



HAL
open science

The Glosae in regula S. Benedicti – a text between the Liber Glossarum and Smaragdus' Expositio in regulam S. Benedicti

Matthieu van Der Meer

► **To cite this version:**

Matthieu van Der Meer. The Glosae in regula S. Benedicti – a text between the Liber Glossarum and Smaragdus' Expositio in regulam S. Benedicti. Dossiers d'HEL, 2016, Le Liber glossarum (s. VII-VIII): Composition, sources, réception, 10, pp.305-319. hal-01419982v2

HAL Id: hal-01419982

<https://hal.science/hal-01419982v2>

Submitted on 10 Jan 2017

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

THE GLOSAE IN REGVLA S. BENEDICTI – A TEXT BETWEEN THE *LIBER GLOSSARVM* AND SMARAGDVVS’ *EXPOSITIO IN REGVLAM S. BENEDICTI*

Matthieu van der Meer
Syracuse University

Résumé

Cet article décrit un texte carolingien découvert récemment, qui est sans doute l’un des plus anciens témoins de l’utilisation du *Liber Glossarum*. Ce texte, conservé dans deux manuscrits et appelé *Glosae de diuersis doctoribus collectae in regula Benedicti abbatis*, applique systématiquement les entrées du *Liber Glossarum* sur la Règle de Benoît. Il provient très probablement du contexte de l’instruction aux novices et vise à la compréhension lexicale, grammaticale et théologique de la Règle. Il est une source unique pour notre connaissance des techniques didactiques et textuelles carolingiens, ainsi que de la mise en œuvre des réformes monastiques. Cet article analyse un certain nombre de problèmes philologiques, en particulier la relation entre les *Glosae*, le *Liber Glossarum* et l’*Expositio in regulam Benedicti* de Smaragde de Saint Mihiel.

Mots-clés

Liber Glossarum, *Glosae de diuersis doctoribus collectae in regula S. Benedicti abbatis*, Smaragde de St. Mihiel, *Expositio in regulam Benedicti*, Règle de Benoît, glossaires latins, monachisme carolingien

Abstract

This article concerns a newly discovered Carolingian text that is arguably one of the oldest witnesses to the use of the *Liber Glossarum*. Preserved in two codices, the text bears the name *Glosae de diuersis doctoribus collectae in regula Benedicti abbatis*. It systematically applies entries from the *Liber Glossarum* to the *Rule of Benedict*. The text most likely originated as a means of providing instruction to novices and aims at fostering theological, as well as lexical and grammatical, comprehension of the *Rule*. It is a unique source of information regarding the implementation of monastic reforms, as well as Carolingian techniques of teaching, reading, and writing. This article analyzes a number of philological problems, especially the relationship between the *Glosae*, the *Liber Glossarum*, and Smaragdus of St. Mihiel’s *Expositio in regulam Benedicti*.

Keywords

Liber Glossarum, *Glosae de diuersis doctoribus collectae in regula S. Benedicti abbatis*, Smaragdus of St. Mihiel, *Expositio in regulam Benedicti*, Rule of Benedict, Latin Glossaries, Carolingian monasticism

The text designated by Carolingian reformers to serve as the guide for monastic life in the Frankish realm was the Rule of Benedict, a sixth-century document written in an unusual style of Latin, whose prescriptions by no means fit seamlessly with the monastic world of the ninth century. Benedict wrote his Rule for a single

community of monastic enthusiasts, rather than for a multitude of monasteries such as those that existed in the Frankish empire. Benedict's monastery had no function within the mechanism of the state, unlike many Frankish royal abbeys. The Rule expresses ideas of purity, community, and salvation that are significantly different from the ideas employed by Carolingian monastic communities.¹ Not surprisingly, therefore, Smaragdus of St. Mihiel prefaces his commentary to the Rule (written sometime between 816 and 827) with these words: "Since I observed confusion of very many monks concerning the Rule of Benedict, the interpretation of the words, the understanding of various sentences (...), I was motivated both by myself and by others to make the effort of explaining the Rule."²

The desire of Carolingian monks to fully understand the intended meaning of the Rule of Benedict undoubtedly went beyond the level of a simple intellectual challenge. In the context of monastic life, the accurate comprehension of even a single word's meaning can be a matter of salvation. The future of one's soul depends on whether or not one has lived according to the guidelines of Sacred Scripture and the Rule. Thus, every word – spoken and lived – is critical. Accordingly, Benedict admonishes, "If you want to have true and eternal life, guard your tongue from evil, and your lips, lest they speak lies."³ Smaragdus' commentary similarly abounds in exhortations to be cautious regarding one's words, to do as one says, and to avoid idle talk: the tongue is, after all, the only creature that man cannot tame.⁴

Carolingian documents such as the *Epistola de litteris colendis* and the *Admonitio generalis* chapter 70 (earlier 72) express similar concerns – within these texts, correct language serves as a sign of correct thinking.⁵ The monks' need for an accurate understanding of individual words was part of a broader culture of reading and writing that first emerged around this time and caused a significant increase in the production of manuscripts containing grammars, liturgical handbooks, biblical commentaries, compilations of canon and secular law, court poetry, philosophy, history, hagiography, and theology.⁶ This culture also stood at the core of innovations such as the Caroline minuscule, punctuation, and musical notation.⁷ The increased production of glossaries in the Carolingian age must also be understood against this background. Perhaps the best known glossary from this period is the *Liber Glossarum*, a monumental compilation of older glossaries comprised of more than 500,000 entries. The unmanageably massive nature of the text impelled the development alphabetical order as an organizing principle – an innovation that remains in use until this day.⁸

¹ Diem 2016.

² Smaragdus 1974, p. 6: Cum turbas plurimorum cernerem monachorum in beati Regula Benedicti, interpretationes verborum, et intellectum diversarum sententiarum, discretionemque judiciorum sagaciter quaerere plurimorum, quae variante modulo varia fit culparum, ut expositioni ejus operam darem, et a meipso motus, et ab aliis sum coactus.

³ Benedictus 1960, p. 4, regula prol. 17.

⁴ Smaragdus 1974, p. 31: Omnis enim natura bestiarum, et volucrum, et serpentium, etiam caeterorum domantur et domata sunt a natura humana, linguam autem nullus hominum domare potest.

⁵ *Epistola de litteris colendis* 1893, p. 78-79; *Admonitio Generalis* 2012, p. 222-24; cfr Contreni 2014, p. 110-111, Diem 1998.

⁶ McKitterick 1989, p. 163, refers to Bernhard Bischoff's estimation of 50,000 manuscripts produced in the ninth century, some 7,000 of which survive.

⁷ McKitterick 2012, p. 23-33, Contreni 2014, p.106-107.

⁸ For literature on the *Liber Glossarum*, see Bishop 1978, Ganz, 1993, Huglo 2001, Grondeux 2011, Grondeux and Cinato 2015.

The text that this article is concerned with is one that emerged in the context of the Carolingian monastic reforms and the subsequent need for exactitude in understanding the meanings of words, but its content also provides a window into the reception of the *Liber Glossarum*.⁹ The text – the *Glosae de diuersis doctoribus collectae in regula S. Benedicti abbati* – was written sometime between 790 and 816. An edition is being prepared at this moment (September 2016) and will appear this year as number 282 in the series *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis*. The *Glosae* consists of a catena glossary based on the *Liber Glossarum* and a patristic florilegium. Abbot Smaragdus of St. Mihiel († ca. 827) used the *Glosae* for his *Expositio in Regulam Benedicti*, a widely distributed and authoritative commentary to the *Rule of Benedict*.¹⁰ The *Glosae* forms a link between the *Liber Glossarum* and the *Expositio*. Apart from the philological aspects concerning the compilation and reception of glossaries, the *Glosae* enables us to think about the ways in which texts in general in the ninth century were read and taught, and in particular how this was done with the *Rule of Benedict*.

1. GLOSAE IN REGULA S. BENEDICTI

Already in the third quarter of the seventh century Frankish clergymen emphasized the authority of the Rule of Benedict in monastic houses.¹¹ Under Charlemagne and his son Louis the Pious, the Frankish monarchy supported the effort to create uniformity within monasticism through the general observance of this single rule.¹² At the councils of Aachen of August-September 816 and July 817, under the supervision of Louis the Pious, the *Regula Benedicti* was declared the binding norm for all monasteries in the *regnum*. It was to be implemented by being read, memorized, and discussed, along with being taught to novices at the monastic school.¹³

In the wake of these decrees, three Carolingian texts were created that each in its own way explains the *Regula Benedicti*: The first is the *Concordia Regularum*, a collection of quotations from monastic rules following the structure of the *Regula Benedicti*. This text was produced by Benedict of Aniane, the mastermind of the Carolingian monastic reforms, probably around the year 816 or 817.¹⁴ The second text, the *Expositio in regulam S. Benedicti*, was written by Smaragdus of St. Mihiel, a contemporary of Benedict of Aniane, probably closely after the synods of 816/817.

⁹ The reception history of the *Liber Glossarum* yet has to be written. An important contribution is given by Paniagua, 2015, p. 97-110. For a broad overview of Carolingian glossaries, see McKitterick 2012, p. 21-76, 169-193.

¹⁰ Smaragdus 1974.

¹¹ *Concilium Leudegarii* 1893, p. 221: De abbatibus uero uel monachis ita obseruare conuenit, ut, quicquid canonum ordo uel regula sancti Benedicti edocet, et implere et custodire in omnibus debeant. For an overview of the continuity between Pippin III's and Charlemagne's reform effort, see Brown 1994, p. 1-51.

¹² *Concilium Moguntinense* 1906, p. 263: Abbates autem censuimus ita cum monachis suis pleniter uiuere sicut ipsi, qui in presenti synodo aderant, palam nobis omnibus promiserunt, id est secundum doctrinam sanctae regulae Benedicti, quantum humana permittit fragilitas. Ac deinde decreuimus, sicut sancta regula dicit, ut monasterium, ubi fieri possit, per decanos ordinetur, quia illi praepositi saepe in elationem incidunt et in laqueum diaboli. See also Semmler 1983 and De Jong 1995.

¹³ *Statuta Murbacensia* 1963, p. 441: Secundo, ut qui possent regulam memoriter discerent. Ubi iungendum putauimus, ut, cum ex corde recitanda discitur, a dictatoribus ordinatis discentibus interpretetur.

¹⁴ For the question of the dating, see Bonnerue 1999, p. 53 and Claussen 2015.

This text glosses on the rule line by line after the model of Biblical commentaries and, also like Biblical commentaries, consists mainly of patristic quotations. Finally, there is the *Expositio regulae S. Benedicti* written by Hildemar of Corbie about a generation after the reform synods as a teaching text for the novices of the monastery of Civate.¹⁵ The *Glosae de diuersis doctoribus collectae in regula S. Benedicti abbatis* now has to be added to this list.

In its complete form, the *Glosae* survives in two manuscripts: Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 288 (siglum A)¹⁶ and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, n.a.l. 763 (siglum B).¹⁷ It consists of a catena glossary of roughly 1100 entries and a florilegium of roughly 360 patristic and biblical quotations. A third, late medieval manuscript from Augsburg, Staats- und Stadtbibliothek 4-46 (siglum C) contains a heavily revised and extended version of the glossary but does not contain the florilegium.

The composition of the manuscripts in which the *Glosae* can be found says much about the different functions of the text: The Valenciennes Codex contains, apart from the *Glosae*, a collection of monastic rules. The Paris codex consists of a dozen glossaries. Obviously the older Valenciennes codex places the *Glosae* in the context of monastic normative literature, whereas the younger Paris codex underlines the didactical and lexical aspect of the text. The Augsburg codex contains a great number of documents relating to the history of the Benedictine order and a variety of contemplative texts. The codex was written by the monk Georgius Sommerfeldt of the abbey of St. Ulrich and Afra in Augsburg, seemingly for his personal edification.¹⁸

Both the glossary covers the entirety of the *Regula Benedicti*. The florilegium is nearly complete, but lacks commentary to the last two chapters of the rule. The assumption that these two sections comprise a single bipartite work can be justified when one considers the facts that both parts have one title, that medieval library catalogues list them both under the single name *Glosae*, and that Smaragdus used both parts in his work.¹⁹

The glossary provides basic lexical and occasionally more elaborate grammatical explanations of selected words of the *Regula Benedicti* in the order of their appearance in the *Rule*. The glossing is very intense at the beginning and much less intense as the text proceeds. Around the comments on chapter 20 of the *Regula Benedicti*, which is actually far into the textual body of the *Glosae*, the character of the commentary changes from a glossary to an abbreviated reproduction of the *Regula Benedicti*, occasionally interrupted by glosses on specific terms. The text of the *Rule* was not considered too sacrosanct to be rendered in an abbreviated and paraphrased format. The following example from chapter 43, 13-16 of the *Rule* may illustrate the truncated character of the glossary in the later chapters.

<i>Regula Benedicti</i>	<i>Glosae</i>
43, 13-14: Ad mensam autem qui ante uersum	AD MENSAM AVTEM QVI PER NEGLEGENTIAM

¹⁵ Benedict of Aniane 1999; Smaragdus 1974; Hildemar 2014.

¹⁶ Originating from northern Francia (Trier?), early ninth century. Cfr Bischoff 1992, p. 13 and Engelbert 2015, p. 89-90.

¹⁷ Originating from northern Francia (St. Amand?), late ninth or early tenth century. Cfr Knoblich 1996, p. 27-28, 61, 112-113, 162.

¹⁸ For details, see Gehrt 1999, p. 82-89.

¹⁹ For the Valenciennes codex, see Delisle 1874, p. 452. For the Paris codex, see Knoblich, 1996, p. 113 n. 537. The catalogue in question sits in codex Trier, StB 2209/2328 II, f. 1r. Knoblich offers a transcription on p. 120-124. The *Glosae* is listed under nr. 144. Becker 1885, p. 151, lists the text under nr. 105 of the list 68, Tullum Leucorum (= Toul).

non occurrerit, ut simul omnes dicant uersu et orent et sub uno omnes accedant ad mensam, qui per neglegentiam suam aut uitio non occurrerit, usque secunda uice pro hoc corripatur	ANTE VERSVM VITIO NON OCCVRRERIT, CORRIPIATVR, id est castigetur
43, 15-16: si denuo non emendauerit, non permittatur ad mensae communis participationem sed sequestratus a consortio omnium reficiat solus sublata ei portione sua uinum usque ad satisfactionem et emendationem.	SI NON EMENDAVERIT, A COMMVNIS MENSE PARTICIPATIONE, id est consortio, SEQUESTRETVR, id est separetur.

The capitalized text in the right column corresponds with the section of the *Regula Benedicti* in the left column. Within this section, more than half the text of the *Regula* has been omitted in the *Glosae*. The abbreviated text from the *Regula* that appears in the *Glosae* can be read in grammatically meaningful units, while the definitions do not pose insurmountable obstacles. The selections of core passages may reveal to modern historians what was deemed essential by our author and, perhaps, those around him. One remarkable aspect of the text is that some subtle distinctions in the *Regula* have disappeared from the *Glosae*. Whereas the Rule speaks of a twofold reproach (*corripatur*) for the monk who appears late for the meal, the *Glosae* speaks of only one reproach (equaled with punishment – *castigetur*). According to both texts, the monk does not change his behavior, he should eat his meal separated from the rest. The Rule underscores here the privation of wine as part of the punishment. The *Glosae* omits this stipulation.

The question about the context and use of glosses and glossing practices has been subject to some debate in the past years.²⁰ As our *Glosae* is concerned, there is evidence that the glosses were most likely collected for use in the monastic classroom, rather than scholarly discourse. The glosses do not collect different opinions on disputed matters, and they do not link the *Regula Benedicti* to other scholarly texts.²¹ Instead, they aim at the transmission of basic Latin lexical (and sometimes also grammatical) knowledge – enough to understand the *Regula Benedicti* and apply the Rule correctly in daily practice. An indication of the modest intellectual standards set by the *Glosae* can be seen in its repetitive character. The glossator mainly focuses on basic words. A dozen times we see synonyms for words relating to speed (*cito, mox, statim, etc.*) and half as many definitions of punishment (*castigatio, obiurgatio, correptio, etc.*). Sometimes, difficult words get no attention at all, like the noun *senpectas* (RB 27, 2) or the verb *iniungo* (RB 25, 3; 47, 1; 48, 24; 64, 17; 68, 1). Not coincidentally, these words are not mentioned in the *Liber Glossarum*.

Although teaching Latin vocabulary – enough, at least, to understand the *Regula Benedicti* – must have been a goal of the glossator, we unfortunately cannot learn anything about the linguistic background of the audience. The readership or audience must have had a basic competence in Latin already, otherwise the text would have been completely lost onto them. But were they speakers of an early Romance language or of a German dialect? Our source here is silent – unlike some other contemporaneous texts such as the famous *Reichenauer Glosses*, which indicates a Romance-speaking context.²²

²⁰ Cfr Wieland 1975, p. 113-130, Lapidge 1982, p. 99-140, and more recently Teeuwen 2009, p. 86-99.

²¹ Cfr Teeuwen 2011, p. 23.

²² Klein 1968.

The author of the *Glosae* may have internalized the text well enough to reproduce it by heart, without checking whether his text matched with the written text. Only on the basis of this assumption we can explain the occurrence of more than one hundred idiosyncratic renderings of parts of the Rule - that is, variations that have no correspondences in the manuscript tradition as presented in the critical edition of Hanslik.²³ This matter stands aside from the question of which of the various manuscript traditions ('textus receptus', 'textus interpolatus', 'textus purus') lay at the foundation of the *Glosae*. The history of manuscript transmissions and traditions of the *Regula Benedicti* is incredibly complex. If the author of the *Glosae* used one single manuscript for his glosses (which need not be the case) it must have been textually very similar to the Aachen 'Norm-Exemplar' – the text designated by Ludwig Traube as the 'pure text' on account of its closeness to the codex that Saint Benedict presumably wrote himself and whose copy survives in the codex Sankt Gallen 914.²⁴ The Rule-text at the basis of the *Glosae* shows features of both this 'textus purus' and of manuscripts of the so-called 'textus receptus' tradition, which Traube believed to have come about after the 'textus purus' was propagated at the court, but which is now believed to possess an origin roughly coeval with that of the 'textus purus'.²⁵ In a number of points the Rule-text of the *Glosae* differs from that of Smaragdus' *Expositio*.

2. THE SOURCE OF THE *GLOSÆ*'S GLOSSARY

The author of the *Glosae* made extensive use of the *Liber Glossarum*: of the almost 1100 lemmata, an estimated ninety percent can be traced back to the *Liber Glossarum*. The critical edition of the *Liber Glossarum*, from the project 'LibGloss' under the supervision of Anne Grondeux,²⁶ has proven a tremendous resource in the creation of the forthcoming edition of the *Glosae* in that it made accessible a text that was otherwise only fragmentarily available in Wallace Martin Lindsay's highly problematic edition from the series *Glossaria Latina* from 1926.²⁷ Other glossaries that may have been used by the author of the *Glosae* are the Reichenau glosses and the glosses on the Rule of Benedict in the codices Leiden Leiden, Vossius latinus Q. 69, f. 20r-36ra and Fulda, Hessische Landesbibliothek Aa 2, f. 130v-136r.

2.1. How does the glossator of the *Glosae collectae in Regula Benedicti* use the *Liber Glossarum*?

The glossator generally has a flexible approach to the material in the *Liber Glossarum*: he changes verbs to nouns, nouns to adjectives, etc. As an example one

²³ Most of the variants are minute like these: *RB* 53, 2: Et omnibus congruus honor – glossary: Omnibus hospitibus honor; *RB* 53, 3: occurratur ei a priore uel a fratribus cum omni officio caritatis – glossary: occurratur hospiti cum omni officio caritatis; *RB* 53, 9: Et post haec – glossary: et post ea.

²⁴ Traube 1898, Hanslik 1977, p. lxvii-lxix, De Vogüé and Neufville 1972, p. 315-351, Meyvaert 1963.

²⁵ Zelzer, 1989. For this question, see also Van der Meer, the introduction to *Glosae collectae in Regulae Benedicti* (forthcoming).

²⁶ This project was supported by the European Research Council, Starting Grant 263577 (ERC StG 263577)

²⁷ This text only presents definitions that could not be traced to other sources, gives the identified sources but not the text of these sources, and does not distinguish between first hands and later hands. For a discussion of the merits and especially problems of Lindsay's edition, see Grondeux 2011, p. 25-26.

can consider the following instance. The *Liber Glossarum* reads at IM 102: *impius – crudelis, seuus*.²⁸ The glossary reads at *Regula Benedicti* 7, 48: *IMPIETATEM, et cetera, id est crudelitatem, seuitiam*. The glossator forms nouns from the adjectives. Thus, he consciously applies his material to a new context and makes it fit within the glossary.

He also allows himself a considerable amount of liberty and creativity, for instance, when he defines at *RB* 6,6 *licentia* as *iussio* and *libertas*, which he takes from *Liber Glossarum* LI 183 *licet – ius est* and LI 185 *licet – liberum est*. The interpretation of *licentia* as *iussio* is a stretch too far. Occasionally, the glossator consciously improves the material in the *Liber Glossarum*. For example, at FI 229 the *Liber Glossarum* reads *Finis boni appellantur quo quisque, cum peruenerit, beatus est*. Our glossator changes *finis* into *fines* at *RB* 7, 21.

A few instances where the glossator does not adjust his material from the *Liber Glossarum* to the context of the *Regula Benedicti* provides irrefutable proof that our author used the *Liber Glossarum* (rather than the alternate possibility -- that the compiler of the *Liber Glossarum* mined the glossary). Below, I list five of them. I refer to different manuscripts of the *Liber Glossarum* with these sigla:

P, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 11529-11530, saec. VIII ex.

L, Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. lat. 1773, saec. IX inc.

A, Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, B 36 inf., saec. IX inc.

F, Bern, Burgerbibliothek, 16, saec. IX.

1. At *RB* 44, 1 the glossary gives the definition of *fores*: *fores dicuntur claustra quæ foras uertuntur, ianuas hostii, postica uel introitus*. The accusative of *ianuas* is grammatically problematic, but can be explained by the fact that the lemma *Liber Glossarum* FO 97 contains exactly the form *ianuas hostii*. The manuscript *P* of the *Liber Glossarum* gives *hostii* and the Vatican and Milano manuscripts (sigla *LA*) *ostii*.
2. At *RB* 1, 5 the glossary reads at the lemma *Brachium*: *manus, lacertos*. The glossator here follows the *Liber Glossarum* BR 8: *Brachia – manus, lacertos* (*PF*, *lacertus* in the other manuscripts). *Lacertus* would have been more fitting after *brachium*. The agreement of the *Glosæ* with ms *P* is noteworthy.
3. At *RB* 4, 57 the glossary of the *Glosæ* reads: *Lacrimis: Lacrimas a laceratione mentis dictas*. The accusative instead of the ablative *lacrimis* or, as often, the nominative of the normalized version, is given by the *Liber Glossarum* LA 164: *Lacrimas – quidam a laceratione mentis putant dictas, alii existimant ideo quod Greci dasria dicunt*.
4. At *RB* 13, 1 the glossary reads *extranei* after the lemma *Diebus autem priuatis*. *Extraneis* would have matched better as an explanation of *priuatis*. The glossator follows *Liber Glossarum* PR 1384: *Priuati – sunt extranei ab officiis publicis. Est enim nomen magistratum habenti contrarium, et dicti priuati quod sint ab officiis curiae absoluti*.
5. At *RB* prol. 28 the lemma *suasione* is interpreted as *conuenientia uel ortatione*. The former makes no sense, but can be explained by the fact that the *Liber Glossarum* reads at the lemmata: SV 9: *Suadent – (h)ortantur*, SV 10: *Sua praemia – conuenientia*, SV 11: *Suasit – (h)ortatus est*. The glossator of the *Glosæ* erroneously took *conuenientia* with *suasione*.

²⁸ *Seuus* is given by the corrected Milano manuscript, the others give *seruus*.

2.2. The Paris manuscripts 11529-11530 – Vorlage of the *Glosae in Regula Benedicti*?

The new online critical edition of the *Liber Glossarum* makes it possible to identify the manuscript or the family of manuscripts that was the source for the *Glosae*.²⁹ As the five instances above already have suggested, it may well have been the very oldest version of the *Liber Glossarum*, the Paris manuscript in two volumes (*P*), originally produced in Corbie, that lies at the basis of the *Glosae*. The following six instances will corroborate this claim.

1. The lemma *Corea* at CO 2123 reads in the Vatican and Milano mss: *In Greca appellatine diridatum, quod illi CARDIAN dicunt, siue a ecusa in eo enim omnis sollicitudo et scientiae causa manet (...)*. The Paris manuscript gives this definition in the version that also appears in the *Glosae* at RB 4, 1: *Cor enim a Greca appellatione diriuatur, quod illi 'cardia' dicunt, siue a cura – in eo enim omnis sollicitudo et scientie causa manet.*
2. The glossary at RB prol. 4 reads together with mss A2 and P this definition of *Oratio*: *Oratio petitio, supplicatio uel deprecatio dicitur. Constat autem oratio loco et tempore: loco, quia non ubique cum prohibeamur a Christo in publico, sed ubi oportunitas dederit aut necessitas inportauerit. Liber Glossarum OR 49 reads prohibeamus in manuscript P and A2, the corrected version of the Milano manuscript. The manuscripts L and A read proibeamus.*
3. In the same lemma in the *Glosae*, another lemma from the *Liber Glossarum* is picked up: OR 47: *Oratio dicta quasi oris ratio. Nam orare est loqui et dicere. Est autem oratio contextus uerborum consensu. Contextus autem in sensu non est oratio, quia non est oris ratio. Oratio autem plena est sensu, uoce et littera.* In this definition, manuscripts A2 and P read *sine sensu*, whereas LA read *in sensu*. The *Glosae* reads *sine sensu*.
4. The definition of *Gehenna* in the *Glosae* at RB 4, 45 (and in shorter version at RB prol. 42), taken from *Liber Glossarum* GE 11.

<i>Liber Gloss.</i> GE 11	<i>variants of the Lib. Gloss.</i>	<i>Glosae</i> at RB 4, 45 (in mss A = Valenciennes, B = Paris, and C = Augsburg)
Geenna est locus ignis et <u>sulforis</u> , quem appellari putant a ualle idolis consecrata, <u>quae</u> est iuxta murum Hierusalem, repleta olim cadaueribus mortuorum, ibi enim Hebrei filios suos immolauerunt demonibus, et appellabatur locus ipse Geennon.	<u>sulforis</u>] LP; sulfuris L2, sulphuris leg. quae] LA2P; -que A immolauerunt] LA; -arunt P demonibus] LP; -iis A Geennon] L2P; geenon LA	Gehenna est locus ignis et sulphoris quem appellari putant a ualle idolis consecrata, ^a quae est ^b iuxta murum Ierusalem ^c repleta olim cadaueribus mortuorum. Ibi enim Hebrei filios suos immolauerunt demonibus et appellabatur ^d locus ille 'Gehennon'.
Futuri ergo supplicii locus, ubi peccatores cruciandi sunt, <u>cuius</u> loci uocabulo designatur. Duplicem autem esse Geennam et ignis et sulforis .	cuius] LA; <u>uius</u> P esse Geennam et] g. e. P; geenna LA sulforis] LA; sulfuris L2, frigoris P	Futuri ergo supplicii locus, ubi peccatores cruciandi sunt, <u>huius</u> loci uocabulo designatur.

²⁹ <http://liber-glossarum.huma-num.fr/index.html>

^a *correxī cum Liber Glossarum et Isid.*, consecratā AB, congregatam C
^b quae est] quem A
^c Hierusalem B
^d appellabantur A^{a.c.}, appellatur C

The decisive point where the *Glosae* follows manuscript *P* of the *Liber Glossarum* is *huius* versus *cuius*, which is given by the Vatican and Milano manuscripts.

5. At *RB* prol. 47 the glossary follows manuscript *P* of the *Liber Glossarum* VI 440 in a long definition of the lemma *Vitia* in several variant readings:

<i>Liber Glossarum</i> VI 440	<i>variants of the Lib. Gloss.</i>	<i>Glosae</i> at <i>RB</i> prol. 47
Vitia nihil sunt. Sed ubi bonitas deest, uitium est. Omnis enim natura opus Dei est.		VITIA. Nihil sunt. Sed ubi bonitas deest, uitium est. Omnis enim natura opus Dei est.
Opera enim mala <u>que</u> <u>uitia</u> dicuntur, actus sunt, non res, quamquam per se <u>agere</u> dicuntur aliquid, cum ea et per ea totum <u>egit</u> diabolus, uel damnata dicuntur, cum ipse pro his damnatur et homo cum <u>per</u> liberum arbitrium his <u>inlectus</u> trahit <u>adsensum</u> .	que] que LP, quae A uitia] L2A2P; uita LA agere] L2P; agere LA egit] AP; aegit L, agit L2 per] LA; pro P inlectus] LP; intellectus A adsensum] LAP; assensum L2	Opera enim mala <u>que</u> <u>uitia</u> dicuntur, actus sunt, non res, quamquam per se <u>agere</u> dicuntur aliquid, cum ea et per ea totum <u>egit</u> diabolus, uel damnata dicuntur, cum ipse pro his damnatur et homo cum <u>per</u> liberum arbitrium his <u>inlectus</u> trahit <u>adsensum</u> .
Et ideo in futuro saeculo non erunt uitia <u>que</u> in auctore suo diabolo damnabuntur, cum <u>ille</u> scilicet damnatus <u>in gehenna</u> , ut peccent homines, amplius potestatem hęc agere non habebit.	que] que L; quae L2, qui AP ille] LAP2; om. P in gehenna] P; intenta L, intenta poena L2	Et ideo in futuro saeculo non erunt uitia <u>que</u> in auctore suo diabolo damnabuntur, cum <u>ille</u> scilicet damnatus <u>in gehenna</u> , ut peccent homines, amplius potestatem hęc agere non habebit.

The *Glosae* agrees here with ms *P* of the *Liber Glossarum* in these words: *uitia* (instead of *uita* LA), *agere* (instead of *ageret* LA), *egit* (AP, *aegit* L, *agit* L2), *inlectus* (LP, *intellectus* A) and *in Gehenna* (instead of *intenta* LA or *intenta poena* L2). The words *per*, *que*, and *ille* differ from this pattern: they give readings disagreeing with ms *P* (*pro*, *qui* and *om.*) and agreeing L (*per*, *que*, *ille*) and/or A (*per*, *qui*, *ille*). The agreements with *P*, however, outweigh the disagreements.³⁰

6. The *Glosae* gives the lemma *Antiphona* at *RB* 9, 3 and reads exactly with ms *P* of the *Liber Glossarum* AN 424: ‘*Antiphona*’ *ex Greco, interpretatur (Latine add. B) ‘uox reciproca’, duobus scilicet alternatim psallentibus ordine commutato, quod genus psallendi Greci inuenisse traduntur. Apud Latinos autem inprimitus beatissimus Ambrosius antiphonas instituit.* The underlined words appear in ms A of the *Liber Glossarum* as: *reciproga, scilicet coris, ordinem*.
7. The definition of *peccator* in the *Glosae* at *RB* prol. 38 is: *Peccator dicitur qui propria actione fedatur et Domini precepta transgreditur peccando.* The lemma PE 6 in the *Liber Glossarum* reads instead of *propria actione: patratione*, whereas Isidore *Differentiae* I 86 (298)³¹ – from which this definition stems – reads *praua actione*. Manuscript *P* of

³⁰ See for the source of this lemma in Pseudo-Augustine’s *Hypomnesticon*, Grondeux 2015, p. 65.

³¹ Codoñer 1992, p. 126.

the *Liber Glossarum* reads here *pro actione*, the form that is closest to the *propria* of the *Glosae*.³²

It is safe to say that the compiler of the *Glosae in Regula Benedicti* used the Paris manuscript of the *Liber Glossarum* or a version that closely approximated it. The correspondences between the *Glosae* and manuscript *P* confirm the thesis that the *Glosae* was composed somewhere in northern Francia and also allows for the hypothesis that the text was written at the very site where the Paris codices were kept. Written in the so-called ‘a-b’ minuscule, it may have been produced at Corbie, or, as McKitterick suggests, at Soissons, Chelles or Jouarre.³³ Thus, the *Glosae* can contribute to reconstructions of networks of monasteries, their libraries, and the agents and routes of communication.³⁴

3. SMARAGDUS’ USE OF THE *GLOSAE*’S *LIBER GLOSSARUM*-MATERIAL

The glossary in the *Glosae* forms the link that connects Smaragdus’ *Expositio* with the *Liber Glossarum*. In other words, Smaragdus took his lexical material in his *Expositio* not directly from the *Liber Glossarum*, but mediated through the *Glosae*. Smaragdus does not give lexical material in his *Expositio* that does not come from the *Glosae*. Roughly estimated, a quarter of the glossary material and two thirds of the florilegium text have found their way into Smaragdus’ *Expositio*. Both the glossary and the florilegium comment on the prologue and first through seventh chapters of the *Regula Benedicti* in detail and gloss briefly over the remaining text of the Rule.

The comparison of the *Glosae* with the *Expositio* can help us better understand the way in which ninth-century scholars worked. Seldom before have we been able to study so closely the process of selection and rephrasing in the construction of a text. The *Glosae* allows us to get a sense of the specific linguistic, pedagogical, and theological concerns behind Smaragdus’ *Expositio* and can contribute to understanding the nature of this highly elusive man – an author who, so far as we can tell, left hardly any personal trace in his works.³⁵ There are three types of textual evidence that point at Smaragdus’ dependence on the *Glosae*, listed here in incremental order: first, Smaragdus gives definitions from the *Liber Glossarum* in exactly the same order as they are given in the *Glosae*. Second, he adapts quotations from Isidore of Seville that he can only have taken from the *Liber Glossarum*, since they deviate from the text given by Isidore himself. Third, Smaragdus gives readings that deviate from the *Liber Glossarum/Isidore* as a result of errors in the *Glosae*. The definition of *corpus* at *RB* 4, 11 may serve as a case in the first two points.

³² P, f. 121v, <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8454685v/f248.item.r=Liber%20glossarum.zoom>

³³ McKitterick 2012, p. 44.

³⁴ Anne Grondeux has explored the network between Reichenau and northern France that was conducive to the distribution of the *Liber Glossarum*, cfr Grondeux 2015, p. 79-93.

³⁵ Important contributions to the question about the identity of Smaragdus have been made by Raedle 1974 and Ponesse 2010.

Isidore	<i>Liber Glossarum</i>	<i>Glosae</i> (at RB 4, 11)	Smaragdus (<i>Exp.</i> p. 94, l. 29 – p. 95 l. 3)
Corpus eo quod corruptum perit. Solubile enim atque mortale est (<i>Etym.</i> 11, 1, 14; <i>Diff. I</i> 371 [116])	Corpus – dictum a corruptione (CO 2301) Corpus – eo quod corruptum perit. Solubile enim atque mortale est (CO 2300)	Corpus dictum a corruptione, eo quod corruptum perit. Solubile enim atque mortale est,	Corpus dictum a corruptione, eo quod corruptum pereat . Solubile enim, caducum atque mortale est.
Inter corripere, obiurgare et castigare hoc interest: corripimus uerberibus, obiurgamus uerbis, castigamus caedibus et uerberibus (<i>Diff. I</i> 209 [96])	Inter corripere, obiurgare et castigare hoc interest: corripimus uerberibus, obiurgamus uerbis, castigamus cedibus (CA 863) Inter corripere, obiurgare et castigare hoc interest: corripimus uerberibus, obiurgamus uerbis, castigamus cedimus (CO 2221) castigare – emendare, corripere (CA 866)	quod castigare oportet, id est emendare, corripere, ieiuniis affligere et, si necesse est, uerberibus cedere . Castigare enim dicimus cedere , sicut de Domino Pilatus ait: Et castigatum dimittam eum.	Quod nos castigare oportet, id est ieiuniis emendare, affligere, atque corrigere, et si necesse fuerit etiam uerberibus caedere. Castigare enim dicimus caedere , sicut de domino Pilato ait: Castigatum eum dimittam.

Here we see that the order of definitions in the *Glosae* taken from the *Liber Glossarum* is adopted by Smaragdus. Smaragdus also changes the mood of a verb and adds some words. Most interesting, however, is the fact that Smaragdus defines *castigare* as *caedere* – a not altogether absurd interpretation, although *caedere* (to hit, strike, kill) has certainly much more force than *castigare* (chastise, punish, reprove, correct). Isidore also puts *castigare* in relation with *caedibus* ('with beatings'). The association of *castigare* with *caedere*, however, may well be mediated by *Liber Glossarum* CO 2221, which gives *cedimus* where we, on the basis of Isidore, would expect *cedibus*.

There are many more instances of Smaragdus' interpreting lemmata in the same order as the *Glosae*. For instance, at RB 4, 60 the *Glosae* read: *VOLVNTATEM PROPRIAM, id est priuatam, uerniculam uel singulariter suam*. The *Glosae* gives the definitions from the *Liber Glossarum* PR 2677, PR 2683, and PR 2679. Smaragdus follows this order (excluding, however, *uerniculam*) when he writes (*Exp.* p. 138 l. 13-14): *Propriam dicit, id est priuatam uel singulariter suam*.

Another example: at RB 4, 69 the *Glosae* read: *ELATIONEM FVGERE, id est iactantiam, audaciam, fidutiam, confidentiam uel temeritatem*. Here the author of the *Glosae* follows the entries in *Liber Glossarum* EL 26 and 27: *iactantia, audacia*, AE 104: *fidutia*, and EL 28: *confidentia, temeritas*. Smaragdus (*Exp.* p. 143, l. 24-25) writes: *Elatio dicitur iactantia mentis et audacia cordis, confidentia uirtutum uel temeritas et tumor cordium*.

The strongest indication that Smaragdus used the *Glosae* is the third point mentioned above: Smaragdus seems to have modified the source-text because of a difficulty in the *Glosae*. I list here two instances of this kind.

First, at RB 53, 22 we read the word *strati*. In the *Liber Glossarum* it is defined as: *Stratus ab sternendo dictus, quasi storiatus. In his solis antiqui ad dormiendum ad cubabant, nondum laneis stramentis repertis. Storia quod sit terra*

strata. The glossary reproduces verbatim the first sentence, but omits part of the second, significantly changing, if not distorting, the content. Smaragdus paraphrases the sentence so that the text is further removed from the original but makes sense (again).

<i>Liber Gloss.</i> ST 306 (=Isidore, <i>Etymologies</i> 20, 11, 1)	<i>Glosae</i> at RB 53, 22	Smar. <i>Exp.</i> p. 283, l. 12-15
Stratus ab sternendo dictus, quasi storiatus. In his solis antiqui ad dormiendum ad cubabant, nondum laneis stramentis repertis. Storia quod sit terra strata.	Strati ab sternendo dicti quasi 'storiati'. In his solis antiqui ad dormiendum (dormiendi A) laniis stramentis reperti sunt	Ab sternendo enim lecti strati dicuntur. Strati quasi storiati; storia enim dicitur quod nos mattam vel nattam dicimus. In his autem solis antiqui monachi dormire solebant et his solis lectulos suos sternebant.

Second, at RB 1, 5, the glossary cites from the *Liber Glossarum* but does so incorrectly. It omits some of Isidore's words (underlined) *Pugna uocata eo quod initio usum fuisset in bello pugnīs contendere uel quia primo bellum pugnīs incipiebant*. Smaragdus straightens the incomprehensible wobble in the glossary by rendering: *Pugna uocata, eo quod primitus in bello pugnīs praeliare incipiebant*.

<i>Liber Gloss.</i> PV 99 (=Isidore, <i>Etym.</i> 18, 1, 10)	<i>Glosae</i> at RB 1, 5	Smar. <i>Exp.</i> p. 57, l.19-20
Pugna uocata eo quod initio usum fuisset in bello pugnīs contendere uel quia primo bellum pugnīs incipiebant.	Pugna uocata eo quod initio usum fuisset in bello pugnīs incipiebant.	Pugna uocata, eo quod primitus in bello pugnīs praeliare incipiebant.

The quotation in the glossary stands nearer to Isidore than Smaragdus' text does, as can be seen from the word *initio*. But Smaragdus rightly adds *praeliare* so as to fill the lacuna of the missing infinitive in the quotation in the glossary.

CONCLUSION

The *Glosae in regula Benedicti* is a text that is relevant both from a philological and from a historical perspective. Of philological interest are the textual dependencies between *Liber Glossarum*, *Glosae de diuersis doctoribus collectae in regula Benedicti abbatis*, and Smaragdus' *Expositio in regulam S. Benedicti*. In fact, the *Glosae* may well be the oldest text that bears witness to the reception of the *Liber Glossarum*. If we assume that the *Liber Glossarum* was composed around 790CE, the *Glosae* could have been written within a time span of up to thirty years thereafter. It is not unthinkable that a detailed analysis of Smaragdus' use of the *Glosae* can help us determine more closely the date of its construction, considering the fact that the decrees of the Aachen councils are a point of reference in Smaragdus' *Expositio*. Since the *Glosae* does not contain any reference to them, it may date from before 816. More study is needed, however, to corroborate this.

The *Glosae* can help us to understand how the Carolingian monastic reformers tried to bridge the cultural gap between the monastic institutions and practices of their day and those of the *Regula Benedicti* itself – a text, after all, written two centuries before the Carolingian era. By analyzing how the *Glosae* provides an interpretation of the *Regula Benedicti*, we may get closer to answering

the question of why the Carolingians deemed this text more suitable than all the other rules as a universal guideline for monastic life.

Moreover, the *Glosae in Regula Benedicti* – with both its glossary and its florilegium – gives us insight in the transmission of knowledge from the monastic scriptorium to the monastic classroom. They show that within a culture that tried to collect, order, harmonize and systematize as much knowledge as possible, productive combinations of genres could duplicate knowledge, or, in other words, “kill two birds with one stone”. The normative and spiritual text of the *Regula Benedicti* is used here as a funnel for Latin lexical and grammatical knowledge. The *Rule* is an authoritative text and, as such, an object of study, and at the same time it is a tool to communicate lexical and grammatical knowledge. The lengths to which Carolingian scholars went collecting and ordering their knowledge in voluminous compendia like the *Liber Glossarum* -- and subsequently transmitting this knowledge to young students in texts like the *Glosae* – effectively laid the foundations for the bloom of intellectual life that we now call the Carolingian Renaissance.

REFERENCES

Primary sources

- Admonitio Generalis* – *Die Admonitio Generalis Karls des Grossen*, ed. H. Mordek, K. Zechiel-Eckes, M. Glatthaar, Hannover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 2012 (Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Fontes Iuris Germanici Antiqui in usum scholarum separatim editi 16).
- Benedictus, *Regula*, ed. R. Hanslik, Vienna, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1960 (Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 75). Also as *La règle de Saint Benoît*, ed. A. De Vogüé and J. Neufville, Paris, 1972 (*Sources Chrétiennes* 181, 1).
- Benedictus Anianensis, *Concordia Regularum* (ca. 800), ed. P. Bonnerue, Turnhout, Brepols, 1999 (Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 168).
- Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui 1. Catalogi saeculo XIII uetustiores*, ed. G. H. Becker, Bonn, Cohen, 1885.
- Concilium Leudegarii episcopi Augustodunensi* (ca. 663-675), 15, ed. F. Maassen, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Leges, 3, Concilia I, Concilia Aevi Merovingici*, Hannover, 1893, 221.
- Glosae Augienses – Die Reichenauer Glossen. Teil 1. Einleitung, Text, vollständiger Index und Konkordanzen*, ed. H.-W. Klein, München, M. Huber, 1968.
- Glosae Leidenses* – The Leiden Glosses on the *Regula Benedicti* in ms Leiden, Vossius latinus Q. 69, f. 20r-36ra – ed. A. Masser, *Lateinische und althochdeutsche Glossierungen der Regula Benedicti im 8. und 9. Jahrhundert*, Innsbruck, 2008, p. 45-58.
- Glosae Fuldenses* – The Fulda glosses on the *Regula Benedicti* in ms Fulda, Hessische Landesbibliothek Aa 2, f. 130v-136r – ed. A. Masser, *Lateinische und althochdeutsche Glossierungen der Regula Benedicti im 8. und 9. Jahrhundert*, Innsbruck, 2008, p. 67-70.
- Hildemarus, *Expositio Regulae* (ca. 843), ed. A. Diem (e.a.), 2014, at www.hildemar.org
- Supersedes in *Expositio Regulae ab Hildemaro tradita*, ed. R. Mittermüller, Regensburg, Pustet, 1888.
- Isidoro de Sevilla, *Diferencias. Libro I*, ed. C. Codoñer, Paris, Les belles lettres, 1992 (Auteurs latins du Moyen Âge 8).
- Karoli epistola de litteris colendis*, ed. A. Boretius, Hannover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1883, 79-79 (Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Legum sectio II, Capitularia regum Francorum 1, 29).
- Liber Glossarum*, ed. A. Grondeux, 2016, at <http://liber-glossarum.huma-num.fr>
- Supersedes W. M. Lindsay, J.-F. Mountford, J. Whatmough, F. Rees, R. Weir, M. Laistner (ed.), *Glossaria Latina, Iussu Academiae Britannicae edita, 1, Glossarium Ansileubi siue librum glossarum*, Paris, 1926, reprint Hildesheim, 2007.
- Smaragdus, *Expositio in regulam S. Benedicti* (ca. 820), ed. A. Spannagel and P. Engelbert, Siegburg, F. Schmitt 1974 (Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum 8).

Statuta Murbacensia (Actuum praeliminarium synodi primae Aquisgranensis commentatio siue Statuta Murbacensia), ed. J. Semmler, Siegburg, F. Schmitt, 1963 (Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum 1).

Secondary literature

- Bischoff, Bernhard, 1982. « Die ältesten Handschriften der Regula S. Benedicti in Bayern », *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktinerordens und seiner Zweige* 92, 7-16.
- Bishop, Terence Alan Martyn, 1978. « The prototype of Liber Glossarum », M. B. Parkes and A. G. Watson (ed.), *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts & Libraries. Essays presented to N. R. Kerr*, London, Scholar Press, 69-84.
- Brown, Giles, 1994. « Introduction: The Carolingian Renaissance », *Carolingian Culture. Emulation and Innovation*, ed. R. McKitterick, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1-51.
- Cinato, Franck, 2015. « Prolégomène à une catalogue du *Liber Glossarum*. I. fragments, tradition directe et indirecte », *Dossier HEL 8. L'activité lexicographique dans le haut Moyen Âge latin. Rencontre autour du Liber Glossarum (suite)*, 15-35.
- Claussen, Martin, 2015. « Reims, Bibliothèque Carnegie, 806: a little-known manuscript of Benedict of Aniane's Concordia regularum », *Early Medieval Europe* 23, 1, 1-42.
- Contreni, John J., 2014. « Learning for God. Education in the Carolingian Age », *Journal of Medieval Latin* 24, 89-124.
- Delisle, Léopold, 1874. *Cabinet des manuscrits de la bibliothèque nationale*, 2, Paris, Imprimerie nationale.
- Diem, Albrecht, 2016. « The Carolingians and the *Regula Benedicti* », D. van Espelo (ed.), *Religious Franks. Religion and Power in the Frankish Kingdoms: Studies in honour of Mayke de Jong*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 231-251.
- Diem, Albrecht, 1998. « The Emergence of Monastic Schools. The Role of Alcuin », L. A. J. R. Houwen and Alasdair A. McDonald (ed.), *Alcuin of York. Scholar at the Carolingian Court*, Groningen, Egbert Forsten, 27-44 (Mediaevalia Groningana 2).
- Engelbert, Pius, 2015. « Benedikt von Aniane und der Codex regularum Clm 28118 der bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München », *Studia Monastica* 57, p. 69-90.
- Ganz, David, 1993. « The Liber Glossarium: a Carolingian encyclopaedia », *Science in Western and Eastern Civilization in Carolingian Times*, ed. P. L. Butzer, D. Lohrmann, Basel / Boston, Birkhäuser Verlag, 127-135.
- Gehrt, Wolf, 1999. *Die Handschriften der Staats- und Stadtbibliothek Augsburg*, 6: 4 Cod. 1-150, Wiesbaden, Harrasowitz Verlag.
- Grondeux, Anne, 2011. « Le *Liber glossarum* (VIII^e siècle). Prolégomènes à une nouvelle édition », *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 69, 23-51.
- Grondeux, Anne, 2015. « Stemma provisoire de la tradition manuscrite du *Liber Glossarum* », *Dossier HEL 8. L'activité lexicographique dans le haut Moyen Âge latin. Rencontre autour du Liber Glossarum (suite)*, 5-10.
- Grondeux, Anne, 2015. « Note sur la présence de l'Hypomnesticon pseudo-augustinien dans le *Liber Glossarum* », *Les Dossiers d'HEL 8. L'activité lexicographique dans le haut Moyen Âge latin. Rencontre autour du Liber Glossarum (suite)*, 59-78.
- Grondeux, Anne, 2015. « Le rôle de Reichenau dans la diffusion du *Liber Glossarum* », *Dossier HEL 8. L'activité lexicographique dans le haut Moyen Âge latin. Rencontre autour du Liber Glossarum (suite)*, 79-93.
- Huglo, Michel, 2001. « Les arts libéraux dans le *Liber Glossarum* », *Scriptorium* 55, 3-33.
- Jong, Mayke de, 1995. « Carolingian Monasticism: the Power of Prayer », *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 2: c. 700-c. 900, ed. R. McKitterick, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 622-653 and 995-1002.
- Knoblich, Isabel, 1996. « Die Bibliothek des Klosters St. Maximin bei Trier bis zum 12. Jahrhundert », Trier, Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier.
- Lapidge, Michael, 1982. « The Study of Latin Texts in Late Anglo-Saxon England: The Evidence of Latin Glosses », N. Brooks (ed.), *Latin and the Vernacular Languages in Early Medieval Britain*, Leicester, Leicester University Press, 99-140.
- McKitterick, Rosamond, 1989. *The Carolingians and the Written Word*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- McKitterick, Rosamond, 2012. « Glossaries and other innovations in Carolingian Book production », E. Kwakkel (ed.), *Turning Over a New Leaf. Change and Development in the Medieval Book*, Leiden, Leiden University Press, 21-76, 169-193.

- Meyvaert, Paul, 1963. « Towards a History of The Textual Transmission of the *Regula S. Benedicti* », *Scriptorium: Revue internationale des études relative aux manuscrits* 17, 83-106.
- Paniagua, David, 2015. « Nuevas aportaciones acerca del Glossarium Bruxellense (Bruxelles, Bibl. roy. 10.615-10729 ff. 95v-96r) », *Dossiers d'HEL* 8, 97-110.
- Ponessa, Matthew D. 2010. « Editorial practice in Smaragdus of St Mihiel's commentary on the Rule of St Benedict », *Early Medieval Europe* 18, 61-91.
- Rädle, Fidel, 1974. *Studien zu Smaragd von Saint-Mihiel*, München, W. Fink.
- Semmler, Josef, 1983. « Benedictus II: una regula - una consuetudo », *Benedictine Culture 750-1050*, ed. W. Lourdaux, D. Verhelst, Leuven, Leuven University Press, 1-49 (Mediaevalia Lovaniensia 1 / studia 11).
- Teeuwen, Marieken J., 2009. « Glossing in Close Co-operation: Examples from Ninth-Century Martianus Capella Manuscripts », R. H. Bremmer and K. Dekker (ed.), *Practice in Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*, Paris, Leuven, Walpole, MA, Peeters, 85-100 (Mediaevalia Groningana New Series 16).
- Teeuwen, Marieken J., 2011. « Marginal Scholarship. Rethinking the Function of Latin Glosses in Early Medieval Manuscripts », P. Lendinara and L. Lazzari (ed.), *Rethinking and Recontextualizing Glosses. New Perspectives in the Study of Late Anglo-Saxon Glossography* 54, Turnhout, Brepols, 19-37.
- Traube, Ludwig, 1889. *Textgeschichte der Regula S. Benedicti*, München, 1898 (Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Historische Klasse 21, 9).
- Wieland, Gernot, 1975. « A Canterbury classbook of the mid-eleventh century (the 'Cambridge Songs' manuscript) », *Anglo-Saxon England* 4, 113-130.
- Zelzer, Klaus, 1989. « Von Benedikt zu Hildemar. Zu Textgestalt der Regula Benedicti auf dem Weg zur Alleingang », *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 23, 112-130.

