

Mariken Teeuwen

«THE MASTER HAS IT WRONG».  
DISSENTING VOICES IN COMMENTARY TEXTS

Marginal and interlinear texts are a difficult area of research<sup>1</sup>. Obviously, they are often difficult to read, as they are commonly executed in tiny script, arranged around a main text in a confusing fashion and because of limited writing space full of obscure abbreviations. They are often transmitted in a damaged way precisely because of their existence in the margin, the most fragile part of the book. But they are also difficult because the nature of these texts seems to defy the boundaries of 'text' in a traditional sense. Text in the margin is always open: scribes had the freedom to skip, alter or add, whether from the physical consultation of other books or from memory and imagination. The relationships between individual manuscripts are more complicated than the accepted methods of scholarly text edition provide for<sup>2</sup>. We need to find new ways to chart the features of these fuzzy texts, and find new forms in which to make them visible.

The material difficulty, and the difficulty of finding a new way to make editions these texts are two great challenges in the research of marginal and interlinear texts, and there is yet another difficulty looming: the purpose or function of glosses and marginal texts is not at all clear. The tra-

1. Many of the observations I make in this paper are also published in other contributions. See especially M. Teeuwen, *Marginal Scholarship: Rethinking the Function of Latin Glosses in Early Medieval Manuscripts*, in *Rethinking and Recontextualizing Glosses: New Perspectives in the Study of Late Anglo-Saxon Glossography*, cur. P. Lendinara - L. Lazari - C. Di Sciacca, Porto 2011, pp. 19-37; M. Teeuwen, *Writing Between the Lines: Reflections of a Scholarly Debate in a Carolingian Commentary Tradition*, in *Marginal Scholarship and Martianus Capella: Ninth-Century Commentary Traditions in Context*, cur. M. Teeuwen - S. O'Sullivan, Turnhout 2011, pp. 11-34.

2. C. Dionisotti, *On the Nature and Transmission of Latin Glossaries*, in *Les manuscrits des lexiques et glossaires de l'antiquité au moyen âge*, cur. J. Hamesse, Louvain-la-Neuve 1996, pp. 202-52; J. E. G. Zetzel, *Marginal Scholarship and Textual Deviance: The 'Commentum Cornuti' and the Early Scholia on Persius*, in «Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies Supplement» 84, (2005), esp. pp. 144-61.

ditional interpretation of a glossed manuscript is that it was used in a context of teaching<sup>3</sup>. Others (notably Michael Lapidge) observed that, when scrutinised in more detail, glosses do not always fit a school setting: in some cases they seem to have been copied just for the sake of preservation in rarely used library books<sup>4</sup>. A new hypothesis concerning the practice of glossing books suggests that in some cases, it fits best the character of a scholarly practice, reflecting intellectual debates that were sparked by the texts to which the marginalia were added<sup>5</sup>. In the ninth century, when glossing activity was at a peak, monastic scholars glossed books to create collections of learning, tying as many references to other texts to the text at hand as possible. The hypothesis rests on a close analysis of the oldest commentary tradition on Martianus Capella's *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*, on the basis of which it became clear that even the few Latin-Latin commentary traditions that have been published are deeply interconnected, even when they are scattered across the whole of Latin literature in a haphazard way. They rely upon a common body of texts and share material between them, just as, for example, glossaries do, or encyclopedic collections<sup>6</sup>. Moreover, the margin was the perfect place for *dissent* and *debate*: contradictions were displayed and discussed<sup>7</sup>. Many marginal annotations

3. G. Glauche, *Die Rolle der Scholautoren im Unterricht von 800 bis 1100*, in *La scuola nell'Occidente latino dell'alto medioevo*, Spoleto 1972, pp. 617-36; G. Wieland - A. G. Rigg, *A Canterbury Classbook of the Mid-Eleventh Century*, in «Anglo-Saxon England», 4 (1975), pp. 113-30; G. Wieland, *The Latin Glosses on Arator and Prudentius in Cambridge University Library Ms. Gg. 5. 35*, Toronto 1983; S. Reynolds, *Glossing Horace: Using the Classics in the Medieval Classroom*, in *Medieval Manuscripts of the Latin Classics: Production and Use*, cur. C. A. Chavannes-Mazel - M. M. Smith, Los Altos Hills-London 1996, pp. 103-17.

4. M. Lapidge, *The Study of Latin Texts in Late Anglo-Saxon England: The Evidence of Latin Glosses*, in *Latin and the Vernacular Languages in Early Medieval Britain*, cur. N. Brooks, Leicester 1982, pp. 99-140. And, in response to this article, G. Wieland, *The Glossed Manuscript: Classbook or Library Book?*, in «Anglo-Saxon England», 14 (1985), pp. 153-73.

5. M. Teeuwen, *Harmony and the Music of the Spheres: The ars musica in Ninth-Century Commentaries on Martianus Capella*, Leiden-Boston-Köln 2002, esp. pp. 145-50; M. Teeuwen, *The Pursuit of Secular Learning: The Oldest Commentary Tradition on Martianus Capella*, in «Journal of Medieval Latin», 18 (2008), pp. 36-51, esp. 45-51; Teeuwen, *Writing between the lines* cit.; M. Godden, *Glosses to the Consolation of Philosophy in Late Anglo-Saxon England: Their Origins and Their Uses*, in *Rethinking and Recontextualizing Glosses* cit., pp. 67-91.

6. R. McKitterick, *Glossaries and Other Innovations in Carolingian Book Production, in Turning Over a New Leaf: Change and Development in the Medieval Manuscript*, cur. E. Kwakkel - R. McKitterick - R. Thomson, Leiden 2012, pp. 21-76.

7. Teeuwen, *Writing Between the Lines* cit.

seem driven by the urge to collect material from different authorities, compare them and analyse the differences, weigh them against each other. These discoveries have far-reaching implications for our assessment of marginal scholarship as a whole. Rather than seeing them as a “report from the classroom”, we should see them as a crucial source of information on Carolingian learning and scholarship, its preoccupations and methods. Marginal texts offer us a lens through which we will be able to see Carolingian intellectual life anew<sup>8</sup>.

In this paper, I shall illustrate this point with a number of examples, mostly taken from the ninth-century commentary tradition on Martianus Capella.

In a ninth-century manuscript of Martianus Capella’s *De nuptiis*, Leiden, University Library, Voss.Lat.Folio. 48 (hereafter VLF 48), which is enriched with a thick layer of marginal and interlinear annotations from the oldest commentary tradition on this text (to be dated to 820-840), the following marginal annotation is found<sup>9</sup>:

VLF 48, fol. 31v, gl. 13, ad *De nuptiis* IV 336, GRAIA<sup>10</sup>  
 secundam (*sic, lege secundum*) Hildebertum “nec deseram ego graia” ut sit nominativus. secundum autem rei veritatem accusativus est pluralis i. “non deseram per ordinem loquendi ea que sunt greca”.

In paraphrase, the gloss says that Hildebertus, when explaining the text, takes *graia* as a nominative, but that he is wrong: in fact, *graia* is a plural accusative. How this particular sentence actually makes sense is not

8. The glossed manuscript as a reflection of scholarship and intellectual practice in the early Middle Ages is the major theme of a five-year research project I have now embarked upon, together with a research team consisting of a Postdoc researcher and a PhD. The project, *Marginal Scholarship: The Practice of Learning in the Early Middle Ages (ca. 800- ca. 1000)*, is funded by the Netherlands Organisation of Scientific Research (NWO). For more information about this project see [www.huygens.knaw.nl/marginal-scholarship-vidi/](http://www.huygens.knaw.nl/marginal-scholarship-vidi/) (last consulted in April 2012).

9. See also Teeuwen, *The Pursuit of Secular Learning* cit., pp. 36-9.

10. For a view of this manuscript, see the Leiden Digital Special Collections website, at <https://socrates.leidenuniv.nl/>. A full set of high quality colour photographs of the manuscript is available on this site. An online edition was created by an international network of specialists: Mariken Teeuwen, in cooperation with Bruce Eastwood, Mary Garrison, Jean-Yves Guillaumin, Natalia Lozovsky and Sinead O’Sullivan. It is available at <http://martianus.huygens.knaw.nl> and shows black and white photos of the manuscript with a complete transcription of text and glosses. The glosses quoted here are taken from that online edition. For *De nuptiis*, I refer to the edition of James Willis, *Martianus Capella, De nuptiis*, Leipzig 1983, followed by the book number in Roman numerals, and the section number in Arabic numerals.

all too important here: what is, is that this particular gloss shows how one authority (Hildebertus) is dismissed, and another (the anonymous glossator) asserts itself; it shows an intellectual debate. The phenomenon of discussion in commentary texts comes to the surface in this particular gloss, but when studying the commentary tradition on Martianus Capella, it is at the background of many other annotations as well. However, this particular gloss is also unique – in more than one way. First of all, the Leiden manuscript has it, but others with the same commentary tradition don't<sup>11</sup>. It was not part of the 'core' of the oldest commentary tradition, in other words, but was added in just one of its copies. Second, it is the only gloss that I came across in which a contemporary scholar (for that is what Hildebertus must be) is attacked in such an overt way. The glossator must have had a particular grudge against him, because just one page further he also adds a gloss that gives his name as an example of 'an individual', and adds «ut Hildebertus malus» («just as bad Hildebert», fol. 32r, gl. 10) without further explanation. Glosses generally do compare different opinions on certain topics, but it is rare that they explicitly choose one opinion over the other, and to plainly state that a certain opinion is wrong is even more exceptional. Another example that comes to mind is the case of a manuscript from Lyon (Paris, BnF, NA lat. 329), with the treatise *Liber officialis*, on the interpretation of Mass, from Amalarius<sup>12</sup>. Amalarius was, for various reasons, not received with open arms in Lyon, and the manuscript is filled with remarks that criticize the text, attack Amalarius personally or make fun of him. For example, when Amalarius explains that a *tonsura* should be seen as a metaphor for the expulsion of superfluous thoughts, the glossator notes that Amalarius

11. The readings of this particular manuscript (Leiden, VLF 48) were systematically compared to the readings of three others: Besançon, B. Municipale, 594; Leiden, University L., BPL 88; and Vatican City, BAV, Reg. lat. 1987. The number of surviving manuscripts with the oldest commentary tradition has been estimated at 18 by Sinead O'Sullivan; see *Glossae aevi Carolini in libros I-II Martiani Capellae 'De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii'*, ed. S. O'Sullivan, Turnhout 2010, pp. CX-CXXX and S. O'Sullivan, *The Stemmatic Relationship Between the Manuscripts Transmitting the Oldest Gloss Tradition*, in *Carolingian Scholarship* cit., pp. 35-55. I checked a number of the other manuscripts with the oldest commentary tradition, but did not find the gloss in any of them.

12. This case has been fully explored by K. Zechiel-Eckes, *Florus von Lyon als Kirchenpolitiker und Publizist: Studien zur Persönlichkeit eines karolingischen 'Intellektuellen' am Beispiel der Auseinandersetzung mit Amalarius (835-838) und des Prädestinationsstreits (851-855)*, Stuttgart 1999, esp. pp. 72-6.

himself should then not only have shaved off his hair, but also his brain, which was, after all, the source of all these superfluous thoughts<sup>13</sup>.

Generally speaking, it can be said that marginal annotations tend to express the idea that several interpretations of a text are possible. They lay bare that authorities are not, or at least not always, consistent, that different theories are found, or different sets of terms are used. This phenomenon is crucial to the very nature of glossing.<sup>14</sup> For example, in Martianus' encyclopaedia on the seven liberal arts, *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*, Boethius often plays the role of "second" or "other" authority when the arts of arithmetic and music treated. In Boethius' *De institutione arithmetica* and in his *De institutione musica*, the exposition of these arts follow a different path than the exposition of the same ones in *De nuptiis*. It leads to glosses such as the following ones (the italics are mine):

VLF 48, fol. 70v, gl. 49, ad *De nuptiis* VII 765, INCIPIT IGITUR

Numerus qui duplex sesquialter vocatur *secundum Boetium*, *secundum istum* duplex superdimidius.

Qui *secundum Boetium* triplex sesquialter, *secundum istum* triplus superdimidius.

Qui *secundum illum* quadruplus sesquialter, *secundum istum* quadruplus superdimidius.

Qui *secundum <illum>* duplex sesquitercius, *secundum istum* duplus supertertius.

Qui *secundum illum* triplex sesquitercius, *secundum istum* triplus supertertius.

Et qui *secundum Boetium* quadruplex sesquitercius, *secundum istum* quadruplus supertertius.

Qui *secundum illum* duplex sesquiquartus, *secundum istum* duplus superquartus.

Qui *secundum illum* triplus sesquiquartus, *secundum istum* triplus superquartus.

VLF 48, fol. 87r, gl. 25, ad *De nuptiis* IX.940, SED SPECIALIS PER SINGULOS TROPOS XXVIII

Supra XVIII posuit nunc XXVIII. Si volueris diatonicum tantum commemorare tunc X et VIII habebis. Si autem cromaticum vel enarmonium intromiseris X supra habebis. Sub uno tamen nomine V cromatici et V enarmonici adduntur i.e. pro una corda. *Sed subtiliter et obscure iste dixit. Boetius vero enucleatius patefecit.*

13. Ibid., p. 72 and note 6: «si capilli superflui superfluas cogitationes significant et ideo tonderi aut radi debent, multum tibi necesse erat ut non solum caput corporis sed etiam mentem raderes unde tanta superflua prodeunt». Zechiel-Eckes refers to the earlier edition of J. M. Hanssens, *Amalaris episcopi opera liturgica omnia*, Città del Vaticano 1948-1950, II, pp. 573-4.

14. G. Wieland, *Interpreting the Interpretation: The Polysemy of the Latin Gloss*, in «Journal of Medieval Latin», 8 (1998), pp. 59-71.

In both cases, the glossator refers explicitly to Boethius. In the first example, the gloss provides the reader of Martianus with a set of matching technical terms for numerical proportions that form the mathematical basis for musical intervals from Boethius' *De institutione arithmetica*, book I section 22<sup>15</sup>. A reader will thus be supported in his understanding of the material, even when a different technical vocabulary was used. In the second, which refers to Boethius' *De institutione musica*, and incidentally to the same book- and section number here: I 22<sup>16</sup>, the gloss reacts to Martianus' statement that all in all, there are 28 proper tones in the Greek Perfect System (IX 940)<sup>17</sup>. When he enumerated them in IX 931, however, he stated that there are just 18 tones (from *proslambanomenos* to *nete hyperbolaion* – or from *adquisitus* to *ultima excellentium*)<sup>18</sup>. The glossator explains how the difference comes about: Martianus gives the names of the 18 tones, but 10 of them can also appear in different modes: the *modus chromaticus*, and the *modus enharmonicus*. When all possible tones are thus counted, the total is not 18, but 28. The glossator is not as neutral in his evaluation of the two authorities as in the first example: «Boethius», the annotator notes, «makes this clear in a more precise manner».

So here, a second authority was brought in not only to contrast the first, but to enhance the understanding of the first. This intellectual effort can be observed very often in the annotations, especially in the book on arithmetic, where Martianus stands corrected by other authorities. The following three examples show how Martianus was presented as a deviant opinion on number, the nature of numbers and the terminology used for them, for instance in his idiosyncratic use of the terms *pars* and *membrum*, which deviates from that of other authorities in the field (the italics are mine):

VLF 48, fol. 69r, gl. 42, ad De nuptiis VII 752, ET CUIUSQUE NUMERI MEMBRA

Proprium vero membrum est quod dum consideratur in corpore ipsius numeri ipsum tamen metiri non potest ut in senario partes et membra considerantur. habet enim duas partes binarium quidem et ternarium quid (*sic, lege qui*) duo

15. Boetii *De institutione arithmetica libri duo, De institutione musica libri quinque*, ed. G. Friedlein, Leipzig 1867, p. 46; see also *Martianus Capella, Les noces de Philologie et de Mercure Livre VII, L'arithmétique*, ed. J.-Y. Guillaumin, Paris 2003, pp. 113-5.

16. Boetii *De institutione* cit., pp. 214-27.

17. *De nuptiis* IX 940 (ed. Willis, p. 362): «sunt igitur innumerabiles soni, sed specialiter per singulos tropos viginti octo tantum poterunt convenire, quorum nomina superius memoravi».

18. *De nuptiis* IX 931 (ed. Willis, p. 357): «verum soni sunt per singulos quosque ac per omnes tropos numero XVIII».

numeri senarium metiuntur. habet et membra: continet enim intra se quaternarium et binarium. ideo quaternarius membri est quia senarium non metitur. binarius vero in hac consideratione et membrum et pars potest inveniri. inde fit ut et quedam membra partes possint inveniri et quelibet partes membra. *sed notandum quod auctor huius artis in hoc loco contra aliorum auctoritate utitur.* membrum namque numeri vocat quod ipsum totum numerum metiri potest. partem vero appellat eos numeros in quos dividitur numquam tamen metiuntur. verbi gratia: in duodenario ternarium et quaternarium membra ponit dum totum numerum dividunt in septenario vero ternarium partem esse insinuat cum ipse ternarius septenarium non metitur in sequentibus. *tamen huius operis manifestissime secundum aliorum auctoritatem ratione usus est.*

VLF 48, fol. 69v, gl. 67, ad De nuptiis VII 757, AUT RATIONE MEMBRORUM

Inter membrum et partes talem differentiam esse Martianus velle videtur ut in proportione duorum vel trium numerorum membrum appelletur. in divisione vero singulorum numerorum partes dicant. vel si quaternarium et senarium proportionaliter adiunxero, statim mihi videbatur senarius quaternarium superare binario. et e contrario quaternarium video minorem esse senario duobus. huic sequitur ut ipsum binarium membrum aut senarii aut quaternarii dicam. senarii enim tertium membrum est dimidium quaternarii. sed si eundem binarium in corpore ipsius senarii posuero video tertiam ipsius esse ideoque pars vocatur. *Scire tamen debemus alios doctores arithmetice artis sine ulla differentia membrum pro parte et partem pro membro posuisse.*

VLF 48, fol. 70r, gl. 18, ad De nuptiis VII 759, BIS IN SENARIO NUMERO

*Notandum quod Martianus, quamvis cum aliis in multis habuerit concordiam auctoribus, in multis tamen aliorum auctoritatem confundere suoque proprio usus fuisse.* nam secundum alios a multiplici forma inchoat quae est aequalitatis (*sic, sed lege inaequalitatis*) prima species. sed superparticularem et superpartientem quasi in unam formam confundit quae secundum auctoritatem Boetii ab invicem separantur. *et quod gravius est: bis eandem rationem ponit. quod nullus alius fecisse invenitur.* superparticularem enim et superpartientem sub una forma in ratione membrorum ponit. et iterum superparticularem et superpartientem sub una forma et sub una ratione partitur. deinde multiplicem superparticularem et multiplicem superpartientem in ratione membrorum quarto loco posuit. postea multiplicem superparticularem et multiplicem superpartientem sub una forma in quinto posuisse usus fuisse videtur loco. hinc est ut idem numerus formarum cum isto et cum aliis inveniatur, diverso tamen modo. prima ergo forma secundum istum multiplex secundum alios superparticularis, et superpartiens in ratione membrorum, quae forma ab aliis simplex superparticularis vocatur. tertia superparticularis et superpartiens in ratione partitur, ab aliis tantum superpartiens vocatur. quarta multiplex superparticularis et multiplex superpartiens in ratione membrorum, quae forma ab aliis multiplex superparticularis vocatur. quinta multi-

plex superparticularis et multiplex superpartiens, quae forma *ab aliis* multiplex superpartiens.

A powerful and new instrument to visualize differences between authorities is encountered in the commentary tradition on the book on Astronomy: the diagram. The value and innovation of the astronomical diagrams that sprang from Martianus' text has been fully analyzed by Bruce Eastwood<sup>19</sup>. I shall not repeat his work here, but just want to draw attention to a diagram that is found in several manuscripts with Martianus' *De nuptiis*<sup>20</sup>: a diagram in which three different interpretations of the movement of the planets in the cosmos are shown in one single figure. Here, again, the process of presenting conflicting authorities side by side is apparent. Each of the three interpretations explained a circumsolar pattern for the planets Venus and Mercury, which, according to Martianus (VIII 857), do not revolve around the earth, but around the sun. In the diagram, the authorities that are thought to be the source of each of the abstract representations of the planetary movements are sometimes named (Pliny, Martianus, Plato or Bede), sometimes not. The diagram illustrates the same phenomenon we already observed in the texts: it sets deviant authorities side by side, paraphrases or deduces the learning found in these other authorities, and offers them in comparison to the authority at hand. Eastwood has shown, furthermore, that the diagrams in fact go beyond the text and add new learning to it, gained precisely from this comparison of sources<sup>21</sup>. Not only do they present ancient learning in a concentrated form, but they also offer a steppingstone from ancient learning to new, contemporary learning. The ancient learned traditions are broken up into "capsules" of manageable information, they are compared to each other and transformed into new building blocks to create a medieval structure.

19. B. S. Eastwood, *The Power of Diagrams: The Place of the Anonymous Commentary in the Development of Carolingian Astronomy and Cosmology*, in *Carolingian Scholarship* cit., pp. 193-220; B. S. Eastwood, *Ordering the Heavens: Roman Astronomy and Cosmology in the Carolingian Renaissance*, Leiden-Boston 2007, esp. pp. 373-425; B. S. Eastwood - G. Grasshoff, *Planetary Diagrams – Descriptions, Models, Theories from Carolingian Deployments to Copernican Debates*, in *The Power of Images in Early Modern Science*, cur. W. Lefèvre - J. Renn - U. Schoepflin, Basel 2003, pp. 197-226.

20. The diagram is found in Leiden, University L., VLF 48; Paris, BnF, lat. 8669; Paris, BnF, lat. 8671; Leiden, University L., BPL 36; München, BSB, clm 14729. See Eastwood, *Ordering the Heavens* cit. pp. 257-8, and for a plate see *ibid.* p. 392.

21. Eastwood, *The Power of Diagrams* cit. 219-20.



A similar process can be observed in a diagram added to a capsule of dialectical learning. In this diagram, added to the Leiden Martianus Capella manuscript (VLF 48) on fol. 32 r, it is shown how substance can be organized in categories of 'beings', according to the Aristotelian logical tradition<sup>22</sup>. The result is a very simple Porphyrian Tree: a circular diagram that illustrates the way in which man (*homo*) differs from various other substances. A small circle in the centre of the drawing contains the term *homo*. Around this circle is a larger circle, divided into four sections, containing (clockwise from the topmost) the terms *animalitas*, *ratio*, *sensus* and *mortalitas*. Around this circle is a larger circle, also divided into four sections, each corresponding to one of the four sections of the middle circle. It contains the terms (clockwise from top) *lapis*, *equus*, *arbor* and *angelus*. So *man* is said to differ from *rock* in being *animate*, from *horse* in being *rational*, from *tree* in being *sensate*, and from *angel* in being *mortal*. Since Martianus himself does not treat the logical principles underlying such categorizations, the diagram clearly adds learning to what is already there. As Mary Garrison analyzed, the diagram and its surrounding glosses include learning from Boethius' *De topicis differentiis*, and Cassiodore's *Institutiones* and *De anima*. In other words, the marginal annotations do not only paraphrase, but extend the learning on the subject at hand beyond the text itself, and embed it in a new context.

In my final example an annotation is shown that has caught the attention of several colleagues working on the oldest commentary tradition on Martianus Capella<sup>23</sup>. It illustrates how Carolingian scholars found a way to incorporate non-Christian elements of the ancient learned tradition into their own Christian learning, without compromising it. The Neoplatonic blueprint of *De nuptiis* clearly inspired the Carolingian scholarly elite but also caused friction, which is sometimes laid bare by the glossators. The gloss in question reacts on Martianus' exposition on the term *accidens*, accident, or accessory quality (book IV, section 362). Again, we can see here how the glossator goes beyond the text at hand, and involves other authorities:

22. This diagram is discussed by Mary Garrison in *Questions and Observations Based on Transcribing the Commentary on Books IV and V, Dialectic and Rhetoric*, in *Carolingian Scholarship* cit., pp. 147-76, esp. 154-65. A plate of the diagram is found on p. 157.

23. C. M. Bower, *Quadrivial Reasoning and Allegorical Revelation: 'Meta-knowledge' and Carolingian Approaches to Knowing*, in *Carolingian Scholarship* cit., pp. 57-74, esp. 66-9; A. Luhtala, *On Early Medieval Divisions of Knowledge*, in *Carolingian Scholarship* cit., pp. 75-98, esp. 95-6; I. Ramelli, *Eriugena's Commentary on Martianus in the Framework of his Thought and the Philosophical Debate of his Time*, in *Carolingian Scholarship*, pp. 245-72, esp. 252-7.

VLF 48, fol. 32r, gl. 57, ad *De nuptiis* IV 347, ACCIDENS

[...] Omnis igitur naturalis ars in humana natura posita et concreata est. Inde conficitur ut omnes homines habeant naturaliter naturales artes. Sed quia pena peccati primi hominis in animabus hominum obscurantur et in quamdam profundam ignorantiam devolvuntur, nichil aliud agimus discendo nisi easdem artes quae in profunde memoriae repositae sunt in presentiam intellegentie revocamus. Et cum aliis occupamus curis, nihil aliud agimus artes neglegendo nisi ipsas artes iterum dimittere, ut redeant ad id a quo revocatae sunt. Cum ergo apparet rethorica in animo alicuius hominis, non aliunde venit nisi ab ipso, i. de profunditate ipsius memoriae et ad nullum alium redit aliqua causa, i. aut morte[m] vel alia qualibet re, nisi ad eandem profunditatem eiusdem memoriae.

In this annotation a theory emerges on the nature of the arts that is not part of Martianus' allegory. All the arts, the glossator explains, are natural parts of the human mind being created together with it; they are *innate* to humankind, by nature inherent to the human soul. But because of original sin (*pena peccati*), the arts have become hidden, and all people have fallen into profound ignorance. Therefore, when we learn, we do nothing else than recall the arts to the presence of our minds from the depths of our memory, and when we neglect them, being occupied with other concerns, we send them back to where they came from. Hence, when rhetoric is in someone's soul, it does not come from elsewhere but rather from himself, that is from the depths of his memory and it returns to no other place than to the depths of his memory.

The gloss presents a fascinating mix of ancient and patristic ideas about the soul and about knowledge. Anneli Luhtala recognized Augustinian elements, especially from his early works, in which he, in accordance with Plato's theory of recollection (*anamnesis*), held the view that the soul existed prior to its embodiment and brought with it into this life a knowledge of all the arts<sup>24</sup>. According to this view, learning is in fact *recollecting* knowledge of the arts. This position was later rejected by Augustine in his *De doctrina christiana*, and perhaps therefore not so much taken up by Alcuin. Nevertheless, the anamnesis doctrine is significantly present in the oldest commentary tradition on Martianus Capella, and re-emerged in full glory in the works of, for example, John the Scot Eriugena (*Expositiones in ierarchiam coelestem, Periphyseon*), and Regino of Prüm (*Epistola de armonica institutione*)<sup>25</sup>. In fact, the manuscripts themselves of

24. Luhtala, *On Early Medieval Divisions* cit., pp. 95-6. She refers to Augustinus' *Retractiones*, see *ibid.* p. 83.

25. Ramelli, *Eriugena's Commentary* cit., p. 252-7; Bower, *Quadrivial Reasoning* cit., p. 65-9.

Martianus Capella (and other authors) are the perfect illustration of the early medieval pursuit of such a recollection: they strive to fill the manuscripts to their very edges with as much pieces of knowledge as they can gather, creating a second, medieval encyclopedia of learning around the late-ancient one. The effort and zeal that went into such a pursuit speaks to us through the manuscript pages, with their abbreviations, Tironian notes, diagrams and layers of material.

In this paper, I hope to have shown that the margins of Martianus Capella's *De nuptiis* are filled with discussion. The activity in the margin does not only show us a schoolmaster, explaining the text at hand to his pupils, but it shows us a community of scholars, discussing the text amongst themselves, and creating a layer of learning around it. The text often functions as their point of departure, from which they travel to a host of other texts and opinions. They distance themselves from the text where they feel the need, with phrases such as «antiqui dicunt», or «philosophi dicunt», or «alii doctores aliter dicunt». They highlight contradictions, and contrast authorities with each other.

This is not only the case in the oldest commentary tradition on Martianus Capella, even though all the examples were from this context. The same phenomenon is found, for example, in the Carolingian gloss tradition added to Boethius' *De institutione musica*, or Priscian's *Grammar*<sup>26</sup>. I am convinced that as more commentary traditions will become available in modern editions, the trait will turn out to be characteristic marginal scholarship in Carolingian manuscripts, and perhaps also of tenth- and eleventh-century manuscripts. Malcolm Godden and Rohini Jayatilaka, for example, characterized the early medieval Latin gloss tradition on Boethius, *Consolation of Philosophy* with the following words: «one of the things that the glossing history of the *Consolation* particularly encouraged was the idea that any text had a multiplicity of meanings, and it was often impossible to say which was right. For people in the tenth and eleventh century, reading the glosses on Boethius was a lesson in the fluidity of classical legend»<sup>27</sup>.

26. I mention these two authors, just because serious scholarship has been done on their commentary traditions: *Glossa maior in institutionem musicam Boethii*, ed. M. Bernhard - C. M. Bower, München 1993, 1994, 1995 and 2011; for the glosses on Priscian see R. Hofman (transcription) and P. Moran (digital edition), *St. Gall Priscian Glosses*, online available at <http://www.stgallpriscian.ie/> (last consulted in April 2012).

27. M. Godden - R. Jayatilaka, *Counting the Heads of the Hydra: The Development of the Early Medieval Commentary on Boethius's 'Consolation of Philosophy'*, in *Carolingian Scholarship* cit., pp. 363-76, at p. 376.

It is now up to us to further analyze the phenomenon. What were the techniques used to support this kind of scholarship? Do the glosses share common information, and can we identify the sources of that information? How wide-spread was the scholarly practice, and can we identify intellectual centres at the heart of it? Is it a phenomenon unique to the Carolingian period, or did it develop from earlier examples? How did it develop in later ages? What were the dynamics of the practice of marginal scholarship: did learning travel with scholars, with books, or with both, and how can we tell? What may have been the role of the secular courts in this dynamic? With these questions (just a few of the many I have), I wish to conclude my paper, which has shown, hopefully, that the margin is not at all a marginal object of research; on the contrary, it is a very central one, that has been neglected for too long.

## ABSTRACT

This paper will focus on glossed manuscripts from the Carolingian period. The margin, it will be argued, is not merely a place for explanation, for educational remarks on vocabulary, grammar and syntax. It is a crucial source of information on Carolingian intellectual life, its preoccupations and methods. Marginal annotations from this period are often characterized by a drive to collect material from different authorities, compare them and analyze their differences. For example, in marginal annotations and commentaries on the late ancient scholarly texts from Martianus Capella and Boethius, these authorities are not only put next to each other, but also other authors and texts are brought in to create a complete web of learning around a certain topic. This phenomenon will be illustrated with several examples. First some clear cut examples will be shown in which glosses refer to differences between one authority and the other. A second example will show the new and powerful instrument brought in to show differences between authorities: the diagram. Finally, some more abstract examples will be shown. The world of the non-Christian author Martianus Capella was not always in harmony with the Christian worldview of the ninth century. The Neoplatonic blueprint of Martianus' *De nuptiis* clearly inspired the Carolingian scholarly elite, but also caused friction. Ideas on *sapientia*, for example, or on the knowability of the world, expressed in the margin of Martianus manuscripts, show how scholars struggled to balance their pagan authorities with their Christian authorities.

Mariken Teeuwen  
Professor University of Utrecht  
mariken.teeuwen@huylgens.knaw.nl