



**HAL**  
open science

# Notes on the Text of the Twelfth-Century Cluniac Relatio metrica de duobus ducibus

Jérémy Delmulle

► **To cite this version:**

Jérémy Delmulle. Notes on the Text of the Twelfth-Century Cluniac Relatio metrica de duobus ducibus. *The Journal of Medieval Latin*, 2024, 34, pp.71-100. 10.1484/J.JML.5.136327. hal-03919481

**HAL Id: hal-03919481**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03919481v1>**

Submitted on 12 Aug 2024

**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.

# Notes on the Text of the Twelfth-Century Cluniac *Relatio metrica de duobus ducibus\**

JÉRÉMY DELMULLE

*Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes, Paris*

The abundant hagiographic production related to the origins of the abbey of Cluny and its first abbots includes several legends regarding the fourth of them, Maiolus, soon honoured as a saint and as a founder of the Order.<sup>1</sup> Among these is an account which tradition attributes to St. Maiolus himself, and which narrates an important episode of his life, namely the conflict between two dukes, the Sicilian Ostorgius and the Sardinian Eusebius: while the troops of Ostorgius were besieging the city of Eusebius and had taken Maiolus prisoner, the Sardinian duke gathered an army too weak and few in number to prevail against the opponent, but received the providential help of an army of 60,000 dead people in the guise of white riders, who allowed the Sardinians to achieve victory; these riders, it is learned after the battle, were none other than the souls of the dead who had been delivered from purgatory. An abridged version of this story, which testifies to the pivotal role of Cluny in the history of purgatory and the cult of the dead in the Middle Ages, enjoyed wide circulation in the Middle Ages, having been included in numerous collections of Cistercian *exempla*; a long version, which a final analysis shows to be the original one, still lacks a critical edition and has so far received little attention from scholars.<sup>2</sup>

This *exemplum* gave rise to at least two early versified retellings. One of them, entitled *De conflictu duorum ducum et animarum mirabili revelatione ac de milite captivo per salutarem hostiam liberato*, authored by the Liège monk Renier of St. Lawrence (d. 1188), was firstly edited in 1723 by Dom Bernhard Pez in his *Thesaurus Anecdotorum Novissimus* from a transcription sent to him by the librarian of the abbey of St. Lawrence, Dom Célestin Lombard.<sup>3</sup>

---

\* I am grateful to Sébastien Barret, Isabelle Cochelin, and Thomas Falmagne for their helpful comments on a previous draft of this article, and to Gregory Hays for his thorough reading, his stimulating suggestions, and his revision of my English.

<sup>1</sup> On Cluniac hagiographic productions in general, and that of Cluny's abbots in particular, see the historiographic assessments made by Dominique Iogna-Prat, *Études clunisiennes* (Paris, 2002), pp. 35–74: “Panorama de l’hagiographie abbatiale clunisienne”; and most recently, Steven Vanderputten, “Imagining Early Cluny in Abbatial Biographies,” in *A Companion to the Abbey of Cluny in the Middle Ages*, ed. Scott G. Bruce and Steven Vanderputten (Leiden – Boston, 2022), pp. 105–24. The first *Vitae* of St. Maiolus (*BHL* 5177–5180) are studied (with an edition of *BHL* 5179) by Dominique Iogna-Prat, *Agni immaculati: Recherches sur les sources hagiographiques relatives à saint Maieul de Cluny (954–994)* (Paris, 1988).

<sup>2</sup> This text as well as the following one, considered by some manuscripts as a series of *miracula* or as a unique *miraculum*, are absent from repertories like the *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina* and Iogna-Prat, “Panorama” (who mentions, however, p. 46, the poem to be discussed in the following as being “on the margins of the hagiographic genre”). The *versio longior* of the prose *Relatio* can be read in a “working edition” published as an appendix to the volume under examination: Christopher A. Jones and Scott G. Bruce, *The Relatio metrica de duobus ducibus: A Twelfth-Century Cluniac Poem on Prayer for the Dead* (Turnhout, 2016), pp. 173–80; on the text, its transmission and history, see especially the Introduction to the same volume, pp. 9–16.

<sup>3</sup> Bernhard Pez, *Thesaurus Anecdotorum Novissimus, seu Veterum Monumentorum, Præcipue Ecclesiasticorum, Ex Germanicis potissimum Bibliothecis adornata Collectio recentissima*, Tomus IV (Augsburg, 1723), pars III, coll. 109–20 (= PL 204:79–90). This work of 506 verses comprises two books, the first of which is devoted to the *exemplum* of Eusebius and Ostorgius; see Peter Dinzelbacher, “Reiner von Lüttich,” in *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, 14 vols. (Berlin – New York, 1978–), 7:1165–69, at 1166. On the genesis of Pez’s edition of Renier’s works, see Hubert Silvestre, “Notes concernant la première édition des œuvres de Renier de Saint-Laurent: Deux lettres de dom C. Lombard à dom B. Pez,” *Revue Bénédictine* 60 (1950), 208–14; Christine Glassner, “Der ‘Thesaurus Anecdotorum Novissimus’ des Melker Benediktiners Bernhard Pez,” *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktinerordens und seiner Zweige* 113 (2002), 341–70, at p. 354.

But there exists a second, anonymous verse version of the *Relatio*, which can reasonably be dated to the twelfth century – so slightly earlier than the first one – which had remained unpublished until a few years ago, when in 2016 the subsidia series of the present journal printed its *editio princeps*, prepared by Christopher A. Jones and Scott G. Bruce, under the title *Relatio metrica de duobus ducibus*.<sup>4</sup> Of this long poem of 827 – mostly Leonine – verses, the two scholars have established the Latin text from the only surviving medieval manuscript, now preserved in Charleville-Mézières, and have provided an English translation, together with an ample and detailed introduction and a rich and very valuable line-by-line commentary, both of which shed light on the less obvious aspects of this literary work. The reviewers of the volume have rightly underlined the great interest of this publication, which had not only the merit of making an – if not literarily, at least historically – important, and almost completely forgotten text known to the scholarly community,<sup>5</sup> but also of offering a clear and easy-to-read English translation of a far from simple Latin text.<sup>6</sup> Nevertheless, none of the reviewers I am aware of have brought their attention to the establishment of the Latin text in itself.

Any *editio princeps* invites remarks and discussion; and this one perhaps even more than others. Firstly, because the edition is based on only one manuscript and because the text of the Charleville-Mézières manuscript is, by the admission of the editors, not perfect in every respect, they had to intervene in several places (totalling twenty-three) to emend the text and to put forward conjectures, most of them very astute and welcome; elsewhere, they have assumed a lacuna and there remain two *loci desperati* which are open to debate. Secondly, the edition is affected by more misreadings than could be expected from a single-witness-based text, which it is therefore necessary to rectify.<sup>7</sup> Thirdly, the editors were unaware of the existence of a second witness of the *Relatio*, independent of the Charleville manuscript, which makes it possible in places to improve the text. This new witness is not as helpful as one might wish, being both fragmentary and altered, but it can be used to confirm several of the conjectures which were proposed by the editors and presents some other variants worthy of examination; above all, it makes it possible to consider more broadly the history of the text's transmission. In the following pages, I will present this new witness, and then propose a series of critical notes and remarks on the text of the manuscripts in order to emend the text of the edition or to supplement its apparatus.

### *The Manuscript Tradition*

The manuscript tradition of the *Relatio* is definitely a very thin one, but its medieval circulation was not limited to the single manuscript used for the edition. A more complete survey of the

---

<sup>4</sup> Jones and Bruce, *The Relatio metrica*. On this poem, see also Scott G. Bruce, “Cluny and the Crusades,” in *A Companion to the Abbey of Cluny*, pp. 306–21, at 317–19.

<sup>5</sup> See Hans Walther, *Initia Carminum ac Versuum Medii Aevi Posterioris Latinorum: Alphabetisches Verzeichnis der Versanfänge mittellateinischer Dichtungen* (Göttingen, 1959), no. 2473. The poem had already been drawn attention to by André Wilmart, “Poèmes de Gautier de Châtillon dans un manuscrit de Charleville,” *Revue Bénédictine* 49 (1937), 121–69 and 322–65, at p. 123 and Addendum pp. 168–69.

<sup>6</sup> See, among others, Justin Lake, in *The Medieval Review* 23/06/2017: <<https://scholarworks.iu.edu/journals/index.php/tmr/article/view/23805/29504>>; Timothy Baker, in *Sehepunkte* 18/5 (2018) <<http://www.sehepunkte.de/2018/05/30731.html>>; Pascale Bourgain, in *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale, X<sup>e</sup>–XII<sup>e</sup> siècles* 58/232bis (2015), 504–6; Franz Neiske, in *Francia-Recensio* 2018 <<https://doi.org/10.11588/frrec.2018.3.51767>>; Jay Rubenstein, in *The Journal of Medieval Latin* 28 (2018), 355–58; Sébastien Barret, in *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 54 (2019), 343–45; Johan Belaen, in *Le Moyen Âge* 126 (2020), 404–6; and Michael Edward Moore, in *Speculum* 96 (2021), 833–34.

<sup>7</sup> The critical text of the *Relatio* was prepared by the editors using microfilm images of the manuscript (see Jones and Bruce, *The Relatio metrica*, p. 71), digitized reproductions of which are now available online on IRHT's *Bibliothèque Virtuelle des Manuscrits Médiévaux* (<<https://bvmm.irht.cnrs.fr>>). An examination of the manuscript itself would have made it easier to read certain passages as seen below.

text's witnesses should include not only the manuscript known to Jones and Bruce, but one modern copy of it from the 17<sup>th</sup> century as well as some evidence about another, independent medieval manuscript, which has since been lost.

The only preserved medieval manuscript, called **C** by the editors, is the extant Charleville-Mézières, Médiathèque Voyelles, MS 190; it has already been described in detail several times.<sup>8</sup> This codex, dated to the end of the twelfth century or the first years of the thirteenth and produced in a scriptorium in Eastern France,<sup>9</sup> comes from the Cistercian abbey of Notre-Dame at Signy. It gathers, in addition to some texts in prose related to hagiographic legends and the itinerary genre (including the *Vita Barlaam et Iosaphat*, the *Translatio sancti Iacobi apostoli*, and Bede's *De locis sanctis*), a "kind of poetic anthology"<sup>10</sup> containing especially compositions by Hildebert of Lavardin, or attributed to him, and others by Walter of Châtillon; the poem under consideration constitutes the first piece of this poetic collection: it occupies fols. 144ra–149vb and is given the title *Ex relatione s. Maioli abbatis de duobus ducibus*.

A new witness of the poem, not previously reported, is found in the archives of the Benedictine abbey of Melk in Austria, under the shelfmark Melk, Stiftsarchiv, MS Karton 7 Patres 10, Faszikel 3, Nr. 2; I will call it **M**. It is a seventeenth-century, unfortunately incomplete copy of an obviously medieval exemplar, which transmits the poem under a title identical to that of the Charleville-Mézières, MS 190.<sup>11</sup> Only twelve 31/34-line pages are preserved, which contain a little less than half of the poem (from line 1 to line 393 *ululatus*); but the document, if it was a complete copy of the poem, must originally have contained twenty-six pages. One can distinguish two hands: the first one transcribed most of the preserved text (lines 1–384; pp. 1–12), while the second one was only responsible for nine of these lines (lines 385–393; p. 12), the rest being lost. Neither of these two copyists has yet been identified, nor has the person responsible for some additions, corrections, or conjectures made to the manuscript by a hand closely contemporary with the first two (**M**<sup>2</sup>), who intervened in a bolder script and slightly lighter ink and who must also have paginated the document. The most likely scenario is that this transcription was made by a non-German transcriber and then sent, like the one by Dom Lombard mentioned above, to the Pez brothers for publication; however, it seems that the text was never prepared for printing.<sup>12</sup> It is because it was mistakenly catalogued as Lombard's transcription of Renier of St. Lawrence's poem on the same subject<sup>13</sup> that this manuscript has not received attention until now.

To these two witnesses, another manuscript must be added: although now lost, it is attested by an old library catalog and was still part of the book collection of the Cistercian abbey of Orval (Belgium, in the Gaume region) in the seventeenth century; it will be called **α**.<sup>14</sup> The

---

<sup>8</sup> Jules Quicherat, in *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques des départements*, vol. 5 (Paris, 1879), pp. 627–29; Wilmart, "Poèmes de Gautier"; Joseph van der Straeten, *Les manuscrits hagiographiques de Charleville, Verdun et Saint-Mihiel avec plusieurs textes inédits* (Bruxelles, 1974), pp. 31–32; Colette Jeudy and Yves-François Riou, *Les manuscrits classiques latins des bibliothèques publiques de France*, vol. 1: *Agen-Évreux* (Paris, 1989), pp. 419–22; Jones and Bruce, *The Relatio metrica*, pp. 16–18.

<sup>9</sup> See for this matter Jeudy and Riou, *Les manuscrits classiques*, p. 419, whose opinion is shared by the editors.

<sup>10</sup> Wilmart, "Poèmes de Gautier," p. 122.

<sup>11</sup> A digital copy of the manuscript is available online at <[https://arche.acdh.oeaw.ac.at/browser/oeaw\\_detail/427918](https://arche.acdh.oeaw.ac.at/browser/oeaw_detail/427918)>.

<sup>12</sup> An overview of the history of the constitution and content of this collection is in Christine Glassner, *Neuzeitliche Handschriften aus dem Nachlass der Brüder Bernhard und Hieronymus Pez in der Bibliothek des Benediktinerstiftes Melk* (Vienna, 2008), "Einleitung," pp. 7–14. On the relationships between German and French Benedictines in the first half of the eighteenth century, see Thomas Wallnig, *Critical Monks: The German Benedictines, 1680–1740* (Leiden – Boston, 2019), pp. 102–10.

<sup>13</sup> See the very brief description available online with the digital copy of the manuscript at <[https://arche.acdh.oeaw.ac.at/browser/oeaw\\_detail/427918](https://arche.acdh.oeaw.ac.at/browser/oeaw_detail/427918)>.

<sup>14</sup> On the history of the Orval library and its dispersal, see above all Thomas Falmagne, *Die Orvaler Handschriften bis zum Jahr 1628 in den Beständen der Bibliothèque nationale de Luxembourg und des Grand Séminaire de*

catalog of the abbey's manuscripts – drawn up, at the latest, in 1673 by the French Cistercian Dom Jacques de Lannoy and included in the *Catalogus catalogorum* compiled by Charles Le Tonnelier, librarian of the abbey of St. Victor in Paris – describes, under no. 55, a collection of mostly hagiographic works containing a text referred to by exactly the same title found in **C** and **M**: *Ex relatione S. Maioli abbatis de duobus ducibus*.<sup>15</sup> The identity of this text with the poem of Charleville-Mézières, MS 190, pointed out long ago,<sup>16</sup> has been overlooked by the recent editors. Little else is known about this manuscript, but its age can be roughly estimated from the fact that it is cited as having been used in the mid-thirteenth century by the chronicler Aegidius of Orval.<sup>17</sup> It is therefore likely to be dated to the first decades of the scriptorium's activity, between the end of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth century.

What can be determined about the relationship of these manuscripts? In addition to being incomplete by the loss of its end, the Melk manuscript is a rather mediocre, untidy copy made by an inattentive or distracted copyist, judging by the number of crossings-out and emendations: there are many careless mistakes, some of which have been corrected by the copyist himself; others of the same type, which were left uncorrected, were probably made while copying and were not in the medieval exemplar; a line (331) is missing by *saut du même au même*.

But in spite of its mediocrity, **M** is of great interest in that it has preserved unquestionable indications that its exemplar, which is now only partially reachable, cannot be confused with the manuscript **C** nor with a copy of it. The independence of the two manuscript witnesses emerges from the comparison of their texts, and in particular from at least two places, where the readings in **M** are obviously better than those of **C** (see below the critical notes to lines 109 and 195) and can hardly be explained by a happy innovation of the copyist of **M**.

Moreover, one can find two series of material confirmations of the independence of these two witnesses. The first clue is admittedly debatable: on pages 1–6, a hand, of which it is difficult to state with confidence whether it belongs to the copyist himself or to **M**<sup>2</sup>, has indicated by opening square brackets the beginning of lines which in **C** are highlighted by a larger red plain initial (which the editors have rendered as an indent).<sup>18</sup> In addition to the places that coincide with such a capitalization in **C**, **M** highlights seven other passages (lines 39 *Verbis*, 52 *Christe*, 84 *Incipe*, 88 *Mi pater*, 99 *Subuenit*, 134 *Nomina*, and 177 *Sed*); although these square brackets presumably have a typographical purpose in the copyist's intended edition, it is also possible that they reflect the layout of the manuscript he used, which in that case could not be **C**.

---

Luxembourg, Part 1: *Quellen- und Literaturverzeichnis, Einleitung, Abbildungen* (Wiesbaden, 2017), "Einleitung," pp. 37–337, at 210–26 (especially, for the dispersal).

<sup>15</sup> See the edition by Anne-Catherine Fraeijs de Veubeke, "Un ancien catalogue de la bibliothèque d'Orval dans le recueil de Charles Le Tonnelier," in *Aureavallis. Mélanges historiques réunis à l'occasion du neuvième centenaire de l'abbaye d'Orval* (Liège, 1975), pp. 83–110, at 92 (with identification of the works): "S. Damascenus de Gestis Barlaam et Josaphat. Libri decem S. Clementis cum duabus epistolis. Chronica Sigiberti. Narratio S. Athanasii de Iconia Domini. Ex relatione S. Maioli abbatis de duobus ducibus. Vita et passio S. Eutropii martyris. De Ecclesiis urbis Romae." The traditional dating of the catalogue to 1675, which is that of Le Tonnelier's *Catalogus*, must be corrected on the basis of its attribution to Dom Jacques de Lannoy, for which, see Marie-Françoise Damongeot-Bourdat, "Le 'bon père' Jacques De Lannoy (1630–1680) et les manuscrits de la bibliothèque de Cîteaux," in *Mélanges cisterciens 2012 offerts par l'ARCCIS au Père Placide Vernet, moine de Cîteaux, pour son 90<sup>e</sup> anniversaire* (Bégrolles-en-Mauges, 2012), pp. 437–49, at 444–46: it has been more correctly dated to "before 28 May 1673" by Falmagne, "Einleitung," pp. 151–52 and n. 413.

<sup>16</sup> See Fraeijs de Veubeke, "Un ancien catalogue," p. 92.

<sup>17</sup> See Aegidius, *Chronica Sigiberti* contained in this manuscript; see Falmagne, "Einleitung," p. 256, n. 760.

<sup>18</sup> In two places the critical apparatus of Jones and Bruce, *The Relatio metrica*, should be corrected: p. 102, line 504, the indication "no section break in the manuscript" is wrong, for in **C** the line begins with a larger red plain initial; p. 103, line 550, the indication "no section break in the manuscript" is inaccurate: a section break is present in **C**, but is actually at line 548 *Syderei*; it should also be added that line 461, in **C** before *paruit* a pilcrow has been added in the margin.

Another element constitutes a more convincing argument. The copyists of **M** demonstrate their scruples several times, reproducing the precise written form of their exemplar without choosing one interpretation over another, so that it can be postulated that in some cases their copy represents a “facsimile” of the lost exemplar: thus, for 67 *fiam* the copyist writes *fiā*, then crosses it out and correctly transcribes *fiam* (**M**, p. 3, line 7); for 231 *est, ē* (**M**, p. 8, line 8); for 370 *omnia, oīa* (kept because of a doubt about the meaning of the abbreviation?; **M**, p. 12, line 13); for 387 *amplo, āplo* (perhaps because he refused to choose in the face of a spelling that could also suggest *apostolo*?; **M**, p. 12, line 30). While these four forms are found identically in **C** (compare respectively with **C**, fols. 144rb, line 32; 145va, line 16; and 146va, lines 11 and 28), for 277 *dauid*, the copyist of **M** cautiously reproduces the Caroline abbreviation *ḏḏ* from his exemplar, while **C** has here *dauid* written out (compare **M**, p. 9, line 22 and **C**, fol. 145vb, line 26), which proves the independence of the two witnesses, since it is unlikely that **M** would have reduced a complete name to its abbreviation.

However, while it is true that **C** and the exemplar of **M** were distinct manuscripts, they must have been very closely linked. Certain common spellings or abbreviations, such as those mentioned above, tend to prove this. For instance, the same abbreviation *ḏḏ* for *Dauid* is also found in **C**, fol. 148vb, line 22, at line 696: “ut mandare uelis, Salomon Daudique fidelis” (a passage for which **M** is missing); thus, it is possible that it was already found in **M**’s exemplar. Other errors in **M** can be easily explained by graphic features that must have been in its exemplar and are also visible in **C**: for example, two occurrences of *sibi* in **M** (lines 47 and 333) probably correspond to a *si* written with *s* and a superscript *i*, just as in **C** (in the same lines and elsewhere); for 32 *Grinea*, the variant *ignea* in **M** is due to the presence in one of its ancestors of the form *gnea* with a *g* surmounted by an *i*, precisely as found in **C** (fol. 144ra, line 33); elsewhere (in lines 42, 45, and 289), it is the presence of interlinear glosses that explains the presence of wrong variants in **M** (see below). Finally, the similarity between the two medieval manuscripts under examination can be asserted from three obvious errors which **C** and the exemplar of **M** had in common: at line 23, *forpice* instead of *forcipe* (corrected in **M** by **M**<sup>2</sup>); at line 43, *cum scieris* instead of *conscieris*; and at line 56, *uniorum* instead of *uiuorum*. Moreover, **M** does not offer a solution to the gap supposed by the editors between lines 241 and 242.<sup>19</sup> One must therefore assume that the exemplar of **M** was a manuscript very close to **C**, which could be either its exemplar or another copy of the same antigraph.

As to where this lost witness came from, there is nothing in the manuscript to indicate or even suggest it. But the available evidence implies that the exemplar of **M** was the above-mentioned manuscript of Orval (**α**). In the *Nachlass* of the Pez brothers, indeed, of which **M** is a part, there are more than sixty documents that obviously come from the literary archives of the Benedictines of the Congregation of St. Maur kept in the seventeenth century at the abbey of St. Germain-des-Prés and that must have been sent to the Pez brothers, probably at the beginning of the eighteenth century, at a time when Bernhard was embarking on the preparation of the *Thesaurus Anecdotorum Novissimus*.<sup>20</sup> Some of these documents had been sent to St. Germain by the subprior and librarian of the abbey of Cîteaux, Dom Jacques de Lannoy, correspondent of Dom Luc d’Achery, who contributed significantly to the preparation of the latter’s *Veterum aliquot scriptorum ... Spicilegium* by sending to the editor several unedited pieces that were meant to be published but never got printed,<sup>21</sup> and it happens that the Maurists’

<sup>19</sup> See Jones and Bruce, *The Relatio metrica*, p. 88.

<sup>20</sup> See my forthcoming catalogue in Jérémy Delmulle, “Archives mauristes conservées à l’abbaye bénédictine de Melk,” forthcoming in *Revue d’Histoire des Textes*.

<sup>21</sup> For a preliminary overview on Dom Jacques de Lannoy, see especially Damongeoit-Bourdat, “Le ‘bon père’.” Most of Dom de Lannoy’s correspondence was published in a series of ten articles in the early twentieth century by Dom Jean-Martial Besse (then with Dom Yves Laurent), “Les correspondants cisterciens de Luc d’Achery et de Mabillon. Dom de Lannoy,” *Revue Mabillon* 3 (1907), 225–38 and 341–56; 4 (1908), 485–97; 8 (1912–1913), 311–25; 9 (1913–1914), 19–32, 157–86, 216–41, and 360–72; 10 (1914), 40–54 and 123–50.

correspondence has preserved a letter from Dom de Lannoy to Dom d'Achery, not dated (ca. 1678–1679?), which mentions a copy of this same, extremely rare work, also bearing the title *Ex relatione S. Majoli*, which was made for him at the abbey of Orval (so most probably from **a** itself) and which he entrusted to Dom Hugues Lanthenas, monk of St. Bénigne of Dijon,<sup>22</sup> to be given in person to Mabillon. The letter reads:<sup>23</sup>

J'avois escrit à D. Hugues Lanthenas qu'il pouvoit envoyer à D. Mabillon les vers qu'on m'avoit envoyés d'Orval *Ex relatione S. Majoli*, je ne sçay s'il l'a fait, ou s'il a cru qu'ils ne pouvoient lui servir.

A little further down, in a postscript, it adds:<sup>24</sup>

L'occasion s'estant présenté de venir à Dijon j'ay mis entre les mains du R. P. Prieur de S. Bénigne le paquet cy dessus mentionné, quelques variantes, pour D. Blampain et la vie d'un frère convers de notre Ordre, etc. pour D. Mabillon; j'adjouste l'exposition d'Herveus que j'avois escrit pour mon usage ...

No trace of this document, as well as of the others mentioned with it, could be found in the Maurists' archives now kept at the Bibliothèque nationale de France in Paris. But in view of what has been said about the constitution of the Pez brothers' collection, and taking into account the fact that Lannoy's relations with the monks of Orval (and in particular Abbot Dom Charles Bentzeradt) and with Le Tonnelier, whose catalogue mentions the manuscript, are well attested elsewhere,<sup>25</sup> one is justified in thinking that the Melk copy is precisely the one that Lannoy received from his Orval correspondent, which he would have sent through an intermediary to St. Germain-des-Prés and which would have been part of the batch of Maurist documents sent to Melk at a later time.<sup>26</sup> A further clue in favour of this identification is to be found in the similarity, noted above, between the text of **C** and that of the exemplar of **M**: this could be explained, in the case of **a**, by the fact that both manuscripts transmit (or transmitted) the text of the *Relatio* in a markedly similar codicological context, that is, in a collection of hagiographic and legendary texts, the first and main component of which was the *Vita Barlaam et Iosaphat*.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> On the historical works of Dom Lanthenas (ca. 1634–1701) [*Matricula* 1381], see especially Marie-Louise Auger, “La bibliothèque de Saint-Bénigne de Dijon au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle: Le témoignage de Dom Hugues Lanthenas,” *Scriptorium* 39 (1985), 234–64; further bibliography in Philippe Lenain, *Histoire littéraire des bénédictins de Saint-Maur*, 5 vols. (Louvain-la-Neuve – Leuven – Bruxelles – Turnhout, 2006–2018), 1:467–68.

<sup>23</sup> Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 17686, fols. 275r–276r, ed. Besse and Laurent, “Les correspondants cisterciens,” *Revue Mabillon* 10 (1914), 123–50, at pp. 133–34 (letter no. CLXII). The letter from Lannoy to Lanthenas has not been found.

<sup>24</sup> “Les correspondants cisterciens,” ed. Besse and Laurent, 10, p. 134. The “R. P. Prior of S. Bénigne” was then Dom Gabriel Joseph Séguin (d. 1682) [*Matricula* 563; Lenain, *Histoire littéraire*, 1:334]; the other texts mentioned next concern, in order, the edition of Augustine's sermons, for which Dom Thomas Blampin [*Matricula* 1879; Lenain, *Histoire littéraire*, 2:50–69] was responsible (to be edited as vol. 5 of the *Opera omnia* published by the Maurists in Paris in 1683), and most probably Goswin of Bossut's *Vita Arnulfi conversi* (BHL 713) and Herveus of Bourg-Dieu's *Commentary* on Paul's Epistles, two works which Dom de Lannoy mentions on several occasions in his correspondence with the Maurists since respectively at least 1675 and 1674; see “Les correspondants cisterciens,” ed. Besse and Laurent, 9, pp. 367–68 (letter no. CXLIII), and p. 234 (letter no. CXVIII). None of these documents produced by Dom de Lannoy has yet been identified, either in Paris or in Melk collections, but it is known that the first one was a copy of a manuscript from Orval, the present Troyes, Médiathèque Jacques-Chirac, MS 1434, then taken from Orval to Clairvaux in 1745 by Dom Jean Guyton (see Falmagne, “Einleitung,” pp. 135–38, n. 339; p. 153 and n. 415; pp. 251–52 and n. 745).

<sup>25</sup> On the relationship between Lannoy and Bentzeradt, see the remarks by Falmagne, “Einleitung,” pp. 153–54. As for Le Tonnelier, see above, n. 15.

<sup>26</sup> Several elements seem to demonstrate that this copy was conceived as a preparation for an edition: in addition to the square brackets already mentioned, which must have corresponded to paragraphs in the printed text, some proper names are underlined twice (probably to be put in small capitals or in italics): 9 *Majoli*, 14 *Majolus*, 135 *Ostrorgius*, 136 *Eusebius*, 163 *Eusebi*, 318 *Eusebio*; I have not been able to elucidate the function of the crosses drawn in front of the lines 273, 283, and 318, nor of the two brackets put in front of the lines 241–248 and 329–335 (see **M**, pp. 8 and 11).

<sup>27</sup> Compare the contents of the Charleville manuscript (see above n. 8) with the Lannoy–Le Tonnelier's description (see above, n. 15).

Moreover, relations between the scriptoria of these two abbeys are well attested for the period supposedly corresponding to the presumed production of these two manuscripts.<sup>28</sup> Perhaps at some point identification of the hands of the copyists and/or the rediscovery of the missing end leaves of **M** will confirm this hypothesis, which for now we must be content to regard as highly probable.

Whatever the exact relationship between these manuscripts, the provenance of all the known witnesses provides further evidence of the importance of Cistercian centers for the preservation of Cluniac literature in general and of this poem in particular.<sup>29</sup>

### *Critical Notes*

The following notes propose emendations and additions to the Jones–Bruce edition, based on the examination of the new witness **M** (for lines 1–393) and a new autoptic examination of **C**. For the sake of brevity, I discuss in detail only those passages where the reading of the manuscripts or the comparison of their variants leads to changes in the critical text or where the variant readings of the manuscripts can give rise to doubt; the remaining variants will be listed at the end of this article. The testimony of **M** has been neglected as far as questions of spelling are concerned. The copyists of **M** seem to have sought to normalize the spelling according to Classical Latin standards (for example, it is impossible to know whether the systematically used *ae* diphthong is equivalent to a tailed *e* in the exemplar). It is thus appropriate to retain in the edition the spelling of the only medieval witness, **C**.<sup>30</sup> References to the edition (Jones and Bruce, *The Relatio metrica*, pp. 76–119, even pages) are to verse numbers; the specific words and expressions discussed in the notes are printed with larger spacing to facilitate identification.

**Title**                    Ex relatione s a n c t i M a i o l i de duobus ducibus

---

<sup>28</sup> For a comparative view of the contents of Orval’s and Signy’s medieval libraries and for clues of the relationship between the two abbeys for the copying and circulation of works, see Falmagne, “Einleitung,” pp. 52–60.

<sup>29</sup> Another interesting case of Cistercian transmission of a Cluniac work, that of the *Mariale* of Bernard of Cluny (or of Morlas), has been recently studied by Franz Dolveck, “La diffusion cistercienne du *Mariale* attribuable à Bernard de Morlas. Appropriation ou emprunt?,” in *Les cisterciens et la transmission des textes*, ed. Thomas Falmagne, Dominique Stutzmann, Anne-Marie Turcan-Verkerk (Turnhout, 2018), pp. 169–89.

<sup>30</sup> Mention should be made of the orthographic practice followed in the edition. As they state in their editorial principles (Jones and Bruce, *The Relatio metrica*, p. 71), the editors have rightly chosen to follow the spelling of **C**, including the use of the tailed *e*. These principles are sometimes neglected, however: at line 741 **C** has not *cibus* but *cybus*; it would have been appropriate to record the tailed *e* in 6 *equum* (**M** has *æquum*), 320 *quecumque*, 369 *Hęc*, and 447 *uite*; it is also questionable whether it would be appropriate to spell, according to the apparent usage of the manuscript, *nequid* and *siquid* as one word (see lines 43, 102, 103, 104, and 170). The expansion of abbreviations does not pose great difficulties: although not specified, the abbreviation *prae-* is systematically rendered as *pre-*, which is quite justified; most tildes are to be expanded by the letter *m* (one exception, 105 *inmane*, could be corrected); one reads most often *numquam*, so the abbreviated forms should be systematically expanded like this rather than by *nunquam* (lines 188, 386, and 452; at line 188, contrary to what the apparatus says, **C** does not read *non quam*, but *numquam*: the misreading is due to the fact that the first letter, which is also the initial of the verse, *ñ*, is written in the intercolumn and spaced from the rest of the word); there is only one occurrence of *nunquam* spelled out at line 415; similarly, *quorundam* is spelled out once at line 261. Finally, in their material presentation of the single manuscript, the editors could have devoted some space to explaining certain graphic features, which do not all seem to be “unremarkable for the period” (p. 71): the copyist of **C** used several peculiar abbreviations, such as *quam*, written with a *q* with a barred tail surmounted by a superscript *a* (see e.g. lines 350 and 474); *quoque* is abbreviated *q<sup>o</sup>*; (see lines 248 and 502); the distinction must be made between *hec* (written *h̄c*; see lines 120, 189, and 485) and *hoc* (*h<sup>o</sup>*; see line 264). A particularly important point concerns the problem of abbreviations by superscript letter: apart from the common abbreviations, some do not involve substituting letters, e.g. *h<sup>i</sup>* for *hi* (see line 226) or *ut* written as *u* with a superscript *t* (see lines 58, 59, 122, 220, 334, 343, etc.); more problematic is the case of the abbreviation composed of an *s* with a superscript *i*, which is used to mean *sibi* (see lines 55, 86, 365, 438, and 592) as well as *si* (see lines 47, 200, and 333), the latter also sometimes being written out in full as *si* (see lines 170, 175, 271, and 272).



The first problem posed by the edition lies in the title itself of the work: in **C**, as in **M** and **α**, Maiolus is qualified as an abbot: “sancti Maioli abbatis.” One sees no reason not to retain this last word; it is thus advisable to repair what is certainly a simple oversight of the editors (see the correct title on p. 18 of the Jones–Bruce edition).

**16–21**            Instituit ritum subtili corde petitum,  
                       ritum tranquillum monachos hortatur ad illum,  
                       ad callem rectum domino pandente relectum.  
                       Pectore uiuaci tenuit regimen Cluniaci;  
                       cura peruigili tanto prouidit ouili,  
                       seruans gaudentes attonsas sponte bidentes.

Instead of *hortatur* at line 17, **C** and **M** both have *hortatus* (with the abbreviation sign <sup>9</sup> for *-us* in **C**, in all letters in **M**). In a context entirely in the past tense (*instituit, tenuit, prouidit*) – the poet thus begins the account of the life of Maiolus – *hortatur*, which would be the only verb in the present tense, is out of place. The perfect participle is here much preferable, and can be interpreted as part of a participial apposition: “He instituted ... having exhorted the monks,” as well as of an asyndetic coordination (with verb “to be” implied): “He instituted ..., he exhorted ...,” etc.

**70–73**            Sic homo subtilis reddar tibi belua uilis –  
                       bestia non ueluti regis lasciua bruti,  
                       ultio quem tristis septem puniuit aristic,  
                       sed uitis morum fiam fera plena malorum.

Instead of *belua* at line 70, **C** undoubtedly reads *bestia*, which is also the reading of **M**. *Belua* is thus probably a correction by the editors – to avoid repetition with the first word of the following line? – but it is not indicated as such in the apparatus. In any case, the correction is not metrically necessary, and it seems wiser to adhere to the testimony of the manuscripts. Besides, the repeated *bestia* is an example of corrective repetition, which is a recognized and practiced figure.<sup>31</sup>

**90–91**            Ordinar, instabo, Maioli dicta curabo,  
                       non leue figmentum sed morigerum documentum.

As printed, the first line, which introduces the first reported speech of Abbot Maiolus, creates a strange meaning; the last verb, in particular, as it is constructed, is not satisfactorily understandable (see the translation: “I shall ... take pains over the sayings of Maiolus”). *Curabo* is in fact a misreading for *citabo*, clearly present in both **C** and **M**. Thus restored, the text is much improved and the rhyme with *instabo* more complete.

**104–105**        ... si qua manet menda flammis aut uerme luenda,  
                       seu pice liquente culpas inmane coquenti.

Listing the fates reserved by God for the dead, Maiolus tells that “if any fault remains it is to be cleansed through flames (*flammis*) or worms (*uerme*) or the molten pitch (*pice*) that dreadfully burns away sins.” Instead of *liquente* both **C** and **M** in fact have *liquanti*. The ablative in *-i* is standard when the participle is used adjectivally, as here. It is also preferable to that in *-e* from the point of view of the Leonine rhyme in the verse. However, the meaning of *liquo*, *-āre* (“to make something become liquid”) is at first sight less satisfactory than that of *liqueo*, *-ēre* (“to be liquid”). The sentence is clearly about “liquid pitch” which, poured on the sins, is able to “cook” them (*culpas coquenti*), not “make them liquid.” For this reason, one could conjecture,

<sup>31</sup> See Jeffrey Wills, *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 71–73.

by means of a very slight intervention, the form *liquenti* (as an equivalent of the expression *pix (pice) liquida*, much more frequent in prose). This would have the double advantage of giving a more proper sense and a richer rhyme.

**106–109** Quos ope tali monstro iuuari: si celebremus  
missas pro se, si lacrimose sepe rogemus,  
lar sopitur, pix lenitur, cetera cessat  
que macerandos sed reuocandos tortio pressat.

Here the two manuscript witnesses disagree at line 109: **C** has *reuocandos*, while **M** has *renouandos*. As regards the dead for whom prayers and masses are celebrated, it is equally conceivable that they are “to be reclaimed” (*reuocandos*) – meaning, from that place of torture; the same term is rendered as “delivered” in the editors’ Introduction (p. 21) – or “to be renewed” (*renouandos*), that is, restored to their original state. The opposition between the two verbal adjectives, emphasized by *sed*, however, makes one lean more towards the second solution: *macerandos*, which the translators have neutrally rendered as “who are to be pained,” illustrates above all the idea of mortification and exhaustion, which requires for the dead person for whom one prays a renewal of his strength; an identical parallel between these two verbs, joined by the rhyme at the end of the verses, is found in Othloh of St. Emmeran, *De doctrina spirituali liber metricus* 34.55–56 (PL 146:291A): “Fletibus assiduis hinc compuncti macerantur, / atque bonis studiis velut a primo renovantur” – “Full of compunction, they are exhausted by continual weeping / and by good zeal are renewed as at the beginning.” I therefore propose to preferably print the text of **M**: “que macerandos sed renouandos tortio pressat.”

**130** Pugnandi gnauis tamen fit pugna suauis.

In this nicely formulated sentence in the form of a maxim, the presence of *tamen* makes the verse unmetrical (*gnāuīs tāmēn*). In reality, the copyist of **C** employs the abbreviation *t̄m*, usually used for *tantum* (elsewhere, the same copyist abbreviates *tamen* with *tñ*: compare at line 119 on fol. 144vb, line 12; and line 682 on fol. 148vb, line 8; for another similar problem, see below the note to lines 438–439); **M** has *tantum* as well, spelled out in full. *Tantum* is thus preferable in that it has the advantage of solving the metrical problem, provided that the word *suauis* is read with dieresis (*sūāuis*); while admittedly Classical Latin does not allow it, it is far from unusual in medieval poetry (from at least Paul the Deacon, *Carm.* 19.1; compare, in the Cluniac poet’s time, *suauis* in the same final position in Peter of Blois, *Carm.* 4.1.2 and 27; Petrus Riga, *De ordine mundi* 164; Aegidius of Paris, *Carolinus* 1.501; Eberhard of Béthune, *Graecismus* 13.195, etc.<sup>32</sup>). The line is better understood this way, as there is no opposition with the immediately preceding lines: “Fighting is pleasurable only to those who are good at fighting.”

**157–158** Mecum non ibit mea res dum flatus abibit;  
ire potest pre me, patrię transmissa supere.

*Supere* is a misreading for *supreme* in **C** – a reading confirmed by the testimony of **M**, which has *supremæ* – which is, moreover, the form expected by the rhyme (*pre me*). The correction of the Latin text does not, however, lead to any change in the translation: “being transferred to my heavenly homeland.”

**194–195** Vt definiuit dare, dux constanter iniuit;  
quod ecumque sparsit, pupillos munere farsit.

---

<sup>32</sup> See Dag Norberg, *An Introduction to the Study of Medieval Latin Versification*, trans. Grant C. Roti and Jacqueline de La Chapelle Skubly (Washington, D.C., 2004), pp. 24–25; Peter Stotz, *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters*, 5 vols. (Munich, 1996–2004), 3:7 (VII § 2.8) and 3:150 with n. 124 (§ 112).



judicious to suppose that the original text was *condebatur* and that the omission of an abbreviative sign like *-2* at the end of the word in an ancestor common to both witnesses explains the form *condebat* preserved in **M**. The copyist of **C** or one of his predecessors tried to remove the metrical anomaly but only succeeded in making matters worse.

**278–280**      Reddit honestatem pius, expiat impietatem  
qui, leprę u e t e r i Naaman dignando mederi,  
tinguere dixit ei Iordane per os Helysei.

The adjective attached to *leprę* is in the dative in **C** (*ueteri*), but in the genitive in **M** (*ueteris*). The first solution corresponds to the classical construction of *mederi*, but the second is also found at the time the poem was composed,<sup>34</sup> and would therefore be quite acceptable. However, the use of the verb with the dative at line 309 (“Non ualet huic sceleri post mortem flamma mederi”) makes one lean here for the reading of **C** as it would correspond, so to speak, to the poet’s *usus scribendi*.

**301**            Non aliquo torre colatur noxa G o m o r e ;  
**C** and **M** agree in presenting the spelling *Gomorrę* (*Gomorrę*), which should be retained: it is indeed the normal spelling of the name (a simple calque of Gr. LXX Γόμορρα) and makes the rhyme with *torre* more correct.

**317–318**      S u n t hec dicta satis. Referam concinna relatis:  
iam canet Eusebio quid contigerit mea Clyo.

Instead of *sunt*, **C** and **M** both read *sint*, which should not be changed. Rather than “The preceding words on this topic will suffice,” we should translate: “Let what has been said suffice.”

**351–357**      Hanc inibi messem secui, monachus licet essem,  
singula nostrorum perlustrans cenobiorum  
p r o c u r a t o r i s ritu, sicut est mihi moris,  
ordine spectatum uel facta uel ocia fratrum,  
cum facerent eque quod oportet nocte dieque,  
anne molestaret quis eos uel despoliaret,  
fraterne paci non equus, mente rapaci.

This passage deals with one of the key events in the *Relatio*, namely the abduction and imprisonment of Maiolus in Sardinia – which is probably based on a real event in the life of the abbot of Cluny, who was abducted by Saracens in 972<sup>35</sup> – and on the circumstances in which it occurred, that is, on the occasion of a tour made by Maiolus to the island monasteries of the Order. On this last point, if one refers to the edited text, the two manuscripts seem to disagree at line 353, and the identification of the correct variant might here have consequences for interpreting the date and context of the event. According to the editors, **C** would read *procuratoris ritu*, which is therefore the text they printed, while **M** has instead *pro circatoris ritu*. In **M** the word *circator* is written again (by the same hand, though apparently more

<sup>34</sup> See Karl Strecker, *Introduction to Medieval Latin*, trans. Robert B. Palmer (Berlin, 1957), p. 66; cited by Stotz, *Handbuch*, 4:265, n. 365 (IX § 21.1).

<sup>35</sup> See Jones and Bruce, *The Relatio metrica*, pp. 2–3. On the event, see Monique Zerner, “La capture de Maïeul et la guerre de libération en Provence: Le départ des Sarrasins vu à travers les cartulaires provençaux,” in *Millénaire de la mort de Saint Mayeul, 4<sup>e</sup> Abbé de Cluny, 994–1994. Actes du Congrès international Saint Mayeul et son temps, Valensole, 12–14 mai 1994* (Digne-les-Bains, 1997), pp. 199–210; and the recent reconstruction suggested by Scott G. Bruce, *Cluny and the Muslims of La Garde-Freinet: Hagiography and the Problem of Islam in Medieval Europe* (Ithaca – London, 2015), Chapter 1: “News of a Kidnapping,” pp. 10–40 and Chapter 2: “Monks Tell Tales,” pp. 41–62 (with bibliography).

hesitant) in the margin opposite the line, either because it was already in this place in the medieval exemplar, or, more likely, because of a personal addition by the modern copyist; in any case, the fact that the word is repeated in the margin is proof not only that it has been read correctly (and is therefore the reading of **M**'s exemplar), but that it has been judged to be worthy of a note. In fact, *procuratoris* is a misreading of the text of **C**, which is obviously also *pro circatoris*: the confusion can be explained by the narrow space between the letters, which merges *-irc-* so that one can be led to see *-ur-*, and by the separation between the first letter (here the abbreviation *p*), written in the intercolumn, and the rest of the word, which makes it difficult to judge correctly whether or not there is a space.

However, even if it is absent from the manuscripts, *procuratoris* should not be rejected a priori, and deserves to be taken into consideration as a conjecture, if only for its graphic similarity. Indeed, *procurator* and *circator* are both attested as technical terms in the system of medieval monastic administration, referring to very different functions: the *procurator* ("property manager, representative") is in charge of the management of the abbey's goods, while the *circator* ("roundsman") is a monk in charge of making rounds to control the behavior of the monks inside the monastery. From a purely metrical point of view, the two words are perfectly equal in value, since they require the same metrical license (i.e. shortening of the first vowel of *sīcūt*, instead of *sīcūt*), but from a lexical point of view, *circator* is undoubtedly better, and the change from *pro circ-* to *procur-* can be also easily explained by paleographical reasons (see above). To justify privileging this reading over the other, it would be necessary to be certain that the *circator*, who, according to the customary texts, performs his function exclusively inside a monastery, was authorized to leave the cloister space, as the poem clearly indicates Maiolus had done at the time of the kidnapping (see lines 352–357: "I was making examination of every one of our monasteries ... to inspect point by point the brothers' work or rest, to inspect whether they were doing rightly as they should by night and day, or whether anyone opposed to the brothers' peace was, with rapacious motive, troubling or robbing them"<sup>36</sup>). Unlike the Premonstratensians, for whom the term *circator* quickly took on the meaning of *visitor*, in the Cluniac order the function of the monastic roundsman changed little from the time of Maiolus until the twelfth century, when the poem was written.<sup>37</sup>

The question (as the editors have asked about the word *procurator*) is whether the poet intends to make use here of a word which otherwise has a precise meaning in its purely technical sense. If so, this would imply that at the time of the events Maiolus was already a monk, but not yet an abbot.<sup>38</sup> This would go against the chronological logic of the *Relatio*, which is supposed to relate much later events, and would speak against the likelihood that the event in question is a direct reference to the actual abduction of Maiolus in 972.

In fact, one may wonder if the expression *pro ritu*, which has basically the same meaning as *ritu* alone, could not be understood here rather metaphorically, as meaning "in the manner of, like." *Ritu* + gen. with the meaning of "like" is already classical, and the use of a redundant *pro* with such ablative expressions is attested, if not with *ritu*, at least with other nouns of similar status followed by the genitive (e.g. *causa*, *gratia*, *respectu*, *intuitu*).<sup>39</sup> If so, to use the wording *pro circatoris ritu* would be a matter of the poet comparing the action of Maiolus inspecting as an abbot the Sardinian Cluniac monasteries to the rounds carried out by the *circator* in the

---

<sup>36</sup> I borrow the translation from Jones and Bruce, *The Relatio metrica*, p. 95.

<sup>37</sup> In addition to Hugh B. Feiss, "Circatores: From Benedict of Nursia to Humbert of Romans," *The American Benedictine Review* 40 (1989), 346–79 (at pp. 354–57), see Scott G. Bruce, "'Lurking with Spiritual Intent': A Note on the Origin and Functions of the Monastic Roundsman (Circator)," *Revue Bénédictine* 109 (1999), 75–89, on the monastic office of the *circator* in the Cluniac Order.

<sup>38</sup> See Jones and Bruce, *The Relatio metrica*, Introduction, p. 3, n. 4, and Commentary, p. 143.

<sup>39</sup> For this usage, see *OLD*, s.v. *ritus* 2a, 2:1656; for *pro* as a pleonastic construction with *causa* (or *respectu* or *intuitu*) as an equivalent of the substantive alone, see respectively *TLL*, s.v. 1 *pro*, 10/1–2:1417–1438, at 1435.26–33; and Stotz, *Handbuch*, 4:409 (IX § 111.22).

precincts of his monastery (the points of attention of the inspection, quoted at lines 352–357, correspond in every respect to the prerogatives of the *circator*). This understanding would not require any reconsideration of the chronology and would allow the editor to correct the *procuratoris ritu* of the edition into *pro circatoris ritu*, following both manuscripts, and to translate accordingly. Instead of “I, although a monk, reaped in that place while, in my office as [the abbot’s] lieutenant, I was making examination of every one of our monasteries, per my custom, to inspect point by point the brothers’ work or rest ...” we should render: “I, although a monk, reaped in that place while, after the manner of a roundsman, I was making examination ...”

**358–360**      Rumor iit late de crudeli nouitate,  
                   non p r o u i s a r u m pandens scelus insidiarum  
                   Eusebius fleuit simul hunc ea fama repleuit.

Instead of *prouisarum* in **C**, **M** has *praeuisarum*. Since both participles have the same meaning and are metrically equivalent, it is impossible to determine with certainty which of the two forms gave rise to the other: it seems clear that the innovation is due to the wrong expansion of an abbreviation, but this could have been done in either direction.

**361–363**      ‘Ei mihi!’ dicebat, ‘quare Deus ista sinebat?  
                   Cur sollemne datum n e g l e x e r i t ducere gratum,  
                   nec sibi defendit quod tanta tributa pependit?’

The second, faulty line can simply be corrected by examining the manuscripts: the editors’ *neglexerit* is a misreading for *neglexit* in **C**, which is also the reading of **M**. Once the correct reading is restored, the line no longer poses any problem, and its coordination with *defendit* in the following line argues for taking the latter as a perfect tense rather than a present: “Why did he neglect ... and not defend ...?”

**438–439**      Nobis nil gerimus; t a m e n sibi bella subimus;  
                   felix conflictus pro Iesu, Mars benedictus!

[NB: From here on **M** is no longer available.] The first line is metrically incorrect: while the second *i* of *sibi* can be long as well as short (*sibi* here has an emphasis value and is equivalent to *ei*, as the editors have noted),<sup>40</sup> *tamen*, which requires a short, isolated syllable to be counted between two long ones, is problematic. As above (see note to line 130), the editors have been misled by a misinterpretation of the abbreviation *t̄m* (for *tantum*) taken for *t̄ñ* (the usual one for *tamen*). We should therefore read “tantum sibi bella subimus,” which gives the sentence both a better meaning and a more satisfying balance. Thus, speaking of the war he and his soldiers wage in the name of Christ, Eusebius exclaims: “For ourselves we do nothing, it is only for Him that we go to war.”

**449**            Quod placet instatur, legio n a m magna paratur.

What the editors have transcribed as *nam* is, in **C**, an *n* with a tilde, that is the characteristic abbreviation for *non*, the misreading of which thus has the effect of producing a complete misunderstanding. The reading of the manuscript is the correct one, as the context confirms: this indication of the narrator immediately follows the acquiescence by Eusebius’s soldiers to the motivational speech their duke gave them after the hard defeat caused by a disloyal ambush laid by Ostorgius (lines 358–444). Eusebius speaks thus about heavy losses which he has to deplore and which weaken his troops against those of the enemy: 396–397 “Nos sumus, ut

<sup>40</sup> See Jones and Bruce, *The Relatio metrica*, Introduction, p. 49, n. 130, and Commentary, p. 148. On the use of *sibi* in the sense of *ei*, see especially Stotz, *Handbuch*, 4:294 (IX § 38.5–6), duly cited by C.A. Jones in Jones and Bruce, *The Relatio metrica*, Introduction, p. 49, n. 130.

nostis, perpauci, plurimus hostis, / plurimus et fortis; nos paruę summa cohortis – “We are, as you know, very few, while our enemy is very numerous – numerous and strong; we are, in total, a small company”; and likewise the narrator alludes discreetly to this several times, at line 378 “Dixit et acciuit quos tunc pro tempore quiuit” and 450 “Quotquot uenerunt alacres ad bella fuerunt”; it will only be with the miraculous arrival of the white warriors (lines 461–462) that the Sardinian troops will be strengthened and become capable of facing the attackers.

**470**            Crede Deo, c e r t u s Deus est tibi nempe misertus!

The question here is one of punctuation. *C* has a *subdistinctio* dot after, and not before, *certus*, thus providing a perfectly acceptable meaning. It is, therefore, preferable to keep the punctuation of the manuscript and to understand, not “Trust in God, for certainly God has shown mercy to you!,” but “Trust in God confidently, God has shown mercy to you!”

**490–494**        Pone rogauerunt super hoc quod bella tulerunt,  
an doleat sibi cor ualde super hoc i n i m i c o r u m.  
Infit et ‘Irascor, nec somno nec dape pascor;  
plus quam tucetum trucis haud ducis appeto letum,  
qui uorat ore graui domino quod sanctificaui!’

At line 491, the editors have misinterpreted in *C* the last letters of the final word, which is not *inimicorum* (noun in the gen. pl.), but *inimicor* (deponent verb, first person singular present indicative); the copyist of the manuscript has in fact used the simple ligature *-or* (with round *r*) for *-or*, which has been wrongly read as the abbreviation *-or* for *-orum*. If one thus reads *inimicor* correctly, the Leonine verse is respected, the final word rhyming with the caesura (*cor*) and with the verbs of the following line (*irascor*, *pascor*). Moreover, the line becomes perfectly metrical and makes superfluous the various arguments advanced by the editors about its supposedly hypermetric character, which would be a *unicum* in the poem; thus, it becomes unnecessary to suppose the use of an *ecthipsis*, or *synalepha*, at the end of verse: *inimicor(um) infit* (see the Introduction, pp. 45–46, and the Commentary, p. 152). This correction also involves punctuating the passage differently, like this: “Pone rogauerunt super hoc quod bella tulerunt / an doleat sibi cor. ‘Valde super hoc inimicor,’ / infit, ‘et irascor, nec somno nec dape pascor,’” and to understand it as follows: “At his side, they asked whether his heart grieves over the property that war had taken from him. ‘I am full of enmity over this,’ he says, ‘and I am angry and I partake of neither sleep nor food.’”

**499–503**        Regnat in urbe Dei uelut in Solima Iebusei,  
aut mage Chaldei cum migrarentur Hebrei,  
litus ad Eufrates cum plangeret o m i n a uates,  
quatuor alfabetis modulans lyricis quoque metris  
seuiciam belli, scelus exiliumque popelli.

*Omina* at line 501 is not found in *C*, which actually has *oīa*, the usual abbreviation for *omnia*. Contrary to what is argued in the Commentary (p. 153), there is no ambiguity in the reading of the single witness. If the editors nonetheless prefer to print *omina* on the basis of the parallel with Virgil, *Aen.* 5.523–524: “docuit post exitus ingens / seraque terrifici cecinerunt omina uates” – “as momentous events revealed later, when in after years fear-inspiring seers declared its import” (trans. Henry Ruston Fairclough), the reading should be explicitly presented as a conjecture. However, is the correction justified? *Omina* is a good emendation only in appearance, as opposed to the very banal *omnia*, and the proximity of the word *uates* – which

is here the profane and poetic equivalent of *propheta*, designating Jeremiah<sup>41</sup> – is not a sufficient argument to privilege this word: *omina* is scarcely ever attested as a complement of *plangere* and certainly not in reference to Jeremiah’s Lamentations 1–4. There the prophet laments precisely about *all* the misfortunes that have *actually already* overwhelmed Jerusalem, and not about predictions of misfortunes to come (the classical sense of *omen* that Medieval Latin preserves). It should be noted, moreover, that *omnia* gives a good account of the totalizing rhetoric of the underlying biblical passage, where the word *omnes* is omnipresent (14 occurrences in Lamentations 1 alone). Besides, the iunctura *omnia uates* in the final position is Virgilian too: compare Virgil, *Georg.* 4.392: “Grandaeus Nereus: nouit namque omnia uates,” and it is also found in Ovid, *Met.* 13.733 and Lucan 6.813, before being taken up by several later authors (Claudian, the author of *Karolus Magnus et Leo papa*, Letaldus of Micy, etc.).

**554–557**      Huic armaturę nichil unquam confero iure;  
                   pre niue, pre lacte candent galeę bene factę  
                   († l a c t e † uix fabrę Siculorum quomodo scabrę!);  
                   lux mera scutorum contingit celsa polorum.

The first word of line 556 has discouraged the editors: in fol. 147vb, line 19, C unquestionably reads *lacte*, which can have no meaning here and must be a copying error (attributable to C or to one of its ancestors) influenced by the presence of the same word in the preceding line. Like the editors, I think that the problematic verse can only be understood as a parenthesis, dealing with the weapons of the Sicilians, which are said, in comparison to those of their opponents, to be “scarcely the work of craftsmen” (*uix fabrę*) and “rough” (*scabrę*), with a syntactic parallelism underlined in the internal rhyme (*bene factę / uix fabrę*). One is, therefore, forced to assume that the first word must be a feminine noun in the plural, which could designate “a piece of armour or weaponry, parallel to ‘galeę’” (see note *ad loc.*, p. 156); I would add that metre dictates that the word should be a spondee or a dactyl. The two proposals, cautiously advanced in the Commentary – *spathae*, due to Michael W. Herren, and “ML *lacta* (for *lat(t)a*), from Old English *lætt* ‘lath,’” proposed by the editors, – are both inadmissible, for reasons, respectively, of quantity (*spǣtha*) and meaning. Having failed to find a word ending in *-acta*, I would readily conjecture *hastę* (“lances”): this word, if written with a poorly drawn *h* and a *st*-ligature in an ancestor of C, might have misled a copyist (*h > l*, *st*-ligature > *ct*-ligature, the latter error being very common).

**625**            Legibus assenti! Placet hoc, placet o m n i p o t e n t i!

C clearly reads *omnitenenti* instead of the *omnipotenti* printed in the edition. These two substantivized adjectives, which serve to qualify God and are quasi synonyms, differ from each other mainly by their frequency of use: *omnipotens*, much more frequent and widespread, is also most probably at the origin of the formation of *omnitenens*,<sup>42</sup> which is very rare in both prose and verse; it is attested in Christian poetry as a strict equivalent of *omnipotens* as early as Prosper of Aquitaine, *Epigr.* 39.5, ed. Albertus G.A. Horsting, CSEL100 (Berlin – Boston, 2016), p.104: “Nam deus omnipotens simul omnitenensque potestas” – “For the almighty God and his all-swaying power.” It is therefore unnecessary to correct the reading of the manuscript; *omnitenenti*, which is both metrically and semantically appropriate, is then to be translated more accurately as “All-Swaying” rather than “Almighty.”

<sup>41</sup> On this equivalence, see Albert Blaise, *Le vocabulaire latin des principaux thèmes liturgiques*, ed. Dom Antoine Dumas (Turnhout, 1966), p. 307 (§ 174). For the reference to Jeremiah and Lamentations, made explicit in the following lines, see the Commentary in Jones and Bruce, *The Relatio metrica*, p. 153.

<sup>42</sup> See, for compound words with *omni-*, Stotz, *Handbuch*, 2:445–47 (VI § 155.1, 3 and 8, and for those with *-potens*, § 155.4).



659–660 Sic legitur, uerum c o n f u d i t fabula uerum;  
uerum traductum non curant carmina uatum.

In a passage in which he depicts Eusebius’s soldiers comparing the war Eusebius is waging with the events of the Trojan War (lines 642–658), essentially following the model of Dares Phrygius (see Introduction, pp. 37–38), the poet takes over a criticism of poetry from his source. Here the text of **C** is not *confudit*, but *confundit*, which deserves to be kept and which brings to the statement a generalizing value which must be intended by the author.

772 Non d i s c e d a t i s, rogo, de uerbis memoratis.

The poem ends, after the revelation of the identity of the white horsemen, with a final direct speech by the narrator, which opens with these words. But in **C**, what the editors have deciphered as *discedatis* is in fact *disc<sup>e</sup>dati*s, with the *e* superscript above the *c* by the first hand and not as an addition of a missed letter: the word should therefore be read *discredatis*. The construction *discredere de* + abl., while not frequent, is nevertheless found as early as the Vulgate text of 4 Ezra 16.37: “ne discredatis de quibus dicit Dominus” – “do not refuse to believe what the Lord says.” This reading, moreover, makes the sentence much more comprehensible, since it is not a question of “not drawing back” from the account just given, but of avoiding not believing it; the sentence which follows in lines 773–777: “Nam potuit, cari, potuit Deus hec operari ...” – “For God was able, my beloved, yes, able to do these things ...,” has no other purpose than to prove that this fact was real since nothing is impossible for God. One should therefore print *discredatis* and translate as follows: “Do not be suspicious, I beg you, of the words I have reported.” A close parallel provided by line 39 confirms that this is the preferable solution: “Verbis Maioli, lector, discredere noli!” – “Do not, o reader, distrust the words of Maiolus!”

### *Contemporary Glosses on the Text*

Another avenue of research made possible by a more thorough examination of the textual tradition lies in the study of the fifteen or so glosses that explain in **C** certain difficult or ambiguous words in the poem. The choice of the editors was not to highlight these glosses in the edition, but to reproduce them only in the Commentary. However, since, firstly, these glosses are copied at the same time as the text, in ink and writing compatible with those of the main copyist (taking into account the inevitable differences between texts written in variable sizes), and since, secondly – at least for the section for which the comparison is possible – these same glosses are also found for the most part in **M**, the question arises whether they may already have been in the archetype, and even whether they may in some way be part of the author’s project. If so, these glosses, by explaining the author’s lexical choices or by revealing some of his sources, could bring additional clues, if not to his identity, at least to his education and milieu.

All of these glosses are reproduced below (the *sigla* of manuscripts rendered in uppercase indicate the marginal glosses, while the ones in lowercase refer to the interlinear notes), followed, when possible, by parallel *loci* or potential sources:<sup>43</sup>

42            mentoris ignarum fuit os, cor nequitarum  
              mentoris (mendacii **M**)] ds mendacii c (in **M**, or more likely in its exemplar, the gloss has mistakenly been taken for a correction of the word and thus been integrated into the text).

---

<sup>43</sup> I indicate, where appropriate, whether the parallel has already been reported by the editors.

On the basis of their expansion of the abbreviation *ds* by *deus* (see the Commentary, pp. 123–24), the editors suggest that this gloss is related to a commentary on Prudentius attributed to the Carolingian Master Iso of St. Gall or to Remigius of Auxerre; see *Commentarius in Peristephanon* 10.291 (PL 60:470): “‘Miror quod ipsum non sacrastis Mentorem.’ Mentorem: dei mendacem” – “‘I wonder you have not deified Mentor himself.’ Mentor: one who lies to/about God.” This suggestive parallel between *mendacium* and the name of the famous silversmith Mentor would be a very valuable clue to the origin of the *Relatio*’s glosses, given the rarity of this commentary in the Middle Ages;<sup>44</sup> but a formulation like *deus mendacii* would be in contradiction with what the author intends to mean here, and the fact that *mendacii* is in the main text in **M** and therefore most likely in its exemplar too seems to suggest that it may have been taken as an alternative word: it is thus possible that the abbreviation *ds* is a deformation by the copyist of **C** of a .s. (put for *scilicet*) made difficult to read for some material reason (proximity with a letter of the previous line or with another sign in the exemplar), and that the gloss serves in fact simply to establish an equivalence between the name of Mentor and *mendacium*, saying the following: “the mouth (of Maiolus) did not know artifice.”

**45** si tribuas Choro quod cum sudore peroro  
 choro (uento **M**)] uento **c** (as before, the gloss was misunderstood by the copyist of **M**’s exemplar or one of his predecessors and ended up being integrated into the text)

*Choro* is put here in place of CL *Cauro* (see the Commentary, p. 124); to explain this spelling, compare Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae* 13.11.10, ed. Giovanni Gasparotto, *Isidoro di Siviglia, Etimologie. Libro XIII “De mundo et partibus”* (Paris, 2004), p. 60: “Corus est qui ab occidente aestiuo flat. Et uocatus Corus quod ipse uentorum circulum claudat, et quasi chorum faciat. Hic antea Caurus dictus, quem plerique Argesten dicunt, non ut imprudens uulgus Agrestem” – “Corus is what, in summer, blows in from the West. And it is named Corus because this very one closes the circle of winds and forms a sort of chorus. It was once called Caurus, whom most call Argeste, not, as the common people do out of ignorance, Agreste.”

**82** Verus es Ensames et uerus ad hunc mihi trames  
 Ensames (Enzames **M**)] nomen fontis **c m**<sup>2</sup>

The word *Ensames* (or *Enzames*) is an alternative spelling for *Aensemēs* in Joshua 18.17. Admittedly, its explanation by Origen, translated into Latin by Rufinus, spread in the Middle Ages among several exegetical commentaries (see some references in the Commentary, p. 126); but there is no need to assume an intermediate source here, since the equivalence *Aensemēs* = *fons* is already found in the Hieronymian translation of the Vulgate: “Aensemēs id est fontem Solis” – “Aensemēs, that is, the source of the Sun.”

**131** Dono iuuentuti minus attendisse saluti  
 dono] condono **c m** (to indicate that *dono* is to be understood as a verb and not as a noun).

**133** quis dare mansuetas mentes sua debuit etas  
 quis (queis **M**)] quibus **c**

**187** In domini freno stabit mihi doxia ceno

<sup>44</sup> On the so-called “Weitz Glosses” on Prudentius (Weitz B and Weitz W), see Hubert Silvestre, “Aperçu sur les commentaires carolingiens de Prudence,” *Sacris Erudiri* 9 (1957), 50–74, at pp. 53–54 (which judged the attribution to Iso of at least the Weitz B commentary as well founded), and recently the balanced assessment by Sinéad O’Sullivan, *Early Medieval Glosses on Prudentius’ Psychomachia: The Weitz Tradition* (Leiden, 2004), esp. pp. 22–37.

doxia] .i. uana gloria **c m**

The gloss actually refers to the last two words of the line, *doxia ceno*, which is a metrical inversion for *cenodoxia*, a calque from Gr. κενοδοξία; it is nothing more than a literal translation from Greek, which corresponds to what is found several times in John Cassian, who is the one who introduced the word into the Latin language in reference to the seventh deadly sin (compare *De institutis coenobiorum* 5.1, ed. Michael Petschenig, *Iohannis Cassiani De institutis coenobiorum et de octo principalium uitiorum remediis libri XII*, CSEL 17 (Vienna, 1888), p. 81: “cenodoxiae, quod sonat uana seu inanis gloria” – “cenodoxia which means vain or empty glory” (trans. Boniface Ramsey); 5.10 and 5.21.3, pp. 88 and 99: “cenodoxia, id est uana gloria”; *Conlationes* 5.2, ed. Michael Petschenig, *Iohannis Cassiani Conlationes XXIII*, CSEL 13 (Vienna, 1886), p. 121: “cenodoxia, id est iactantia seu uana gloria,” etc.) – which explains the presence of the term *cenodoxia* in Bernard of Morlas’s *De octo vitiis* (indicated with other parallels in the same author, by Jones in the Commentary, pp. 131–32). Cassian’s explication also has been transmitted from him by several monastic glossaries, such as *Abstrusa*; *Abba*; *Affatim*; *Ampl. I* (the so-called “Épinal–Erfurt Glossary”), *Corpus glossariorum latinorum*, ed. Gustav Loewe and Georg Goetz, 7 vols. (Leipzig, 1888–1923), respectively at 4:33, line 32; 218, line 1; 493, line 34; 5:349, line 43.

**208**            Nostri iuris opes possent farcire Cyclopes  
                  farcire] .i. replere **c m**

Compare, for instance, Haimo of Auxerre, *Annotatio libri Iezechielis imperfecta* 30.21, ed. Roger Gryson, *Haymonis Autissiodorensis Annotatio libri Iezechielis imperfecta*, CCCM 135E (Turnhout, 2015), p. 321: “‘Vt restitueretur ei sanitas et ligaretur pannis et farciretur linteolis,’ idest repleretur pannorum scissionibus” – “‘So that health may be restored to him, he may be bound by strips, and may be furnished with linen,’ that is, so that he may be filled by strips of cloth.”

**214**            Heu, nil pene dedi! Superest audire quod hedi  
                  hedi (hoedi **M**)] .s. audient **c m**

**289**            Stramina, uiburnum subeunt et gramina furnum  
                  stramina] .i. stipule **c** (none in **M**)  
                  uiburnum (uiburnum **M**)] .i. lignum **c** (none in **M**)  
                  gramina (germina **M**)] .i. fenum **c** (none in **M**, whose ancestor once again did not understand the role of the gloss, and corrected in the line *furnum* by *foenum*).

Three of the four nouns in this line are glossed in **C** with several equivalents, all of which echo 1 Cor. 3.12 (as indicated in the Commentary, p. 139), “ligna faenum stipula.” However, it is possible to identify, beyond these echoes, some possible parallels for the chosen poetic equivalents. For the equivalence between *stipula* and *stramen* to designate straw, compare, for example, Haimo of Auxerre, *Expositio in Amos prophetam* 1.3–4, ed. Roger Gryson, *Haymonis Autissiodorensis Commentarii in prophetas Osee Ioelem Amos Abdiam*, CCCM 125F (Turnhout, 2021), p. 269: “ut sicut stipulae uel stramina” – “like a kind of stalks or straw.” The very rare *uiburnum*, which designates a specific variety of shrub, is ultimately borrowed from Virgil, *Buc.* 1.25: “quantum lenta solent inter uiburna cupressi” – “[as high] as cypresses oft do among the bending osiers” (trans. Ruston Fairclough); compare, for its meaning, Servius, *Commentarius in Vergilii Bucolicon librum, ad loc.*, ed. Georg Thilo and Hermann Hagen, *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1881–1902), vol. 3/1, p. 8: “nam uiburnum brevissimum est, cupressus vero arbor est maxima” – “in fact the wayfaring-tree is very small, while the cypress is a very tall tree”; Junius Philargyrius, *Explanatio in Bucolica Vergilii* (both recensions), *ad loc.*, ed. ibid., vol. 3/2, p. 20: “Viburna idest genus virgulti simile cupressi humilis” – “the wayfaring-tree, that is to say a kind of bush

similar to a small cypress”; *Liber glossarum*, BI36, ed. Anne Grondeux and Franck Cinato, *Liber Glossarum Digital* (Paris, 2016), online, at <<http://liber-glossarum.huma-num.fr>>: “Biburna genus est ligni minutissimi” – “The wayfaring-tree is a very small tree species.”

**342** Falaris inuisi sectatrix et Dyonisii  
Dyonisii] apocopa **c m**

The location of the gloss in **M** makes it possible here to be certain that the remark (written after the end of the verse in **C**, without a reference sign) concerns the last word of the verse, *Dyonisii*. As noted in the Commentary, p. 142, one would rather speak in modern terminology of synzesis.

**343** Agmina contraxit ferus hic ut prelia faxit  
faxit] .i. faciat **c m**

Compare, for example, Servius, *Commentarius in Vergilii Aeneidos libros, ad 12.313*, ed. Thilo and Hagen, *Servii Grammatici ... commentarii*, vol. 2/1, p. 606: “faxo, faciam.” In principle, the verb *faxo* is equivalent to *faciam* (future indicative and not present subjunctive); see Alcuin, *Disputatio de vera philosophia* (PL 101:883A): “Item faxo, pro faciam futuri temporis est tantum indicativi modi, et facit: faxo, faxis, faxit; faximus, faxitis, faxunt, id est, facient” – “Thus *faxo* is used instead of *faciam* only for the future indicative, and this gives: *faxo, faxis, faxit; faximus, faxitis, faxunt*, i.e. ‘they will do.’” However, for the use in Medieval Latin of *faxit* for the third person singular present subjunctive *faciat*, see *Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch bis zum ausgehenden 13. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1959–), s.v. *facio*, 4:19–30, at 20.5–6 (as mentioned in the Commentary, p. 142).

**417** Esto cor immotum, non perturbabile uotum  
esto] sit **c** [NB: From here on **M** is no longer available.]

**426** Quid mihi corithi clypeique ualent polimiti?  
corithi] corithi proprie sunt teç arcuum **C** (in a cartouche)<sup>45</sup>

Jones indicates in the Commentary (p. 147) a close parallel in Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae* 18.9.2, ed. Josefa Cantó Llorca, *Etimologías. Libro XVIII “De bello et ludis”* (Paris, 2007), p. 102: “Coriti proprie sunt arcuum tecae, sicut sagittarum faretrae” – “*Coriti* are, properly speaking, the cases of the bows, like the quivers of the arrows.” This passage could certainly be the direct source of the glossator; but it is worth indicating that the very rare word *corithus* (CL *corytus*), designating the quiver, comes once again from Virgil, *Aen.* 10.168–169: “quis tela sagittae / gorytique leues umeris et letifer arcus” – “their weapons are arrows, light quivers on the shoulders, and deadly bows” (trans. Ruston Fairclough), which may explain the poet’s choice of the name *corithi*. And Isidore himself draws his definition from Servius, *Commentarius in Vergilii Aeneidos libros, ad Aen.* 10.169, ed. Thilo and Hagen, *Servii Grammatici ... commentarii*, vol. 2/2, p. 407: “Coryti proprie sunt arcuum thecae; dicuntur tamen etiam sagittarum, quas et pharetras nominamus” – “*Coriti* are, properly speaking, the cases of the bows; but they also apply to what we also call quivers of the arrows.”

**553** si non diuinus? proclamat dux Hericinus  
Hericinus] ab Herice monte Sicilie **c** (in a cartouche)

On the use of this word, see the Introduction, pp. 35–36 and n. 91 and the Commentary, pp. 155–56, where it is claimed that the poet might have been influenced in his use of *Hericinus*

---

<sup>45</sup> The autoptic examination of the manuscript has confirmed that the cartouche is perfectly visible in its entirety, and that its text corresponds to what the editors were obliged to supply from the microfilm images; it is therefore not necessary to keep the angled brackets added by the editors (Jones and Bruce, *The Relatio metrica*, p. 147).

as a metonymy for “Sicilian” by Virgil, *Aen.* 10.36: “quid repetam exustas Erycino in litore classes” – “Why should I recall the fleet burned on the strand of Eryx?” (trans. Ruston Fairclough). Another probable echo is to *Aen.* 5.759 “Erycino in uertice” – “on the crest of Eryx,” commented upon by Servius, *Commentarius in Vergilii Aeneidos libros, ad loc.*, ed. Thilo and Hagen, *Servii Grammatici ... commentarii*, vol. 1, p. 647, in this way: “Eryx mons Siciliae.”

**659** Sic legitur, uerum confudit fabula uerum  
uerum<sup>1</sup>] .i. sed **c** (to distinguish the two uses of *uerum*, first as a conjunction, then as a substantive).

**684** nunc dilataris cum fit Deus auxiliaris!  
auxiliaris] .i. auxiliator **c**

In conclusion, it is evident that the systematic listing of these glosses and the research into their possible sources gave only meager results, which are of limited interest from the point of view of the actual reading of the poem in the Middle Ages. When they are not purely grammatical glosses, intended to disambiguate a form (as at lines 45, 131, and 659) or to justify the use of an archaic term or spelling (as at lines 133, 343, and 417), and when they do not solve a metrical problem (as at line 342), they are paralleled in particularly widespread sources and therefore say little about the education of the anonymous glossator; they can hardly be explained by a real lexicographical interest. But their interest in reality lies elsewhere: by examining them carefully, it becomes apparent that their function seems to explain the choice of certain poetic terms favoured by the poet (289 *uiburnum*, 426 *corithi*, 553 *Herycinus*), by possibly appealing to the reader’s Virgilian knowledge through glosses deriving directly or not from Servius.<sup>46</sup> In this sense, it is very tempting to assume that many of these glosses, if not all, are to be linked directly to the author himself. This is particularly striking in the case of the glosses to line 289, which obviously have the sole purpose of revealing to the reader that the sentence is a poetic rewriting of a verse from Paul: 1 Cor. 3.12, which is then followed in lines 293–294 by an allusion to 1 Cor. 3.15, whose theme, the purifying fire equated in the exegesis with purgatory, is of crucial importance for the understanding of the whole passage.<sup>47</sup> Above all, this hypothesis would also explain the relative scarcity of the glosses whose purpose is to explain learned words or complex constructions, which are however numerous in the poem. Thus, restoring the glosses to their probable status as “authorial glosses” also allows the addition of a few small touches to the portrait of the *Relatio*’s author who exhibits both fondness for Virgil and familiarity with the commentaries on the classics. Whether he is indeed the little-known poet named *Bernardus Scriba*, as proposed by the editors of the *Relatio*,<sup>48</sup> remains to be confirmed by future studies and discoveries.

---

<sup>46</sup> On the weight of Virgil’s influence on the poet, see the remarks by Jones in Jones and Bruce, *The Relatio metrica*, Introduction, p. 50 and n. 133, who proposes a list of Virgilian parallels to which should be added the references given in the above notes and which, in the light of what has just been highlighted, would deserve to be completed by a systematic research of all other echoes to his œuvre and to his commentators.

<sup>47</sup> On the place of the reflections about the purgatory in the poem, see Jones and Bruce, *The Relatio metrica*, Introduction, pp. 20–23 and, on this passage in particular, the Commentary, p. 139.

<sup>48</sup> For their arguments, see Jones and Bruce, *The Relatio metrica*, pp. 57–64; reasons of style as well as chronology make it unlikely that this *Bernardus Scriba*, whose work would still need to be studied in more detail, would be identified with Bernard of Morlas (see pp. 64–70). It should be noted that the editors have already assumed that the poet may have made use of medieval scholia on Persius, which would explain his use of the highly rare *tucetum* at lines 221 and 493; see Commentary, p. 152.

### *Additional Remarks*

Finally, it may be useful to add some corrections and complements to enrich the critical apparatus. In addition to the misreadings of the manuscript listed above, which have a direct impact on the establishment of the text, the apparatus of the Jones–Bruce edition contains some inaccuracies that are worth rectifying. There are also other peculiarities of the text of **C** that make it possible to give a better account of the work of transcription by the Cistercian copyist: namely hesitations, crossings-out, immediate corrections, etc. For more clarity and convenience, all the variant readings, including those already indicated in the edition, are given below. For the sake of completeness, an exhaustive list of all variants of **M** is added, so that the readers can judge for themselves how valuable the text of this manuscript is and then verify that in many places it is correct to discard the variant readings it transmits. Although these are not to be retained in the text itself, they could have their place in the apparatus in the event of a new critical edition of the *Relatio*.

The apparatus below is negative. For the reasons explained above (p. 80), it does not take into account – except for proper names or forms that could lead to confusion – the *orthographica* of **M**; for those of **C**, see the remarks made above, n. 30.<sup>49</sup>

6 quid] qui **C a.c.** || 11 uiridat] uiri dat **M a.c.** || 23 forcipe] forpice **C M**, **M<sup>2</sup>p.c.** || 24 claustrorum] claustorum **M**, *corr.* **M<sup>2</sup>** || 25 pullas] pullans **M** || 32 Grinea] ignea **M** || 36 sumpsit] sibi *add.* **M a.c.** || 38 chamo] camo **M** || 42mentor] mendacii **M** || 43conscieris] cum scieris **CM** || 45si] cum **M**; Choro] uento **M** || 47 si] sibi **M** || 50 amittit] omittit **M** || 51 tempore] tempora **M a.c.** (*ut uid.*); promit] premit **M** || 56 uiuorum] uniorum **C M** || 57 dicere] dix- **M a.c.** (*ut uid.*) || 60 pro] præ **M** || 68 hyrta] hyrca **M** || 69 crescut] prescut **M** || 74 Parnasum] Parnassum **M** || 75 Pegaseos] pagaseos **M** || 76 *post mere*] q- **M a.c.** || 77 execror] exequor **M a.c.** || 79 Pegaseus] pagaseus **M** || 82 Ensames] Enzames **M**; trames] termes **M** || 85 ingeniosus] ingenuosus **M** || 102 desperentur] desperent **M a.c.** || 105 inmane] in mane **M** || 108 cessat] cessant **M a.c.** || 111 spirant] spirat **C M** || 118 pugnaure] pugnare **M**; potentes] potest **M a.c.** (*ut uid.*) || 119 ingentes] in gentes **M a.c.** || 127 fit] fuit **C a.c.** (*ut uid.*) || 132 execror] excoer **M** || 133 quis] queis **M** || 135 ostorgius] ostrorgius **M** || 136 eusebius] \*- **C a.c.** || 137 patriam] patria **M** || regni] regnum **M** || 138 alter<sup>2</sup>] alterat **M** || 154 *post achatem nullum signum interrogationis praeb.* **C M** || 157 flatus] status **C M** || 158 pre] pro **M** || 160 elemonem] elermonem **C**, Dermonem **M** || 165 mature] matre **M a.c.**; preuolet] peruolet **M** || 169 es] os **C M** || 170 tine] tin\*<sup>ç</sup> **C a.c.** || 171 paupertati] pauper\*\*ti **M a.c.** || 173 hic igitur] igitur hic **M**, *transpos.* **M<sup>2</sup>** || 174 meus] mens **M**, meus *coni.* **M<sup>2</sup> sup.l.**; ipse] ipso **M a.c.** (*ut uid.*) || 175 orbus] orbis **M a.c.**, **M<sup>2</sup>p.c.** || 176 queram] requiram **M a.c.** || 179 dominandi] donandi **M a.c.**, dominandi **M p.c.** || 180 obis] orbis **M** || 182 poscemus] *om.* **M a.c.** || 185 causa promam] causam primam **M** || 188 faber] fabor **C M**, favor **M<sup>2</sup>p.c.** || 189 hec] hic **M** || 194 dare dux] da *in ras.* **C**, dux dare **M**, *transpos.* **M<sup>2</sup>**, ini- *add.* **M a.c.** || 196 genus] *in ras.* **C** (*ut uid.*) || 206 sin] sim **M** || 207 uoto] noto **M** || 208 possent] *iter.* **M** || 210 quod] quid **M** || *post poliphemo nullum signum interrogationis praeb.* **M** || 217 crimine] crimina **M**, **M<sup>2</sup>p.c.** || Horcus] orcus **M** || 219 colubrina] columbina **M** || 221 queritur] quaeritur **M a.c.** || 223 tingue] tinge **M** || 225 heu] *in ras.* **C** || 233 est] esse **M**, **M<sup>2</sup>p.c.** || 243 sensu] censu **M p.c.** || 244 uua] una **M**, **M<sup>2</sup>p.c.** || 248 impretermisse] *eras. iterumque scrips.* **M** || 249 qui] quo **M** || 252 populis conuociferatur] populus uociferatur **M** || 255 in] im- **C a.c.** || 256 subtractis] subiectis **M** || 260 causa lucis] lucis causa **M a.c.** || 262 post fatum] præfatum **M** || 263 symbola carorum] *in ras.* **C** (*ut uid.*) || 264 hoc] haec **M a.c.** (*ut uid.*) || 267 gaza] za- **M a.c.** || 270 post fata] per fata **M** || 273 eusebius] eusobius **M a.c.** (*ut uid.*) || 276 laterali] læthali **M**, uel latrali **M in marg.** || 277 menstrua] mentrua **M** || 280 tinguere] **C M**, tingere *add.* **M sup.l.**; ei] *om.* **M a.c.** || 281 non hunc] nunc hun **M** || 283 tergere] tangere **M** || 289 uiburnum] uibernum **M** || gramina] germina **M** || furnum] foenum **M** || 303 stupra] stuprum **M** || 304 non sibi] nonnisi **M** || 306 quicumque] quicquam **M** || 311 consiliatur] conc- **M a.c.** || 312 Iude] Iudas **M** || 315 post fata] per fact- **M a.c.** || 318 contigerit] contingit **M** || 319 honore] nomine **M a.c.** || 320 adducebantur] abducebantur **M** || 331 *om.* **M** || 333 si] sibi **M** || Siculisque] Siculis quæ **M a.c.** || 338 ceruine] ceruice **M** || 342 Falaris] *sic C (prima manu, pace editorum); sectatrix] ses- M a.c. (ut uid.); Dyonisii] Dionysii M || 343 contraxit] contextit **M** || 345 fere] fer\* **M a.c.** || 355 nocte] nocteque **M a.c.** || 361 ei] et **M** || 368 uetustum] ueteratum **M** || 369 Heç] Nec **M** || 374 abibo] adibo **M** || 376 iners] ine\*- **C a.c.** (*ut uid.*) || 381 college] colle\*\* **C a.c.** || 382 nostro] uestro **M p.c.** || 385 dolus] dolum **M** || 387 et] *om.* **M a.c.** || 389 nihil] nihil **M p.c.**, nul- **M a.c.** || 390 hosti] hostis **M** || 391 predonis] pro donis **M** || 392 almorum] armorum **C a.c.** (*ut uid.*) || 393 *post ululatus deficit M* || 396 ut] u **Ca.c.** (*ut uid.*) || 434 tegendam] tegan\*am **Ca.c.** || 435 tribulemus] tribul\*\*\*- **Ca.c.** (*ut uid.*) || 479 iuerunt] iuenunt **C a.c.** || 515 spiras] spirat **C a.c.** || 561 certo] *in ras.* **C***

<sup>49</sup> Abbreviations used: *add(idit)*; *a(nte) c(orrectionem)*; *coni(exit)*; *corr(exit)*; *eras(it)*; *in marg(ine)*; *in ras(ura)*, written on erasure; *iter(auit)*; *p(ost) c(orrectionem)*; *praeb(et)*; *scrips(it)*; *sup(ra) lineam*; *transpos(uit)*; *ut uid(etur)*; an asterisk marks an illegible letter, hyphens are used to indicate “*inter scribendum variants*.”

|| 587 sordidularum] sordid\*\*\*\*\* C a.c. || 597 pete] pe\*\* C a.c. || 615 futilis] fusilis C; Astarte] ast arte C || fusilis] \*\*\*\*- C a.c. || 655 cui] qui C || 672 crimina] carmina C || 683 fama] forma C || 689 nulla] ulla C || 728 rara] rata C a.c. (ut uid.) || 740 dedicat] dedit C || 741 orbi] orbis C || 746 belli sanctissima curia] in ras. C || 754 species] spēs (pro speres?) C || 769 uiam] piam C; confortet] confor\*\*\* C a.c. || 773 potuit<sup>2</sup>] \*- C a.c. || 790 insidias] insidia C p.c. || 804 Gyezi] Gies- C a.c. (ut uid.) || 822 fieri] \*\*- C a.c. || 823 cunctipotentij] \*\*\*\*- C a.c.

#### ABSTRACT

This article proposes to correct and supplement the *editio princeps* of a twelfth-century Cluniac poem, the *Relatio metrica de duobus ducibus* (edited by Christopher A. Jones and Scott G. Bruce in 2016), preserved by a single medieval manuscript, Charleville-Mézières, Médiathèque Voyelles, MS 190 (saec. XII–XIII). A new partial and late manuscript witness (Melk, Stiftsarchiv, MS Kt. 7 Patres 10, Fasz. 3, Nr. 2, saec. XVII) is presented, twenty-seven *loci* of the poem are corrected or discussed, and the attribution to the *Relatio*'s author of a set of glosses which accompany the poem in the two witnesses is suggested.

#### RÉSUMÉ

Cet article se propose de corriger et de compléter l'édition *princeps* d'un poème clunisien du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle, la *Relatio metrica de duobus ducibus* (éditée par Christopher A. Jones et Scott G. Bruce en 2016), conservé par un seul manuscrit médiéval, le Ms. Charleville-Mézières, Médiathèque Voyelles, 190 (s. XII–XIII). Il signale un nouveau témoin manuscrit du texte, partiel et tardif (Ms. Melk, Stiftsarchiv, Ms. Kt. 7 Patres 10, Fasz. 3, Nr. 2, s. XVII), corrige ou discute vingt-sept passages du poème et suggère d'attribuer à l'auteur de la *Relatio* un ensemble de gloses qui accompagnent le poème dans les deux témoins.

Jérémy DELMULLE  
Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes (CNRS, UPR 841)  
jeremy.delmulle@irht.cnrs.fr