even attempt to construct a manuscript typology based on material considerations, which is comparable to textual typologies in terms of accuracy and practicability.

CONCLUSION

This article was about the terminological framework to describe manuscripts. In the early twentieth century, Karl Lachmann posited the work as an ideal and fully textual object. This perspective on the work was first attacked in 1928 and the criticism reached an all-time high in the 1990s with the New Philology, a movement that strongly emphasized the importance of studying manuscripts rather than works. Although this debate is quite well known, there has never been much attention for the terminological consequences of these two positions. On the one hand, the Lachmannian framework allows scholars to classify manuscripts but lacks a rigid designator to indicate 'a (part of a) manuscript as a unit of text and material considerations'. On the other hand, those who renounce the work and concentrate on the material 'scriptum' gain a rigid designator, but threaten to lose the ability to

(Marchiennes, ca. 1134-1200) and Douai *Bibliothèque Municipale* 867 (Marchiennes, eleventh century).

Subdivide the Life into three chapters: Brussels *Royal Library* II 1181 (Stavelot, ca. 1100-1150) and Douai *Bibliothèque Municipale* 854 (Anchin, ca. 1125-1200).

classify manuscripts at all. I have argued that instead of choosing between these two philosophical positions, medievalists could proceed from high medieval practices and build up an epistemological scheme from there.

High medieval scribes seem to have taken the scriptum as the starting point of their activities, even though they called it by different names, such as 'exemplar'. It cannot be doubted that they distinguished the scriptum from its essence (the 'work'), but it is unlikely that they continued to view this essence as an ideal object after the turn of the eleventh century, when radically realist views became less common. Instead, the dominant philosophical position was to regard an essence as the recognition of similarities between individual things (such as scripta) by a human being who was focusing on one specific aspect of these scripta. Of course, the aspect that they focused on could be textual; but it might also revolve around *ordinatio*, illumination, codicological composition, or any other material element that caught their attention.

If we follow medieval practices, we gain an epistemological framework that combines the use of materially defined rigid designators (as defended by the New Philology) with the notion of sameness (as practiced in centuries of philological research). Even more importantly, it opens up a terminological opportunity to research layout transmission with the same nuance and pertinence as textual transmission. A preliminary investigation of high medieval hagiography indicates that changes in layout and changes in text probably influenced each other and were subject to similar mechanics of transmission. Last but not least, the ability to pose and investigate such questions finally allows us to touch on the core of medieval manuscript culture as the transmission of visual experience.[70]

Works Cited

Bibliotheca hagiographica latina antiquae et mediae aetatis, 2 vols. Brussels: Société des
        Bollandistes, 1898-1901. Print.

---

[70] The characterization of medieval literature as a visual experience is based on Nichols 135.

"Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina Manuscripta". Société des Bollandistes, last update December 15, 1998. Web. <http://bhlms.fltr.ucl.ac.be/>.

Abelard, Peter. *Peter Abaelards philosophische Schriften. I: Die Logica 'Ingredientibus'.* Ed. Geyer Bernhard. Münster: Aschendorff, 1919. Print.

Aubrey, Elizabeth. "Genre as a Determinant of Melody in the Songs of the Troubadours and Trouvères." Ed. William D. Paden. *Medieval lyric: genres in historical context.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2000.

Barthes, Roland. "La mort de l'auteur." *Manteia* 5 (1968): 12-17. Print.

---. "Introduction à l'analyse structurale des récits." *Communications* 8 (1966): 1-27. Print.

Beal, Peter. *A Dictionary of English Manuscript Terminology, 1450-2000*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008. Print.

Bédier, Joseph. "La tradition manuscrite du *Lai de l'Ombre:* réflexions sur l'art d'éditer les anciens textes." *Romania* 54 (1928): 161-196, 321-356. Print.

Bedos-Rezak, Brigitte Miriam. "Medieval Identity: A Sign and a Concept." *The American Historical Review* 105.5 (2000): 1489-533. Print.

Bloch, R. Howard, and Stephen G. Nichols. "Introduction." Eds. R. Howerd Bloch, and Stephen G. Nichols. *Medievalism and the Modernist Temper*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999. 1-22. Print.

Bozzolo, Carla, et al. "Noir et blanc: Premiers résultats d'une enquête sur la mise en page dans le livre médiéval." Eds. Ezio Ornato et al. *La face cachée du livre médiéval: L'histoire du livre vue par Ezio Ornato, ses amis et ses collègues*. Rome: Viella, 1997. 473-508. Print.

Bryant, John. *The Fluid Text: A Theory of Revision and Editing for Book and Screen*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002. Print.

Cerquiglini, Bernard. *Éloge de la variante: Histoire critique de la philologie*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1989. Print.

Dagenais, John. *The Ethics of Reading in Manuscript Culture: Glossing the Libro de Buen Amor*.

    Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994. Print.

Decorte, Jos. *Waarheid als weg: Beknopte geschiedenis van de middeleeuwse wijsbegeerte.*

    Kapellen/Kampen: DNB/Uitgeverij Pelckmans/Kok Agora, 1992. Print.

Deploige, Jeroen. "Anonymat et paternité littéraire dans l'hagiographie des Pays-Bas méridionaux

    (ca. 920 - ca. 1320): Autour du discours sur l''original" et la "copie" hagiographique au Moyen

    Âge." Eds. Étienne Renard, et al.*"Scribere sanctorum gesta": Recueil d'études d'hagiographie*

    médiévale offert à Guy Philippart. Turnhout: Brepols, 2005. 77-107. Print.

Derrida, Jacques. "Introduction". Edmunt Husserl, *L'Origine de la géométrie.* Trans. Derrida. Paris:

    Presses universitaires de France, 1961. Print.

Eggert, Paul. "Document and Text: The "Life" of the Literary Work and the Capacities of Editing." *Text*

    7 (1994): 1-24. Print.

---. "The Work Unravelled." *Text* 11 (1998): 41-60. Print.

Fichtenau, Heinrich. "Monastisches und scholastisches Lesen." Eds. Georg Jenal, and Stephanie

    Haarländer. *Herrschaft, Kirche, Kultur: Beiträge zur Geschichte des Mittelalters. Festschrift für*

    Friedrich Prinz zu seinem 65. Geburtstag. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1993. 317-37. Print.

Fros, Henryk. *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina antiquae et mediae aetatis: Novum supplementum*.

    Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1986. Print.

Gullick, Michael. "How Fast Did Scribes Write? Evidence from Romanesque Manuscripts." Ed. Linda L.

    Brownrigg. *Making the Medieval Book: Techniques of Production. Proceedings of the Fourth*

    Conference of the Seminar in the History of the Book to 1500, Oxford, July 1992. Anderson-

    Lovelace: The Red Gull Press, 1995. 39-58. Print.

Gumbert, J.P. "Codicological Units: Towards a Terminology for the Stratigraphy of the Non-

    Homogeneous Codex." *Segno e testo: International Journal of Manuscripts and Text*

    Transmission 2 (2004): 17-39. Print.

Guyotjeannin, Olivier. "Le vocabulaire de la diplomatique en latin medieval: Noms de l'acte, mise par

    ecrit, tradition, critique, conservation." Ed. Olga Weijers. *Vocabulaire du livre et de l'ecriture*

    au Moyen Age: Actes de la table ronde, Paris 24-26 September 1987. Turnhout: Brepols,

    1989. 128-129. Print.

Helvétius, Anne-Marie. *Abbayes, évêques et laïques: Une politique du pouvoir en Hainaut au Moyen*

    Âge (VIIe-XIe siècle). Brussels: Crédit communal, 1994. Print.

Ingarden, Roman. *Das literarische Kunstwerk (2., verbesserte und erweiterte Auflage)*. Tübingen: Max

    Niemeyer Verlag, 1960. Print.

Kwakkel, Erik. "Towards a Terminology for the Analysis of Composite Manuscripts." *Gazette du livre*

    médiéval 41 (2002): 12-19. Print.

Libera, A. de. *La querelle des universeaux: De Platon à la fin du Moyen Âge*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil,

    1996. Print.

Löser, Freimut. "Postmodernes Mittelalter? 'New Philology' und Überlieferungsgeschichte." Eds.

    Jochen Conzelmann, Arthur Groos, and Hans-Jochen Schiewer. *Kulturen des*

    Manuskriptzeitalters: Ergebnisse der amerikanisch-deutschen Arbeitstagung an der Georg-

    August-Universität Göttingen vom 17. bis 20. Oktober 2002. Göttingen:V&R Unipress, 2004.

    215-36. Print.

Maas, Paul. *Textkritiek.* Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1950. Print.

Minnis, A. J. *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*.

    2nd ed. Aldershot: Wildwood House Ltd., 1988. Print.

Mombritius, Bonino. *Sanctuarium seu vitae sanctorum*. ca. 1477. Reprint in Hildesheim: Olms, 1978.

    Print.

Muzerelle, Denis. *Vocabulaire codicologique: Répertoire méthodique des termes français relatifs aux*

    manuscrits, avec leurs équivalents en Anglais, Italien, Espagnol. Rubricae. Paris: Éditions

    CEMI, 1985. Print. - Édition hypertextuelle, version 1.1. 2002-2003. Web.

    http://vocabulaire.irht.cnrs.fr/vocab.htm, 2002-2003.

Nichols, Stephen G. "Philology and its Discontents." Ed. William D. Paden. *The Future of the Middle*

    Ages: Medieval Literature in the 1990s. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1994. 113-44.

    Print.

Nix, Linda Kythe. "Early Medieval Book Design in England: The Influence of Manuscript Design on the

    Transmission of Texts." Eds. Robin Myers, and Michael Harris. *A Millennium of the Book:*

    Production, Design & Illustration in Manuscript & Print, 900-1900. Publishing Pathways.

    Winchester: St Paul's Bibliographies, 1994. 1-21. Print.

---. "Manuscript Layout and Re-Production of the Text in Anglo-Saxon England: A Preliminary

    Examination." *Gazette du livre médiéval* 25 (1994): 17-23. Print.

Parkes, Malcolm Beckwith. "The Influence of the Concepts of Ordinatio and Compilatio on the

    Development of the Book." Ed. Malcolm B. Parkes. *Scribes, Scripts and Readers: Studies in the*

    Communication, Presentation and Dissemination of Medieval Texts. London and Rio Grande:

    Hambledon, 1991. 35-70. Print.

Pickens, Rupert T. "The Future of Old French Studies in America: The 'Old' Philology and the Crisis of

    the 'New'." Ed. William D. Paden.*The Future of the Middle Ages: Medieval Literature in the*

    1990s. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1994. 53-86. Print.

Poulin, Joseph-Claude. "Un élément négligé de critique hagiographique: Les titres de chapitres." Eds.

    Étienne Renard, et al. *"Scribere sanctorum gesta": Recueil d'études d'hagiographie médiévale*

    offert à Guy Philippart. Turnhout: Brepols, 2005. 309-42. Print.

Propp, Vladimir. *Morphology of the Folk-tale.* Austin: Texas UP, 1968. Print.

Rouse, Richard H., and Mary A. Rouse. "Statim invenire: Schools, Preachers, and New Attitudes to the

    Page." Eds. Robert L. Benson, Giles Constable and Carol D. Lanham. *Renaissance and Renewal*

    in the Twelfth Century. Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press, 1991. 201-

    25. Print.

Saenger, Paul. "Silent Reading: Its Impact on Late Medieval Script and Society." *Viator* 13 (1982): 367-

    414. Print.

Shannon, Claude Elwood. "A Mathematical Theory of Communication." *Bell System Technical Journal*
27 (1948): 379-423, 623-656.

Shillingsburg, Peter L. *Resisting Texts: Authority and Submission in Constructions of Meaning*. Ann
Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998. Print.

---. *Scholarly Editing in the Computer Age: Theory and Practice*. 3rd ed. Ann Arbor: The University of
Michigan Press, 1996. Print.

---. "Text as Matter, Concept, and Action." *Studies in Bibliography* 44 (1991): 31-82. Print.

Snijders, Tjamke. "Celebrating with Dignity: The Purpose of Benedictine Matins Readings." Ed. Steven
Vanderputten. *Understanding Monastic Practices of Oral Communication (Western Europe,
Tenth-Thirteenth Centuries)*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2011. 109-30. Print.

---. "Handschriftelijke productie in tijden van hervorming: De kloosterbibliotheek van Sint-Gislenus in
het tweede kwart van de elfde eeuw." *Jaarboek voor Middeleeuwse Geschiedenis* 13 (2010):
6-32. Print.

---. "Manuscript Layout and Réécriture: A Reconstruction of the Manuscript Tradition of the Vita
Secunda Gisleni." *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire/Belgisch tijdschrift voor filologie en
geschiedenis* 87.2 (2009): 215-37. Print.

---. "Ordinare & Communicare: Redactie, opmaak en transmissie van hagiografische handschriften in
kloosters uit de Zuidelijke Nederlanden, 900-1200." Unpublished PhD-thesis, Ghent
University, 2009 (to be published with Brepols in the series Utrecht Studies in Medieval
Literacy). Print.

---. "Rewriting Hagiography in High Medieval Monasteries: A Quantitative Approach." Eds.
Desplenter, Youri, Renée Gabriël and Johan Oosterman. *Between Stability and
Transformation: Textual Traditions in the Medieval Netherlands*. Ghent: Academia Press.
Print. (in press).

Stackmann, Karl. "Autor - Überlieferung - Editor." Ed. Eckart Conrad Lutz. *Das Mittelalter und die Germanisten: Zur neueren Methodengeschichte der germanischen Philologie. Freiburger Colloquium 1997*. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz, 1998. 11-32. Print.

Timpanaro, Sebastiano. *Genesi del metodo del Lachmann.* 1981. English trans. by Glenn W. Most. *The Genesis of Lachmann's Method.* Chicago: University of Chicago press, 2005. Print.

Zumthor, Paul. *Essai de poétique médiévale.* Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1972. Print.

---. "Document et monument: À propos des textes les plus anciens en langue français." *Revue des sciences humaines* 97 (1960): 5-19. Print.