

IUS COMMUNE

Zeitschrift für Europäische Rechtsgeschichte

Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts
für Europäische Rechtsgeschichte
Frankfurt am Main

XXVI

Herausgegeben von DIETER SIMON
und MICHAEL STOLLEIS



Vittorio Klostermann Frankfurt am Main
1999

FRANK SOETERMEER

Summa archiepiscopi alias Summa copiosa:

Some Remarks on the Medieval Editions
of the *Summa Hostiensis**

Medieval works on the *droit savant* were sometimes known under different titles. The *Summula questionum* of Albertus Galeottus, for instance, was sometimes called *Margarita*. The same name was also given to Bonaguida's *Gemma*. While in several manuscripts Bernardus Compostellanus iunior's *Casus decretalium* are called the *Compostellanus*, in others they appear as the *Apostille*.¹ These names occur in the *incipit* or *explicit* of the work. Most of the scribes must have copied them from the exemplar they used. They can therefore be typical of different textual traditions of the same work. When such a work has been edited at several universities, a group of manuscripts in which one of the names occurs may represent a textual tradition which originates from one of these *Studia*.

Unfortunately, it is often hard to find where the name came into being. Most manuscripts lack a colophon in which the scribe has indicated where and when he finished his work. Sometimes other sources can shed some light on the genesis of a textual tradition, in particular contemporary documents on the book-production (e.g. taxation lists of stationers and copying contracts) and catalogues of medieval libraries.

* This article is dedicated to Ennio Cortese (Rome, La Sapienza) on his 70th anniversary. I wish to thank Dr. Martin Bertram (Rome, Deutsches Historisches Institut) for his kind help; he has read an earlier version of the text and gave me precious information on several manuscripts of the *Summa*.

¹ I may refer to my *Utrumque ius in peciis*. Aspetti della produzione libraria a Bologna fra Due e Trecento, (Orbis academicus VII), Milano 1997, pp. 315, 322 s. The diversity of names is also discussed by L. FOWLER-MAGERL, *Ordo iudiciorum vel ordo iudiciarius*. Begriff und Literaturgattung, (Ius Commune Sonderheft 19), Frankfurt am Main 1984, p. 5 s.

"Summa aurea", or maybe "Summa copiosa"?

One of the medieval commentaries which circulated under different names was the *Summa* of Henricus de Segusio (Hostiensis). This has caused some confusion.

In modern literature on the history of medieval canon law, Hostiensis' commentary used to be called the *Summa aurea*. Schulte had written that from times immemorial the *Summa* had been called "aurea" – and that the work deserves that (rather flattering) title.² However, a century later, Martin Bertram expressed the suspicion that the name "Summa aurea" only goes back to the early printed editions,³ and, indeed, it seems to turn up for the first time in the Roman edition of 1477.⁴ It may well have been the idea of the editor; not a single manuscript is known in which the work bears that name.⁵

In catalogues of medieval libraries, a "Summa aurea" is sometimes mentioned, but in those cases, it is not clear which commentary is meant. The library of the Priory of Dover, for instance, owned in 1389 a copy of a "Summa aurea".⁶ In the inventory it is preceded by Goffredus' *Summa* on the decretals. This probably means that the "*Golden Summa*" was also a commentary on the decretals, but not necessarily Hostiensis' work. It may have been a copy of Johannes Andreae's *Summa de sponsalibus et matrimonio*; the author himself gave this work the title "Summa super quarto libro decretalium", but in at least one manuscript it is called "golden", and even a "golden rose" ("Summa aurea Johannis Andreae, vocata Rosa obriza siue Speculum matrimoniale").⁷

² "Die Summa, welche mit Recht aurea seit alter Zeit genannt wird"; J.F. von SCHULTE, *Die Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des Canonischen Rechts*, II, Stuttgart 1877 = Graz 1956, p. 126.

³ M. BERTRAM, Johannes de Ancona: Ein Jurist des 13. Jahrhunderts in den Kreuzfahrerstaaten, in: *BMCL* 7 (1977), pp. 49–64 (p. 57 n. 54). See also his Drei neuere Kataloge juristischer Handschriften, in: *ZRG KA* 82 (1996), pp. 380–402 (p. 383 n. 17).

⁴ See K. PENNINGTON, A "Quaestio" of Henricus de Segusio and the textual tradition of his "Summa super decretalibus", in: *BMCL* 16 (1986), pp. 91–97 (p. 91 n. 1), with at the end an Appendix by M. BERTRAM, Handschriften der Summe Hostiensis mit der "Quaestio" am Ende (p. 96 s.); repr. in: K. PENNINGTON, *Popes, Canonists and Texts, 1150–1550*, (Collected Studies Series CS 412), Aldershot, Brookfield 1993, XVIII.

⁵ I am indebted to Martin Bertram for this information.

⁶ M. R. JAMES, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover*, Cambridge 1903, p. 427 nr. 290.

⁷ MS. Norwich Cathedral, 4, fol. 466–468. See N. KER, *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries*, III, Oxford 1983, p. 531, cited in: S. KUTTNER, *Studies in the History of Medieval Canon Law*, (Collected Studies Series CS 325), Aldershot, Brookfield 1990, *Retractiones*, 28.

Sometimes the name "Summa aurea" was also given to other *Summae*, such as Bonaguida's "Summa introductoria super officio advocacionis in foro ecclesie". In 1373 the Gregorian College at Bologna owned a manuscript of this work which was described as "Summa aurea continens artem advocandi, que incipit in primo folio «Summa aurea»".⁸

But if the traditional title of Hostiensis' work ("Summa aurea") only dates from the second half of the 15th century, how was this voluminous handbook called before? Martin Bertram determined that in many 13th and 14th century manuscripts the *Summa* has a rubric which ends "que uocatur summa copiosa siue caritas".⁹ This had also been noticed by two other scholars, neither of whom was a legal historian. Their main interest was how the manuscripts of the *Summa* had been made. In 1935, Jean Destrez, who was a theologian, made a remark on Hostiensis' commentary in his study on the book production at the medieval universities (the pecia system); he called it the "Summa copiosa".¹⁰ In a review of his book, this was criticized by Stephan Kuttner, who claimed that "the Summa is normally called 'aurea', not 'copiosa'".¹¹

By that time Kuttner could not know that the indefatigable Destrez had already studied dozens of manuscripts of the *Summa*. After his decease (in 1950), his research on the pecia system was continued by Guy Fink-Errera, with Destrez's descriptions of manuscripts at his disposal.¹² Fink-Errera published several studies on the pecia system and other aspects of the book production at the medieval universities. In one of these articles, he paid some attention to the medieval manuscript editions of Hostiensis' *Summa*. He also listed the 37 manuscripts of Hostiensis' commentary which Destrez had studied.

⁸ D. WILLIMAN, *Bibliothèques ecclésiastiques au temps de la papauté d'Avignon*, I, Paris 1980, p. 249. See for this type of descriptions A. DEROLEZ, *Les catalogues de bibliothèques*, (Typologie des sources du Moyen Âge Occidental 31), Turnhout 1979, pp. 47–51 ("Particularités de la catalographie du bas Moyen Âge").

⁹ Johannes de Ancona (above n. 3), p. 57 n. 54.

¹⁰ J. DESTREZ, *La Pecia dans les manuscrits universitaires du XIIIe et du XIVe siècle*, Paris 1935, p. 75.

¹¹ ZRG KA 25 (1936), p. 527 n. 12.

¹² For Destrez's descriptions see L. J. BATAILLON, Le fonds Jean Destrez – Guy Fink-Errera à la bibliothèque du Saulchoir, in: *La production du livre universitaire au moyen âge. Exemplar et pecia. Actes du symposium tenu au Collegio San Bonaventura de Grottaferrata en mai 1983*, ed. L. J. BATAILLON, B. G. GUYOT, R. H. ROUSE, Paris 1988, pp. 13–15. Shortly before he died Destrez wrote in a letter how many 13th and 14th century manuscripts he had seen: more than 15.000. This letter is reproduced in the same volume, Pl. V.

Not less than 25 of these manuscripts belonged to French libraries,¹³ which probably explains why Destrez (and Fink-Errera) called the work "Summa Copiosa". Most manuscripts Destrez had seen seem to have been written in France; I hope to show in the present essay that mainly (and probably: only) French manuscripts have in the rubric the words "que uocatur copiosa siue caritas".

In several Italian manuscripts the *Summa* is, in a rubric or in the *explicit* (or in both), called "Summa domini archiepiscopi". This seems to make sense, for Henricus de Segusio finished the *Summa* before he became "Hostiensis". Only ten years after having completed his commentary was he appointed (in 1262) Bishop of Ostia and cardinal.

It seems rather doubtful that the title "Summa domini archiepiscopi" came from the pen of the author himself. Anyhow, he did not use this expression in his last will. Neither did he call it "Summa copiosa siue caritas". These names were coined by others. The university stationers, who rented out the *peciae* which were used by the scribes, added them subsequently at the beginning or at the end of the text. For both names, documents show where they were introduced.

The publication of the Summa

Hostiensis completed the *Summa* shortly after he had been appointed (in 1250) Archbishop of Embrun.¹⁴ He had been working on it for a long time. At the end of the text, he tells the reader about the misfortunes he had suffered. Other work had kept him occupied; moreover, an earlier version of the work had been destroyed in a fire,¹⁵ a calamity which, according to a local tradition, had happened at his archiepiscopal palace of Crévoux.¹⁶ However, some of the still unbound quires may have been saved; certain parts of the *Summa* seem to date from 1239¹⁷ and probably originate from the first draft.

¹³ J. DESTREZ, G. FINK-ERRERA, Des manuscrits apparemment datés, in: *Scriptorium* 12 (1958), pp. 56–93 (p. 88 s.)

¹⁴ For his biography see now K. PENNINGTON, Henricus de Segusio (Hostiensis), in: *Popes, Canonists and Texts* (above n. 4), XVI; Italian version in: *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* 42, Roma 1993, pp. 758–763.

¹⁵ "... opus ... quod in minori officio inceperam et demum in incendio amiseram ..."; see PENNINGTON, A "Quaestio" (above n. 4), p. 92 n. 5.

¹⁶ N. DIDIER, Henri de Suse, Evêque de Sisteron (1244–1250), in: *RHD* 31 (1953), pp. 244–270, 409–420 (p. 417).

¹⁷ F. GILLMANN, Von der Hinterlegung des Allerheiligsten im Altarsepulchrum, in: *Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht* 102 (1922), pp. 33–41 (p. 35 n. 4 on p. 36–37).

It is not exactly known when, where and how the *Summa* was first published. On the basis of a document on the book production in Bologna, (viz. a taxation list of an anonymous Bolognese stationer) Domenico Maffei presumes that the version published by the author himself dates from 1252.¹⁸ We can reconstruct how Hostiensis probably proceeded. His will mentions some details regarding the publication of his other commentary on the Gregorian decretals, which he called himself *Commentum libri decretalium* (or *super decretalibus*), and sometimes *Apparatus*,¹⁹ nowadays usually known as his *Lectura*.²⁰

After he had achieved, by 1271, the final version of this work, Hostiensis sent copies to the universities of Bologna, where he had studied, and Paris, where he had been a teacher, thus more or less following the example of the Holy See, which for some 60 years had used to send new collections of decretals to the universities. His main purpose was no doubt to ensure that his work was published by the stationers of those universities. Paris and Bologna were not only the most important *Studia*, but at the same time the major centres of university book-production.²¹

Two canonists followed his lead and did the same.²² After having been also appointed cardinal (in 1294), Johannes Monachus (Jean le Moine) worked on an apparatus on the Sext, the new compilation of canon law promulgated by Boniface VIII (1298). In 1301 he completed his Gloss and sent, from Rome, a copy to the University of Paris, where, before being raised to the purple, he had been teaching canon law.

¹⁸ D. MAFFEI, Un trattato di Bonaccorso degli Elisei e i più antichi Statuti dello Studio di Bologna nel manoscritto 22 della Robbins Collection, in: *BMCL* 5 (1975), pp. 73–101 (p. 92 n. 86); repr. in: D. MAFFEI, *Studi di storia delle università e della letteratura giuridica*, (Bibliotheca Eruditorum 1), Goldbach 1995, pp. 23–51 (pp. 524–526: *Addenda et Emendanda*).

¹⁹ See for these names M. BERTRAM, Handschriften und Drucke des Dekretalenkommentars (sog. *Lectura*) des Hostiensis, in: *ZRG KA* 106 (1989), pp. 177–201 (p. 178 s.)

²⁰ The following is based on *Utrumque ius in peciis* (above n. 1), p. 178 s.; and on my article *L'édition de lecturae par les stationnaires bolonais*, in: *TRG* 59 (1991), pp. 333–351 (p. 340), repr. in: *Miscellanea Domenico Maffei dicata: historia, ius, studium, curr.* A. GARCÍA Y GARCÍA, P. WEIMAR, Vol. I, Goldbach 1995, pp. 411–429, and in my *Liures et juristes au Moyen Age*, (Bibliotheca Eruditorum 26), Goldbach 1999, pp. 171–190.

²¹ See for Paris: *La production* (above n. 12) and for Bologna: *Utrumque ius in peciis* (above n. 1). See also R. H. and M. A. ROUSE, The Dissemination of Texts in Pecia at Bologna and Paris, in: *Rationalisierung der Buchherstellung in Mittelalter und Frühneuzeit. Ergebnisse eines buchgeschichtlichen Seminars, Wolfenbüttel, 12.–14. November 1990*, ed. P. RÜCK, M. BOGHARDT, (Elementa diplomatica 2), Marburg an der Lahn 1994, pp. 69–77.

²² See the literature cited in *Utrumque ius in peciis*, pp. 139–140, pp. 177–178.

Seven years later, his former colleague of the Bolognese *Alma Mater*, Guido de Baysio, who had become by then papal chaplain, imitated that procedure; he sent a copy of his own Gloss on the Sext to Bologna, and probably another copy to Paris.

As regards the manuscript of Hostiensis' *lectura* which had to be sent to Bologna, and which the author bequeathed to the University, it is expressly said in his will that its purpose was to be copied.²³ There is no doubt that the same applied to the copy he once had sent to Paris.²⁴ Kenneth Pennington discovered a manuscript which contains an earlier version of the work. The Parisian exemplar of the *lectura* may also have had this version.²⁵ The latter had now to be corrected by means of collation with a third copy, which was ultimately destined for the church of Embrun, his former archbishopric.²⁶ Apparently, that copy contained the last additions and revisions. Because of the later changes, the Parisian exemplar had to be corrected. Probably, the stationers did not produce new *peciae*, but chose the cheaper and easier way. They wrote Hostiensis' later additions in the margins, so that scribes who copied these *peciae* could insert them in the body of the text.²⁷

It may be assumed that in 1252, Hostiensis has acted in the same way as he did in 1271. He immediately sent copies to Bologna and to Paris to have his *Summa* published. In his last will he mentions two copies of the *Summa*. One of them, unbound, he bequeathed to the

²³ "Commentum meum super Decretalibus quod misi Bononiam conscribendum studio bononiensi relinquo ..."; A. PARAVICINI BAGLIANI, *I testamenti dei cardinali del Duecento*, (Miscellanea della Società Romana di Storia patria 25), Roma 1980, pp. 133–141 (p. 134 s.); see also S. KUTTNER, Wer war der Dekretalist Abbas Antiquus? (1937), repr. in: *Studies* (above n. 7), XV, p. 486 n. 3.

²⁴ "Tertium volumen eiusdem Commenti ... quod videlicet misi Parisius per Rostagnum, canonicum Venciensem, lego eidem Rostagno".

²⁵ MS. Oxford, New College 205. As it seems to be Italian it can not be copied from the Parisian exemplar. See K. PENNINGTON, An earlier recension of Hostiensis's *Lectura* on the Decretals, in: *BMCL* 17 (1987), pp. 77–90 (p. 78 n. 7); repr. in: *Popes, Canonists and Texts* (above n. 4), XVII.

²⁶ "Aliud vero eiusdem Commenti volumen quod scripsit Molinarius scriptor, relinquo ecclesie Ebredunensi; ita tamen quod antequam reddatur ipsi ecclesie mittatur Parisius ad corrigendum illud quod ibidem misi".

²⁷ MS. BAV, Borghese 26 is a Parisian exemplar of the *Glossa ordinaria* on the *Decreta Gratiani*. In the margins, it has numerous additions of Parisian canonists (among these a certain "Gy."). In 14th century French manuscripts these additions are often incorporated in the text of the Gloss. In MS. Borghese 26 many other (anonymous) Parisian additions are already integrated in the text, accompanied by a note 'additio' in the margin.

University of Paris. But before it was sent to Paris, it had to be collated with the other copy.²⁸ Apparently, the Parisian exemplars did not yet contain his most recent additions and revisions. Among these may have been a *quaestio* which Hostiensis had added to his *Summa* after it had been published, and which I will discuss further on in this essay.

Italian editions: Padua

Looking for pecia manuscripts, Jean Destrez found two pecia exemplars of the *Summa*.²⁹ Since then, unfortunately one of these (viz. Chartres) was lost during World War II; its provenience was probably Paris. The other exemplar is Italian: MSS. Assisi, Biblioteca Comunale 219 and 221.³⁰ It belonged to a certain Florianus; sixteen *peciae* bear on the last page, in the lower margin, his name ("Floriani"). He is probably the same stationer whose name is mentioned in pecia-notes in MS. Wien, Ö.N.B., 2216, which contains (on fol. 59–75) Johannes de Anguissola's Gloss on the decretals of Gregory X.³¹ As this rather unknown canonist was professor in Padua, it is very likely that Padua is the origin of the Viennese manuscript.

This stationer is mentioned in a statute of Padua from 1264, relating to the payment of the annual salary of 60 pounds, "sicut actenus est consuetum habere", of Florianus, who is "exemplator scolarium", and who "suis laboribus habeat et teneat exemplaria in jure canonico et

²⁸ "Summam meam ligatam lego vicecancellarie Romane, et aliam solutam studio Parisiensi; corrigatur tamen cum ligata antequam mittatur"; PARAVICINI BAGLIANI (above n. 23), p. 135.

²⁹ See J. DESTREZ, M. D. CHENU, *Exemplaria universitaires des XIII^e et XIV^e siècles*, in: *Scriptorium* 7 (1953), pp. 68–80 (p. 72).

³⁰ MS. 219 contains Part I (Books I–II), MS. 221 Part II (Books III–V). Book I consists of 26 *duerni*, Bk. II: 25 *duerni* and a *bifolium*, Bk. III: 24 *duerni*, Bk. IV: 3 *quinterni*, Bk. V: 30 *duerni* and a *bifolium*. See also C. CENCI, *Bibliotheca Manuscripta ad Sacrum Conventum Assisiensem*, I, (Il miracolo di Assisi. Collana storico-artistica della basilica e del Sacro Convento di S. Francesco-Assisi, 4–I), Assisi 1981, pp. 162–63.

³¹ See K. CHRIST, Petia, Ein Kapitel mittelalterlicher Buchgeschichte, in: *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 55 (1938), pp. 1–44 (p. 40); see also BERTRAM, *Drei neuere Kataloge* (above n. 3), p. 401 s. The scribe used *peciae* which belonged to at least two different stationers. Numbers 2 and 3 were rented from Florianus, numbers 5 and 6 from Melioratus. Martin Bertram gave me the text of the pecia-notes: fol. 61vb: "i. pe. Jo. de Cesena" (the author's name); fol. 65ra: "hic finitur pecia secunda Floriani"; fol. 67vb: "hic finitur tercia pecia Floriani"; fol. 70vb: "hic finitur iii. pecia"; fol. 73vb: "hic finitur v. pecia Meliorati"; fol. 76va: "hic finitur vi. pecia Meliorati". For such manuscripts with a heterogeneous text, see *Utrumque ius in peciis*, pp. 263–278.

civili ad utilitatem et comodum omnium doctorum et scholarium ac universitatis studii Paduani". He is mentioned again in the same capacity in 1275, in a statute on the salary of his newly appointed colleague "magister Petrus q. Ordani", who is "exemplator scholarium sive stacionarius librorum et exemplatorum(!) dandorum scolariibus".³² Florianus was not a very common name and it is tempting to assume that MSS. Assisi 219 and 221 belonged to him and contain a Paduan edition of the *Summa*. It is doubtful whether they were copied from an authentic author's copy. By the time Hostiensis finished his *Summa*, the university of Padua suffered a period of decline, and it is therefore not likely that he would have sent a copy to Padua (neither did he send in 1271 a copy of his *Lectura* to Padua).

One may assume that the text of Florianus' exemplar goes back, one way or another, to a Bolognese exemplar. In the upper margin of the first page of the first pecia (fol. 2r), a different hand from the one which has written the text has added the following rubric:³³

"Incipit summa super titulis decretalium compilata additis in aliquibus locis quibusdam aliis rubricellis".

That is probably the authentic rubric of the work, for the *summa* contains some chapters which do not refer directly to the titles of the decretals and which the author himself called "rubricelle". The same rubric is present in MSS. Padova, Biblioteca Antoniniana 29 and 33;³⁴ Paris, BNF, lat. 4001; Lucca, Biblioteca Capitolare 207;³⁵ and BAV, Vat. lat. 2316,³⁶ which were all written in Italy. Another manuscript with

³² See A. GLORIA, *Monumenti della Università di Padova (1222-1318)*, Venezia 1884, Appendix, pp. 24, 29-30.

³³ A later hand added, after "Summa", the name "Ostiensis".

³⁴ MS. 29 contains a fragment of 78 folios; see G. ABBATE, G. LUISETTO, *Codici e manoscritti della Biblioteca Antoniniana. Col catalogo delle miniature a cura di F. Avril e G. Mariana Canova*, (Fonti e studi per la storia del Santo a Padova, Fonti 1-2), Vicenza 1975, p. 34 ("littera bononiensis", and "s. XIII"). MS. 33 contains books I-II, MS. 34 books III-V (but the text ends in the course of the commentary on X.5,40); *Codici*, 36.

³⁵ Only the first two quires (*quinterni*) contain a fragment of the *Summa*.

³⁶ Bologna, s. XIII-XIV. The pecia-notes refer to an exemplar with the following division: Book I: 31; Bk. II: 41?; Bk. III: 27?; Bk. IV: 15; Bk. V: 35. Expl.: "Explicit summa super decretalibus compilata a domino Henrico archiepiscopo Ebredunensi". See also: *A Catalogue of Canon and Roman Law Manuscripts in the Vatican Library*, ed. S. KUTTNER, R. ELZE, II, (Studi e testi 328), Città del Vaticano 1987, p. 23. As usual, the numbers of *peciae* are not mentioned. For a comment on this deficiency, see BERTRAM's review (above n. 3), p. 395s.

this rubric is mentioned in an inventory of the library of pope Boniface VIII, dating from 1311.³⁷

Italian editions: Bologna. "Summa domini archiepiscopi"

At least one of the Bolognese pecia exemplars of the work had a rubric in which the words "domini archiepiscopi" had been inserted. The scribe of MS. Firenze, B.M.L., Fies. 118, wrote the following guide-line for the rubricator, in the upper margin of fol. 1r: "Incipit summa domini archiepiscopi super titulis decretalium compilata additis in aliquibus locis quibusdam aliis rubricellis".³⁸ The manuscript was completed in Bologna on New Year's Eve 1289 (or 1295?). This can be inferred from the colophon at the end of the text (fol. 344v): "Explicit summa super decretalibus compilata a domino archiepiscopo ebredinensi(!). Deo gratias. Amen. Explicit per petrum, incepta per ricardum norm<anum>. Anno d. m^occ^olxxxix^ov^{to}. (!), ultima die decembris. Bon<onie>".³⁹

Two more Bolognese manuscripts have a similar *incipit* and *explicit*.⁴⁰ Both are undated. In MS. Paris, BNF lat. 15410, the text begins with: "Incipit summa domini archiepiscopi compilata additis" (etc.), and ends with: "Explicit summa super decretalibus compilata a domino archiepiscopo ebredinen<si>". At the end of book I (fol. 68va), the scribe reveals his name: "Oretis pro G'laco theotonico qui scripsit istam summam in Bononia civitate Lombardie".⁴¹ MS. BAV, Arch. S. Pietro A. 22 has the following, rather verbose, colophon: "Explicit summa super decretalibus compilata a domino archiepiscopo ebredun<ensi>".

³⁷ "Summa domini Hostiensis ... que intitulatur in principio 'Incipit summa super titulis decretalium compilata additis in aliquibus locis quibusdam aliis rubricellis. Rubrica ...'; F. EHRLE, *Historia bibliothecae romanorum pontificum tum bonifatianae tum avinionensis*, I, Romae 1890, p. 66.

³⁸ The rubricator wrongly omitted the words "domini" and "additis".

³⁹ The pecia-notes refer to an exemplar with the following division: Book I: 31; Bk. II: 27 (nrs. 32–58); Bk. III: 26; Bk. IV: 20; Bk. V: 36 (the total amounts to 140). See G. POMARO, *Manoscritti peccati di diritto canonico nelle biblioteche fiorentine*, in: *Studi Medievali* ³22 (1981), pp. 421–466 (p. 423 n. 1; the transcription of the colophon which is given there is incorrect). The words "explicit – amen" occur (with the same wrong spelling "ebredinensi") also at the end of the text in MS. Firenze, B.M.L. Plut. I sin. 9 ("decretales" for "decretalibus"), which contains only the second part. This manuscript has pecia-notes which refer to an exemplar with the following division in *peciae*: Book III: 27; Bk. IV: 15; Bk. V: 35. See POMARO, *Manoscritti peccati*, pp. 442–445.

⁴⁰ I owe this information to Martin Bertram.

⁴¹ According to Destrez it was copied from an exemplar of 114 *peciae*; DESTREZ, FINK-ERRERA (above n. 13), p. 89 n. 87.

Deo gratias amen. Qui scripsit hunc librum uiuat semper cum Domino, uiuat in celis. Paulus filius domini Iacobini bononiensis qui moratur in strata maiori in (an. *expunxit*) contrata santi Tome, in nomine felix, benedictus. Dominus noster Jhesus Christus. Amen". At first sight, someone who calls himself "bononiensis" seems to be a Bolognese scribe who worked elsewhere, for example at the law school in Padua or in Modena. However, Paulus wrote this manuscript in his home town. In Bologna, the Church of St. Thomas was, indeed, in the *Strada Maggiore*.⁴² On 4 June 1286, the same scribe, "Paulus, filius domini Iacobini, qui dixit se propositus ad scribendum a dicto suo patre", promised in Bologna to copy seven *quaterni* of the Accursian Gloss on the Code.⁴³

The name "summa domini archiepiscopi" originated in Bologna. It is already used in the oldest taxation list of the shop of an (anonymous) Bolognese stationer that has ever been found. In this list an exemplar of the work is mentioned as: "Summa domini archiepiscopi ebredunensis, lx. quaterni, debent solvi l. sol."⁴⁴ The rent, 50 *solidi*, is exceptionally high, compared to the one that can be found in 14th century Bolognese lists: 20 *solidi*. According to Domenico Maffei, this probably means that the *Summa* was a recently published work, and that the taxation was based on the university statutes of 1252, of which only fragments have been preserved.⁴⁵ There are also other reasons to presume that the taxation list dates from these years (ca. 1252–1260).⁴⁶

For half a century, the designation "summa <d.> archiepiscopi" remained the most usual in Bologna, even after Henricus de Segusio had been elevated (in 1261) to the dignity of cardinal-Bishop of Ostia, and he became known as "Hostiensis". The same designation is like-

⁴² A. HESSEL, *Storia della città di Bologna dal 1116 al 1280*, ed. italiana a cura di G. FASOLI, Bologna 1975, p. 230.

⁴³ *Chartularium Studii Bononiensis, Documenti per la storia dell'università di Bologna dalle origini fino al sec. XV* [= *Chart.*], vol. IX, Bologna 1931, nr. 108. The contract was concluded in a house which belonged to the heirs of the well-known Bolognese lawyer Rolandinus de Romanciis.

⁴⁴ M. BOHÁČEK, Zur Geschichte der Stationarii von Bologna, in: *Eos, Commentarii Societatis Philologae Polonorum* 48 (1956; = *Symbolae Raphaeli Taubenschlag dedicatae* II), Vratislaviae, Varsaviae 1957, pp. 241–295 (p. 254 nr. 28); Italian version, with some additions: Nuova fonte per la storia degli stazionari bolognesi, in: *Studia Gratiana* 9 (1966), pp. 407–460.

⁴⁵ MAFFEI (above n. 18), p. 92 n. 86.

⁴⁶ See *Utrumque ius in peciis* (above n. 1), pp. 95–99.

wise used in five other documents in which exemplars of the work are mentioned and which all date from after Hostiensis' death in 1271. They include two other taxation lists of, unfortunately, anonymous (but probably Bolognese) stationers: a list which has been preserved in a manuscript at Autun and which dates probably from ca. 1270–1275 ("Summa archiepiscopi ebredun<ensis>");⁴⁷ and a list in a manuscript at Montpellier, from ca. 1275–1298 ("Summa archiepiscopi").⁴⁸

The contents of the latter one show great similarity with the inventory of the *peciae* of the stationer Sullimanus q. Martini (the father of the well-known jurist Martinus Syllimani), which was drawn up after his death in 1289. Both documents seem to relate to the same shop. Sullimanus had a complete set of *peciae* of the work, and for some of them he had duplicates: "Summa d. Archiepiscopi simplex et aliquae pecie duplicate".⁴⁹

An exemplar of the *Summa* was also present in the bookshop of the stationer Franciscus d. Alberti de Monseverio and his associate, the notary Bonapressus Aspectati. After the death of the latter, in 1278, it was transferred (together with exemplars of four other works) to the *syndicus* of the University, Arditio q. Guidonis de Mediolano: "Exemplaria Summe d. Archiepiscopi ... in petiis".⁵⁰ Arditio was the *bedellus generalis* of the *Studium*, but also a stationer.⁵¹ It may be

⁴⁷ "Summa archiepiscopi ebredun<ensis> .lviii. quater<ni> minus .v. columnis, tass. .lx. <quaterni>". See TH. KAEPEL, H. V. SHOONER, *Les manuscrits médiévaux de Saint-Dominique de Dubrovnik, Catalogue sommaire*, (Institutum Historicum FF. Praedicatorum Romae ad S. Sabinae, Dissertationes Historicae 17), Romae ad S. Sabinae 1965, p. 121 nr. 30; *La production* (above n. 12) Pl. VIII. "Quaternus" meant 2 *peciae*.

⁴⁸ Division in *peciae*: "Summa archiepiscopi in petiis, super primo libro .xv. quat<erni> et .viii. col<umpne>. Secundus in petiis .xv. quat<erni> minus .iii. col<umpnis>. Tercius in petiis .xiii. quat<erni>. Quartus in petiis .vii. quat<erni> et una petia. Quintus in petiis .xvii. quat<erni> et .v. col<umpne> et media." See J.-F. GENEST, *Le fonds juridique d'un stationnaire italien à la fin du XIIIe siècle: matériaux nouveaux pour servir à l'histoire de la pecia*, in: *La production* (above n. 12), p. 135 s. and Pl. VII. I discussed the datation and origin of these lists in *Utrumque ius in peciis*, pp. 96–104.

⁴⁹ L. FRATI, *Gli Stazionari bolognesi nel medio evo*, in: *Archivio storico italiano*, ⁵⁴5 (1910), pp. 380–390 (p. 389); also in: S. THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Sententia Libri Ethicorum*, (Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita, T. XLVII), Romae 1969, p. 86*.

⁵⁰ *Archivio di Stato di Bologna* [= ASB], *Memoriale* [= Mem.] 36, fol. 53v (23 Febr. 1278); see *Utrumque ius in peciis* (above n. 1), p. 83. I refer to the index of this study for the Bolognese stationers which are mentioned here.

⁵¹ For his activities as *bedellus*, see now A. I. PINI, *Per una storia sociale dell'università: i bidelli bolognesi nel XIII secolo*, in: *Annali di storia delle università italiane* 1 (1997), pp. 43–75 (pp. 63–75).

assumed that from then on these *peciae* were rented out in his own shop. Finally, an exemplar is mentioned in a contract of sale of 1303, when the stationers Rainaldus Riçardi de Ibernica and Iacobus Leonis de Cardono, purchased six exemplars of works on canon law, inter alia: "Summa d. Archiepiscopi".⁵²

The designation "summa <d.> archiepiscopi" is also used in some copying contracts. A scribe from Modena, "Amathaxius fil. qu. Amadaxii not. qui fuit de Mutina et nunc moratur Bon<onie> ..., scriptor" agrees on 9 September 1280 towards a student of canon law to write "totum librum Summe archiepiscopi"; on 31 October 1283 two brothers, "Iohannes et Michilinus fratres filii qu. Bonmartini" promise to copy "tota Summa archiepiscopi". In a contract of 22 February 1286 "Iacobus cond. d. Ungarini clericus" undertakes to write the "medietas Summe Archiepiscopi". His colleague "Rizardus fil. qu. Ranberti" promises on 22 September 1286 to write the whole work: "totam Summam archiepiscopi".⁵³ Moreover, the title is used in most contracts of sale or transport, as well as in other deeds which mention copies of the work.⁵⁴ In 13th century Bolognese documents, the work is rarely called "Summa Hostiensis".⁵⁵

Only later, viz. during the first quarter of the 14th century, the latter name superseded that of "summa archiepiscopi", as some Bolognese documents from this period certify.⁵⁶ The old name "Summa archiepiscopi" was only preserved in the general taxation list included in the (lost) statutes of 1317, on which all later lists of this type were directly or indirectly based: the Bolognese lists of 1326, 1347 and 1432, and the lists of the universities of Padua (1331) and Perugia (1457). They all have the same wording. In these lists the *Lectura* is first mentioned

⁵² G. ORLANDELLI, *Il libro a Bologna dal 1300 al 1330. Documenti*, (Studi e ricerche di storia e scienze ausiliarie I), Bologna 1959, nr. 115 (7 June 1303). See also *Utrumque ius in peciis*, p. 88.

⁵³ ASB, Mem. 42, fol. 45r; Mem. 52, fol. 96v; *Chart.* IX (above n. 43), nrs. 133, 417.

⁵⁴ Contracts of sale: *Chart.* X, Bologna 1936, nr. 125 (24 July 1269); ASB, Mem. 30, fol. 150v (18 October 1276); Mem. 36, fol. 280v (20 October 1278); *Chart.* IX, nr. 159 (24 April 1286); ORLANDELLI, nr. 53 (12 July 1301). Contracts of transport: *Chart.* XIV, Bologna 1981, nr. 382 (6 September 1270); *Chart.* IX, nrs. 242 (14 January 1286) and 319 (11 September 1286). Other deeds: *Chart.* VII, Bologna 1923, nr. 236 (6 July 1268); ASB, Mem. 30, fol. 168r (24 November 1276).

⁵⁵ *Chart.* VII, nr. 279 (1 September 1268): sale of a "Summa ... d. Henrici cardinalis episcopi Hostiensis"; *Chart.* X, nr. 105: sale of a "Summa cardinalis Hostiensis" (22 June 1269).

⁵⁶ ORLANDELLI, nr. 26 (4 October 1300), 234 (25 July 1317), 249 (11 May 1318), 307 (16 December 1323).

and then the *Summa*: "Lectura d. Hostiensis ... Summa eiusdem tunc archiepiscopi".⁵⁷

Finally the intriguing name "Summa copiosa" deserves some attention.

Parisian editions. The "Summa copiosa (sive caritas)"

A dated manuscript of the *Summa* presents the following extended version of the original rubric: "Incipit summa de titulis decretalium compilata additis in aliquibus locis quibusdam aliis rubricellis, *que uocatur summa copiosa*".⁵⁸ The illumination of this manuscript, Montefano (Marche), Monastero S. Silvestro Abate, 12, has been attributed (by G. Avarucci) to the Parisian illuminator Honorius.⁵⁹ At the end of the text (at fol. 436v) it has the date 23 December 1283: "Explicit liber quintus copiose. Anno domini millesimo ducentesimo octuagesimo iii. in mense decembris x. kal. ianuarii. Hic liber est scriptus, qui scripsit sit benedictus. Et eodem modo qui compilauit sit benedictus. Et qui eciam eum scribere fecit. Amen".

Just as for the Bolognese name "Summa archiepiscopi", documents on the book production seem to provide a decisive answer to the question where the name "Summa copiosa" was given to the work. Two taxation lists of Parisian stationers have been preserved. The oldest list, which may date from ca. 1275, enumerates the exemplars of an anonymous stationer,⁶⁰ and among these: "Pro Copiosa, x. sol.". The

⁵⁷ In the list of the university of Florence (1387), the words "tunc archiepiscopi" have been changed in "Hostiensis"; see A. GHERARDI, *Statuti della Università e Studio Fiorentino dell'anno MCCCLXXXVII*, Firenze 1881 = Bologna 1973 (Athenaeum 9), 45. For the other lists, see *Utrumque ius in peciis* (above n. 1), pp. 314, 318. A Bolognese list of 1561 is reproduced in F.C. VON SAVIGNY, *Geschichte des römischen Rechts im Mittelalter*, ²III, Heidelberg 1834 = Darmstadt 1956 = Bad Homburg 1961 = Aalen 1986, p. 649. For the character of these lists, see *Utrumque ius in peciis*, pp. 95–131.

⁵⁸ MS. BAV Arch. S. Pietro C. 112 has a variant of the extended version of the rubric: "que nominatur copiosa".

⁵⁹ BERTRAM, *Handschriften der Summe* (above n. 4), p. 97. The illuminator Master Honorius (from Amiens) is mentioned in the Parisian tax registers (*taille*) of 1292–1300 (no more registers have come down to us); see K. FIANU, *Les professionnels du livre à la fin du XIII^e siècle: l'enseignement des registres fiscaux parisiens*, in: *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 150 (1992), pp. 185–222 (p. 188). In these years he was the most highly regarded Parisian illuminator.

⁶⁰ For the datation see H. V. SHOONER, *La production du livre par la pecia*, in: *La production* (above n. 12), pp. 17–37 (p. 23); L. J. BATAILLON, *Les textes théologiques et philosophiques diffusés à Paris par exemplar et pecia*, in the same volume, pp. 155–63 (p. 155). RICHARD H. and MARY A. ROUSE (and also Shooner) believe that both lists relate

youngest list was drawn up on 25 February 1304 and includes the exemplars of "Andreas dictus de Senonis" (André de Sens); in this list we find: "Item in Copiosa, c. et lxx. pecias, xii. sol."⁶¹ As we have seen, that name was never used in Bolognese documents on the book production or contracts of sale. It already came into being during Hostiensis' lifetime. In the *Prohemium* of his *Diamargariton*, an abridged version of the *Lectura*, he calls his other voluminous commentary on the Gregorian Decretals "Summa que copiosa dicitur".⁶²

Copies of the "Summa copiosa" in medieval libraries

In 14th century Parisian documents copies of the *Summa* are sometimes mentioned which apparently had the same rubric as MS. Montefano. The library of the Sorbonne had in 1338 a "Summa de iure que dicitur Copiosa «Alpha et o unum in essencia»". The latter words are indeed the beginning of Hostiensis' handbook. The library of the Collège de Dormans had in 1375 a "Copiosa que dicitur somma Ostiensis", and the library of the Louvre owned in 1373 a copy of "La somme nommee Copieuse en vn grant volume couvert de cuir".⁶³ Jacques d'Audeloncourt, a *doctor legum* who was a canon of Paris, bequeathed ca. 1351–1359 to the Abbey of Clairvaux: "Summam meam Hostiensem (!) que dicitur Copiosa".⁶⁴ Another copy was among the

to the same shop. See *The Book Trade at the University of Paris*, in the same volume, pp. 41–114 (pp. 58, 62, 72).

⁶¹ MS. BAV, Reg. lat. 406, fol. 66v, 68r. See also H. DENIFLE, AE. CHATELAIN, *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, Parisii 1889–94, Vol. I, 648; Vol. II, 110. An exemplar which has belonged to this stationer is MS. Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, 45/22 (Johannes Monachus' Gloss on the Sext); see *Utrumque ius in peciis*, p. 111. Source-material such as the Bolognese contracts which I discussed above have unfortunately not been preserved for Paris.

⁶² R. HELSSIG, Eine bisher übersehene Schrift des Henricus Hostiensis, in: *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht* 14 (1904), pp. 70–82 (p. 71). This work is mentioned in the oldest Parisian taxation list (MS. Reg. lat. 406, fol. 66v): "Pro apparatu Hostiensis xxx. sol., Pro Margarita ipsius xii. den."

⁶³ L. DELISLE, *Le cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale*, III, Paris 1881, p. 112; P. GLORIEUX, *Aux origines de la Sorbonne*, I. *Robert de Sorbon*, Paris 1966, p. 257; É. PELLEGRIN, La bibliothèque de l'ancien Collège de Dormans-Beauvais à Paris, in: *Bulletin philologique et historique (jusqu'à 1715) du Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques*, Années 1944–45, Paris 1947, pp. 99–164 (p. 110); J. VAN PRAET, *Inventaire ou catalogue des livres de l'ancienne Bibliothèque du Louvre fait en l'année 1373 par Gilles Mallet* ..., Paris 1836, p. 145 nr. 907.

⁶⁴ A. VERNET, *La Bibliothèque de l'Abbaye de Clairvaux du XII^e au XVIII^e siècle*, I. *Catalogues et répertoires*, Paris 1979, p. 360.

books of Robert le Coq, Bishop of Laon and former advocate of the king of France (Philip VI) at the *Parlement* of Paris. When he was found guilty of conspiracy, his goods were confiscated. In 1362 two librarians made an inventory of his books (no less than 76, of which 45 on the two laws). This interesting list mentions, among others, a manuscript which contained the "Copieuse".⁶⁵ There is no doubt that it had been produced in Paris. The same holds for "la Somme de Ostiensis, autrement appellé copieuse" which belonged, in 1373, to a library in Rouen.⁶⁶

Of course, such Parisian manuscripts also found their way to libraries abroad, and sometimes we know how. Richard de Haut († 1338), who had studied law in Orléans during the last decade of the 13th century, bequeathed his books to the Prior and Chapter of Christ Church, Canterbury. Among these was a "Summa copiose" (!),⁶⁷ which is mentioned in an inventory of 1508 ("Summa que dicitur copiosa"). By that time Christ Church also had two other manuscripts. A "Summa copiosa super decretales prima" and a "Summa copiosa secunda".⁶⁸ Around 1342, Frater Oliverus de Staneway presented the Franciscans of Ipswich with his "Summa Hostiensis que dicitur Copiosa",⁶⁹ and Josse of Menen, a canon of the chapter of St. Donatian in Bruges, bequeathed in 1382 his "Summa seu Copiosa" to the Augustinians.⁷⁰ In a catalogue of the Benedictine monastery of Admont, made in 1376, a "Summa copiosa sive karitatis, incipit 'Alpha

⁶⁵ R. DELACHENAL, La bibliothèque d'un avocat du XIV^e siècle. Inventaire estimatif des livres de Robert le Coq, in: *Nouvelle Revue historique de droit français et étranger* 11 (1887), pp. 524–537 (p. 532 nr. 13). As far as I know, no manuscripts of translations of the *Summa* are known, though it is not excluded that such translations may have been made.

⁶⁶ L. DELISLE, Documents sur les livres et les bibliothèques au moyen âge, in: *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 31 (1849), pp. 216–231 (p. 230).

⁶⁷ "Lego ... Item totum corpus juris civilis, Item Decretales ..., Decretum (!) una cum glosa Hostiensis in duobus voluminibus. Item Summa copiose (!) et Speculum judiciale ...". See C. E. WOODRUFF, Letters to the Prior of Christ Church, Canterbury, from University Students, in: *Archaeologia Cantiana* 39 (1927), pp. 1–33 (p. 5 n. 1).

⁶⁸ JAMES (above n. 6), p. 160 nr. 218, p. 161 nrs. 234, 249.

⁶⁹ *The Friars' Libraries*, ed. K. W. HUMPHREYS, (Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 1), London 1990, p. 215. For copies of the *Copiosa* which belonged to the Abbey of Ramsey, Huntingdonshire (mid-14th cent.) and St. Mary's Abbey in York (15th cent.) see R. SHARPE, J. P. CARLEY et al., *English Benedictine Libraries. The Shorter Catalogues*, (Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 4), London 1996, pp. 358, 363, 742.

⁷⁰ A. DEROLEZ, *Corpus Catalogorum Belgii. The Medieval Booklists of the Southern Low Countries, I. Province of West Flanders*, Brussel 1997, p. 128 s.

et o” is mentioned; the Franciscans of Siena had in 1481 a “Summa quae dicitur Copiosa, in pulcra lettera”.⁷¹ A humanist scholar in Nuremberg, Hartmann Schedel (1440–1516), owned a “Summa Hostiensis, Copiosa dicta”.⁷²

In all these cases the notary (or other person) who drew up the document borrowed the name or description from the rubric. In the list of the 22 legal books which pope Urban V gave in 1363 to the *Collège de Saint-Martial* in Toulouse, Hostiensis’ work is called “Quedam summa que uocatur copiosa, que incipit in quarta linea: essentia”.⁷³ Apparently, this College had a Parisian manuscript. However, in the inventories of the libraries of other Colleges, copies of the work are called “Summa Hostiensis”.⁷⁴

In some inventories of the papal library (1375, 1411) only the name “Summa Hostiensis” (or: “Ostiensis”) is used.⁷⁵ In another inventory (1369) some copies are called “Summa Ostiensis”, but others “Liber vocatus Copiosa”, “Summa vocata copiosa” or “Copiosa Ostiensis”.⁷⁶ In

⁷¹ G. MÖSER-MERSKY, *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Österreichs*, III. *Steiermark*, Graz, Wien, Köln 1961, p. 26 (see also pp. 31, 52; further on, I shall discuss manuscripts with the rubric “que uocatur copiosa siue caritatis”); K. W. HUMPHREYS, *The Library of the Franciscans of Siena in the Late Fifteenth Century*, Amsterdam 1978, p. 92 nr. 454.

⁷² P. RUF, *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz*, Bd. 3, T. 3, München 1927, p. 827.

⁷³ M. FOURNIER, Les bibliothèques des collèges de l’Université de Toulouse. Étude sur les moyens de travail mis à la disposition des étudiants au Moyen Age, in: *Bibliothèque de l’École des Chartes* 51 (1890), pp. 443–476 (p. 455). See for the public libraries of southern French universities: J. VERGER, Les bibliothèques des universités et collèges du Midi, in: *Livres et bibliothèques (XIII^e–XV^e siècle)*, (Cahiers de Fanjeaux 31), Toulouse, Fanjeaux 1996, pp. 95–130.

⁷⁴ In Toulouse: the *Collège de Verdale* (1343), the *Collège de Mirepoix* (1417, 1435) and the *Collège de Périgord* (1497); FOURNIER (above n. 73), pp. 450, 466, 468, 475. In Avignon: the *Collège d’Annecy* (1435) and the *Collège de Sénanque* (founded in 1496), as well as the library of the founder of the *Collège de Saint-Michel* (1454); M. FOURNIER, Les bibliothèques de l’Université et des collèges d’Avignon, in: *Nouvelle Revue historique de droit français et étranger* 15 (1891), pp. 76–112 (p. 86 nr. 71, p. 95 nr. 17, p. 101 nr. 6, p. 108 nr. 10).

⁷⁵ EHRLE (above n. 37), p. 491 nrs. 515–516, p. 492 nr. 517, p. 494 nr. 565, p. 543 nr. 1363; A. MAIER, Der Katalog der päpstlichen Bibliothek in Avignon vom Jahr 1411, in: *Archivum historiae pontificiae* 1 (1963), pp. 97–177, nrs. 33, 38, 97, 98, 142. No copies of the “Summa copiosa” are mentioned in the catalogues which are published in: M.-H. JULLIEN DE POMMEROL, J. MONFRIN, *La bibliothèque pontificale à Avignon et à Peníscola pendant le Grand Schisme d’Occident et sa dispersion. Inventaires et concordances*, Roma 1991, Vol. I–II.

⁷⁶ EHRLE (above n. 37), p. 365 nr. 1029, p. 366 nr. 1048, p. 378 nr. 1210, p. 399 nr. 1527, p. 400 nrs. 1538–1540, p. 403 nr. 1587, p. 380 nrs. 1238 and 1243, p. 410 nr. 1708.

some cases we know the origin of such copies of the *Summa* in the papal library. One came from the office of the Inquisition in Florence, which owned in 1334 a "*Summa Hostiensis que uocatur Copiosa*".⁷⁷ In 1353 the library owned a "*Summa copiosa*" which had belonged to Manuel Fieschi, who had been canon of York and Bishop of Vercelli. A "*Liber vocatus Copiosa*" which had belonged to a Swedish bishop had found its way to the library by 1369. Other copies of the "*Copiosa*" had previously belonged to a bishop of Lisbon who died in 1364, and a collector of Portugal who died four years later.⁷⁸ All these manuscripts were probably made in France and most of them in Paris.

However, and remarkably, in 1322–1323 a "*Summa copiosa*" was written for the pope (at the time the canonist John XXII) in Avignon itself. It is mentioned in two notes on the salary of the scribes who were writing the book, Jean de Toulouse and his English colleague "*Iohannes Baconi*". One may assume that one of them wrote the first, and the other the second part. On 19 December 1322 a payment was done "*pro viginti quinque sexternis Summe copiose quam scribit Iohannes de Tholosa, scriptor tholosanus, pro domino nostro papa, videlicet pro labore scripture ...*"; a half year later, on 19 June 1323, "*pro triginta quinque sexternis scribendis de Summa Hostiensis que dicitur Copiosa pro domino nostro papa cuius (primam inserendum?) partem scribit magister Iohannes Baconi scriptor anglicus, habitator Avinionis, et residuam partem scribit Iohannes de Tolosa scriptor supradictus ...*".⁷⁹ The wording suggests that "*Copiosa*" occurred in the exemplar they used.⁸⁰

The Parisian name "*Copiosa*" was also immortalized by Bérenger Frédol († Avignon 1323). He made an index on Hostiensis' *Summa*. In the manuscripts it is called "*Oculus Copiose*" and according to Johannes Andreae, Frédol gave it that name himself.⁸¹ This seems indeed likely, as he seems to have spent most of his career as a

⁷⁷ WILLIMAN (above n. 8), pp. 134, 135, 136.

⁷⁸ WILLIMAN (above n. 8), pp. 185, 194, 221, 242.

⁷⁹ EHRLE (above n. 37), p. 148; K.H. SCHÄFER, *Die Ausgaben der Apostolischen Kammer unter Johann XXII.*, Paderborn 1911, p. 268.

⁸⁰ Jean "wrote" 25 and John 35 *sexterni*. The total is 60 *sexterni* or 720 folia. The quires referred to are probably the quires of the exemplar, and not the quires of the copy they were writing.

⁸¹ See the *additio* on the *Speculum iudiciale* which is cited by SCHULTE (above n. 2), p. 184 n. 7: "... opus quod per alphabetum super Summa Host. composuit et vocavit '*Oculus Copiose*' ...".

university professor in Paris.⁸² No doubt his own copy of the *Summa* had been written in Paris.

So far about manuscripts which are probably lost, but now about the surviving copies.

The Quaestio at the end of the text of the Summa

The already mentioned MSS. Montefano and BAV, Arch. S. Pietro C. 112 belong to a number of manuscripts which have at the end of the text a *Quaestio* by Hostiensis. In most manuscripts, it is preceded by a rubric, which in some others occurs at the end. In this rubric the author remarks that "this *quaestio*" was sent to him, at the Roman Curia, from Bologna, after he had finished the *Summa* ("Hec questio fuit nobis missa de Bononia in curia Romana post compilationem huius Summe"). Kenneth Pennington found two manuscripts in which this *quaestio* is completely lacking, and which seem to contain the original version of the *Summa*.⁸³ From the words "in curia Romana" Pennington concludes that Hostiensis wrote the text after he had become a cardinal in 1262, and that he sent it to the university stationers so that they could add it to the text.

The *quaestio* ends with a sentence in which the author explains where the *quaestio* should find its proper place, viz. under the title "De sententia excommunicationis" (X. 5.39), and he remarks that if the problem had been treated there, less doubts would have arisen ("si omnia hec fuissent ibi posita hec questio minus dubitationis forsitan habuisset"). It seems that in many manuscripts, the *quaestio* has indeed been inserted under this title, and in all the printed editions. However, both the remark about the Curia and the sentence about the placement have been left out.⁸⁴ Apparently, some stationers respected Hostiensis' wish and inserted the *quaestio* at the place where it belonged, but omitting the elements which had become superfluous;

⁸² SCHULTE, 190; H. F. VIOLLET, Béranger Frédol, canoniste, in: *Histoire littéraire de la France* 34, Paris 1914, p. 165.

⁸³ MSS. München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14006 and Clm 15707; maybe also Paris, Bibliothèque St^e. Geneviève 328, in which the *quaestio* is a later addition; in MS. München, Clm 24 the *quaestio* is inserted under X 5,39. See A "Quaestio" (above n. 4), p. 93 n. 9.

⁸⁴ PENNINGTON, A "Quaestio", p. 92–93. He checked the text in the editions 1477, 1478, Venice 1480, Venice 1487, Venice 1498 (Hain 8961–8965), Lyon 1537 (repr. Aalen 1962) and Venice 1574 (repr. Torino 1963).

others opted for a more simple solution and added it at the end of the text, in the last pecia.

Martin Bertram lists 29 manuscripts of the latter type, many of which seem to date from the 14th century.⁸⁵ I was able to establish that most of them have the following extended rubric: "Incipit summa de titulis decretalium compilata additis in aliquibus locis quibusdam aliis rubricellis, *que uocatur summa copiosa siue caritas*".⁸⁶ Often, the last word is not "caritas", but "caritatis".

In the survey that follows, I add some remarks about the illumination on the first page, which in all cases seems to be made in Northern France, or eventually England. The rubric is lacking in the following manuscripts:

Amiens, Bibliothèque Municipale, 360 (s. XIII): a historiated initial of 12 lines high: a man with a book; in the outer margin, foliate motifs.

Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale, E. 10 (cat. 745) (s. XIV)⁸⁷: a floriated initial of 12 lines high; vines; in the upper margin, a bird; a bas-de-page scene with three dogs, a wild boar and a gnome.

The rubric occurs in the following manuscripts; in MSS. Frankfurt, Reims and Rouen the words "Hec questio fuit nobis missa" etc. occur at the end of the *quaestio*, in the others at the beginning:⁸⁸

Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale, 582 (s. XIII/XIV):⁸⁹ a historiated initial of 10 lines high: sitting Christ with his right hand raised and in his left a globe; decoration extending along the margins: vines; historiated initials as well at fol. 34v, 62v, 116ra, 166r, 180rb (*arbor*), 200r, 202r (Christ with *arbor*), 215rb; on fol. 100va grotesques: a buffoon, a fish and dogs. No pecia-marks.

Chartres, Bibliothèque Municipale, 322 (360; Bk. III-V; 383 fol.; 318 x 220 mm) and 323 (361; Bk. I-II; 273 fol.; 320 x 225 mm) (s. XIV).⁹⁰ Lost

⁸⁵ Handschriften der Summe (above n. 4). With the exception of MS. Montefano, the list gives no information about the possible origin.

⁸⁶ The last six words of the rubric were cited by BERTRAM in his article *Johannes de Ancona* (above n. 3), p. 57 n. 54.

⁸⁷ Not a word is said about the decoration in H. OMONT, *Catalogue général* (etc.), I, Paris 1886, p. 200.

⁸⁸ Also in MS. Kassel, Landesbibliothek, 2° iurid. 6 (s. XIV). In this manuscript the *quaestio* is a later addition.

⁸⁹ According to Pennington the rubric occurs at the end, which is wrong.

⁹⁰ *Catalogue général* (quarto series) 11, Paris 1890, p. 115s. Unfortunately no photographs exist; see *Catalogue général* 53. *Manuscripts des bibliothèques sinistrées de 1940 à 1944*, Paris 1962. The following data are taken from Destrez's (unfortunately unfinished) description of these manuscripts. I would like to thank Father Louis Jacques Bataillon O.P. (Commissio Leonina) for sending me photographs of these

on 26 June 1944. Exemplar of a Parisian stationer. Although exemplars usually had no decoration, as they were only used as a model, this one had coloured initials and also some decoration, in Parisian style. It was probably copied from another exemplar. The copyist gave it the same division, which is as follows: Book I (fol. 1–140) 35 *peciae*, Bk. II (fol. 140bis–272) 34 (of which the last one contained very little text), Bk. III (fol. 1–135) 34, Bk. IV (fol. 136–207) 18, and Bk. V (fol. 208–383) 44 (total amount: 165). Many *peciae* had been corrected (mostly 'cor. per h.', sometimes 'cor. tho' and in a few cases both).

Frankfurt, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Barth. 8 (s. XIV-in.): a floriated initial, decoration extending along the margins.⁹¹ Just as the exemplar Chartres, it seems to have been copied from the exemplar of the Parisian stationer André de Sens.⁹²

Montefano (Marche), Monastero S. Silvestro Abate, 12 (1283): a historiated initial of 7 lines high: sitting Christ with his right hand raised and in his left a globe; decoration extending along the outer margin: a hunting scene with a bird, a little dog, a greyhound and a hare.

München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 28160 (s. XIV): a floriated initial in French style, decoration extending along the margins.⁹³

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 4000 (s. XIV): a historiated initial of 12 lines high: sitting Christ with his right hand raised and in his left a globe, in front of a rhombic background. In the outer margin, vines, a peasant, a bird, dogs, a climbing animal.

Reims, Bibliothèque de la Ville, 713 (s. XIV): a historiated initial of 10 lines high: sitting Christ with his right hand raised and in his left a globe, in front of a rhombic background. In the lower margin, three little trees, a dog and a hare.

Siena, Biblioteca Comunale degli intronati, G.IV.26 (s. XIII): a floriated initial of 12 lines high.⁹⁴

notes and for his useful observations. See also GIOVANNA MURANO, *Tipologia degli exemplaria giuridici*, to be published in: *Juristische Buchproduktion im Mittelalter* (Ius Commune Sonderheft).

⁹¹ Expl.: "Explicit Summa que uocatur copiosa siue caritatis" (This also at the end of the text in MS. Amiens 360). See for a detailed description G. Powirtz, H. Buck, *Die Handschriften des Bartholomaeusstifts und des Karmeliterklosters in Frankfurt am Main*, Frankfurt am Main 1974, p. 21 s.

⁹² The pecia-notes refer to an exemplar with the following division in *peciae*: Book I: 35; Bk. II: 34; Bk. III: 34; Bk. IV: 18; Bk. V: 44. The total amounts to 165. This corresponds exactly to the exemplar of André de Sens (see above n. 61). See G. Powirtz, *Pecienhandschriften in deutschen Bibliotheken. Die Bestände der Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek Frankfurt am Main*, in: *Bibliothek und Wissenschaft* 31 (1998), pp. 211–251 (p. 222 s.; Pl. 1–2).

⁹³ See H. HAUKE, *Katalog der lateinischen Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München. Clm 28 111–28254*, Wiesbaden 1986, p. 75 s.

⁹⁴ In Bertram's list wrongly "G.IV.16". I thank Dr. Fulvio Mancuso (Siena) for his help. He traced the manuscript for me, studied some elements in the text and sent me photographs of the relevant passages.

Troyes, *Bibliothèque Municipale*, 97 (s. XIII): a historiated initial of 10 lines high; simple decoration.⁹⁵

Troyes, *Bibliothèque Municipale*, 98 (s. XIII/XIV): a historiated initial of 14 lines high: sitting Christ with (probably) his right hand raised and in his left a globe; in the lower margin, vine ranks, a bird, hares, a greyhound, a grotesque and a lion.⁹⁶

BAV, *Vat. lat.* 2314 (s. XIV): a historiated initial combined with a three-quarter border; two grotesques, in the French style,⁹⁷ one of them a buffoon with a tambourine.

Venezia, *Biblioteca Marciana*, 2651 [= Lat. IV.101] (s. XIII/XIV): a historiated initial of 8 lines high: Christ with a raised finger, and opposite of him three women with an aureole.

The rubric also occurs in some other manuscripts which have the *quaestio* at the end of the text.⁹⁸ Sometimes it is also present in French manuscripts which do not have the *quaestio* at the end of the text,⁹⁹ and occasionally in an Italian manuscript. In the latter case it was probably added to the text in France.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁵ It belonged to the Abbey of Clairvaux. In a catalogue of 1472 it is described as: "Item ung autre volume contenant aussi ladicte Somme Hostiensis appellée Summa Copiosa sive caritatis en .v. livres sur les Decretales, comme les precedentes ..."; see VERNET (above n. 64), p. 255.

⁹⁶ In the catalogue of the Abbey of Clairvaux (1472): "Item ung autre tresbeau grant volume contenant Summa Hostiensis qui est dicte Summa copiosa sive caritatis de titulis decretalium"; see VERNET (above n. 64), p. 254.

⁹⁷ *A Catalogue* (above n. 36), II, p. 21 s.

⁹⁸ *Kues, Sankt Nikolaus-Hospital, Cusanusstiftsbibliothek*, p. 259 (Cat. J. MARX, 1905, pp. 252 s.; s. XIII/XIV); *London, British Library*, Royal 10.D.IV (Cat. G. F. WARNER, J. P. GILSON, 1921, p. 330; s. XIV); *London, British Library*, Royal 10.E.VIII (Cat. WARNER, GILSON, p. 335; s. XIV); *Mons, Bibliothèque publique de la Ville*, 38/354 (Cat. P. FAIDER, Mme FAIDER-FEYTMANS, 1931, p. 75 s.; s. XIV); *Saint-Omer, Bibliothèque Municipale*, 199 (Catalogue général III, 1861, p. 106; s. XIV); *Saint-Omer, Bibliothèque Municipale*, 461 (Catalogue général III, p. 211; s. XIV); *Schlägl, Stift*, 458.3 (Cat. G. VIELHABER, 1918, nr. 15; s. XIV).

⁹⁹ For instance: *Paris, BNF*, lat. 4002 (a historiated initial, 15 lines high; sitting Christ with his right hand raised and in his left a globe, surrounded by an angel and three animals); lat. 4003 (a floriated initial, 10 lines high); *Troyes, B. M.*, 99 (a historiated initial, 13 lines high: sitting Christ with his right hand raised and in his left a globe; vines, a hare and a dog; s. XIII: in 1297, this manuscript was sent from Paris to Clairvaux); *BAV, Vat. lat.* 2315 (expl.: "Explicit liber copiose"; the space which has been left for a miniature is filled with a simple block letter "A"). It also occurs in MSS. *Amiens, B. M.*, 361 (colophon: "Explicit summa Hostiensis dicta copiosa - one line erased - Iohannis dicti magistri, Rothomagensis dyosesis, et fuit completa scriptura anno Domini m^occc^oxii^o die ueneris post festum sanctae Luciae in regressu lecture sue Aurelianensis"; it seems to have been copied from an exemplar of 127 *peciae*; see DESTREZ, FINK-ERRERA [above n. 13], p. 89 n. 85); *Arras, B. M.* 821 (453); *Bourges, B. M.*, 187; *Napoli, B. N.*, XII.A.10; *Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek*, 1102 (dated: "Anno domini m^occ^ooctogesimo septimo die ueneris in uigilia omnium sanctorum perfectum fuit istud opus").

¹⁰⁰ This is the case in MS. *Paris, BNF lat.* 4004. The *incipit* and *explicit* are written by a different hand.

The now lost MSS. Chartres 323 (361) and MS. 322 (360) consisted of *peciae*, which originated from Paris.¹⁰¹ As we have seen, most of the other manuscripts present the sort of decoration which is typical for Parisian manuscripts of the late 13th century and the first decades of the 14th century. The text opens with either a historiated initial showing Christ on a throne, with a globe in his hand (Arras; Montefano; Paris BNF lat. 4000; Reims; Troyes 98),¹⁰² or a foliate initial. The left margin (and sometimes also parts of the upper and lower margin) are decorated with a stalk with stylized leaves and flowers. Often the decoration also includes little hunting scenes with birds, dogs, hares, swines, and sometimes grotesques. The decoration is not always a reliable indication of the origin, but mostly, it is. Manuscripts written in Italy but decorated in France are very rare.¹⁰³

We already saw that the MS. Montefano, which has the extended rubric ("que uocatur copiosa") and the *quaestio* at the end of the text, was probably written in Paris and is dated 23 December 1283. The even more extended rubric, including "sive caritatis", was also introduced in Paris before the end of the 13th century. It occurs in an interesting group of four manuscripts with the *quaestio* at the end, which are all decorated in the Parisian style:

Bremen, Staatsbibliothek, a.139 (s. XIII) [= B]: a floriated initial of 9 lines high, and a partial decorative border with vines.

Nürnberg, Stadtbibliothek, Cent.II. 64 (s. XIII) [= N]: a floriated initial of 15 lines high, partial decorative border with vines.

Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, 329 (s. XIII) [= P]: a historiated initial of 11 lines high: Christ with his right hand raised and in his left a globe, seated between a bull and a lion. In the upper margin, angels in front of a rhombic background. Much more refined than the illumination of the MS. Montefano. The lower margin shows a hunting scene: dogs with a hare.

Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, 2127 [= Lat. IV, 99] (s. XIII)

¹⁰¹ See also DESTREZ, FINK-ERRERA (above n. 13), p. 89.

¹⁰² The *Summa* begins with "Alpha et o, unum in essentia et trinum in personis, a quo omnes leges pendere iubentur ...".

¹⁰³ Such a manuscript is BAV, Vat. lat. 1370 (*Decreta Gratiani*, with the *Glossa ordinaria*). See my A propos d'une famille de copistes. Quelques remarques sur la librairie à Bologne aux XIIIe et XIVe siècles, in: *Studi Medievali*, Ser. III, 30 (1989), pp. 425–478 (p. 426 s.); repr. in: *Livres et juristes* (above n. 20), pp. 95–148. Two other examples are MSS. Nürnberg, Stadtbibliothek, II 43 and II 79. See BERTRAM, *Drei neuere Kataloge* (above n. 3), p. 387.

[= V]; contains only Part II (Bk. 3–5): a miniature of 9 lines high has been cut out. In the outer margin, vines.¹⁰⁴

In all four manuscripts the words “si omnia hec fuissent ... forsitan habuisset” are followed by “finit hec questio”; in Venezia the rubric “hec questio fuit nobis missa” is at the end of the *quaestio*, in the others at the beginning.

These manuscripts are “pseudo-dated”. At the end of the text they have exactly the same date, 23 July 1289: “Anno domini m°. cc°. octogesimo nono in die sabbati post festum beate magdalenes”.¹⁰⁵ Apparently all four manuscripts go directly or indirectly back to an exemplar which had been completed on this date, and no doubt in Paris.¹⁰⁶ Destrez found several other examples of this phenomenon, manuscripts in which the date at the end does not relate to the manuscript itself, but has been copied from the exemplar. Sometimes, when the scribe who wrote the exemplar had mentioned his name, that name was also copied.¹⁰⁷

Conclusion

From the point of view of Kenneth Pennington, who revealed this interesting element in Hostiensis’ *Summa* (the *quaestio* at the end), the manuscripts show a chronological development of the text. At first, the *quaestio* was lacking. Sometime after 1262 Hostiensis sent it to “the stationers” to have it added to the text. Subsequently, it was at first added as an appendix. Later, it was inserted under the title “de sententia excommunicationis” (X. 5.39).

I suppose that it was not a linear chronological development, but rather a matter of university textual traditions. At some universities,

¹⁰⁴ All four are mentioned by BERTRAM, *Handschriften der Summe* (above n. 4). See for MS. Nürnberg: I. NESKE, *Die Handschriften der Stadtbibliothek Nürnberg*, Band III: *Die lateinischen mittelalterlichen Handschriften. Juristische Handschriften*, Wiesbaden 1991, p. 46 s. (“Mehrfarbige Deckfarbenmalerei mit Blattgold im französischen Stil”). The manuscript seems to have only one pecia-mark (on fol. 10ra), as is often the case in French manuscripts. See for this phenomenon *Utrumque ius in peciis*, pp. 233–241. See for MSS. Paris and Venezia also DESTREZ, FINK-ERRERA (above n. 13), p. 88.

¹⁰⁵ m°. cc°. BN] millesimo ducentesimo PV; octogesimo nono BPV] lxxx°ix°. N; magdalenes BPV] marie magdalene N.

¹⁰⁶ According to Destrez, MSS. Venezia 2127 and Paris SG 329, and also Troyes 98 and 99, are based on the exemplar Chartres. See DESTREZ, FINK-ERRERA (above n. 13), p. 89 n. 84. This is most unlikely, as MS. Chartres probably did not have this colophon.

¹⁰⁷ DESTREZ, FINK-ERRERA, p. 78 s.

stationers inserted the *quaestio* in the text, as the author had wished. In Paris however, a stationer (or: several stationers) did not, and added it at the end; their exemplars were still used by the copyists during the 14th century. The placement of the *quaestio* is an indication of where the manuscript was made. If it occurs at the end of the text, it is probably a Parisian manuscript.

The placement of the *quaestio* and the extended rubric at the beginning may not be the only particularity of this textual tradition of the *Summa*. At French law schools (Orléans, Toulouse), independent textual traditions of the Accursian Gloss came into being during the second half of the 13th century.¹⁰⁸ They have in common that many additions by other authors have been incorporated in the text. These sometimes long and elaborated passages are almost always anonymous. For that reason, they are mostly unrecognizable as additions not written by Accursius himself.¹⁰⁹ Often they have been added at the end of a gloss. In those cases, many scribes have mechanically added the siglum "Ac.". In some manuscripts which have been copied from such *peciae*, the additions are accompanied by a note "additio" in the margin, but mostly such notes are lacking. This means that such manuscripts contain a lot of traps for the modern scholar who consults them.

In Orléans the university stationers added the additions in the margins of the *peciae* with the consent of the *doctores*. When new *peciae* were made they were incorporated in the text. In the margins the scribes then wrote the word "additio". The same was done in Paris, where during the last decades of the 13th century an independent textual tradition of the Gloss on the *Decreta Gratiani* came into being.¹¹⁰

In Paris, not only the Glosses on the civil and canon law were in this way enriched (or spoiled), but also other commentaries on the canon law: e.g. the so-called *Apparatus Innocentii* of pope Innocent IV and Guido de Baysio's *Rosarium*.¹¹¹ The Parisian manuscripts of the

¹⁰⁸ See F. SOETERMEER, Due tradizioni testuali dell'*Apparatus Digesti Novi* di Accursio, in: *RIDC* 8 (1997), pp. 77–127; repr. in: *Livres et juristes* (above n. 20), pp. 289–339.

¹⁰⁹ For such manipulations ("disinvolve operazioni cannibalesche") see now also D. MAFFEI, Riflessioni su Jacques de Revigny e Pierre de Belleperche lessicografi, in: *Studia Gratiana* 29 (1998; = *Life, Law and Letters: Historical Studies in Honour of Antonio García y García*), pp. 605–612 (pp. 608–610).

¹¹⁰ See above n. 27.

¹¹¹ A manuscript of the *Rosarium* with such probable Parisian additions in the text is Arras, B. M., 804, completed by "Evenus filius Rogerii de Sancto Matheo" on 18 April

Summa copiosa can shed new light on the development of the text of Hostiensis' commentary after the author's death. If the stationers in Paris integrated additions in the *Apparatus Innocentii* and in Guido de Baysio's *Rosarium*, as they did with the Gloss on the *Decreta Gratiani*, they may have done the same with Hostiensis' *Summa*. Scholars who use these manuscripts should therefore realize that the whole text may not come from the pen of the *monarcha utriusque iuris*.

I hope to have shown that the origin of a manuscript can be important, also for the legal historian.¹¹² Unfortunately, almost only "modern" (recently published) catalogues give useful (and reliable) information on this aspect. In his review of four catalogues of this type, Martin Bertram argued strongly in favour of catalogues in which the appearance, the type of script, the pecia-notes and the decoration of the manuscripts are also discussed.¹¹³ His plea deserves to be supported.¹¹⁴

1338. The author of an addition on the word "Fas" (D.1 c.1, fol. 3rb) refers to a theological source (St. Thomas Aquinas). A probably Parisian textual tradition of the *Apparatus Innocentii* is present in MS. BAV, Urb. lat. 157. I hope to come back on this subject later.

¹¹² HANS VAN DE WOUW is right in arguing that "la codicologie à soi doit occuper une place dans l'histoire du droit"; see: Quelques remarques sur les versions françaises médiévales des textes de droit romain, in: *El Dret Comú y Catalunya. "Ius Proprium – Ius Commune a Europa"*. Homenatge al Professor André Gouron. Actes del III^{er} Simposi Internacional, Barcelona 5–7 de novembre de 1992, ed. A. IGLESIA FERREIRÓS, Barcelona 1993, pp. 139–150 (p. 145).

¹¹³ Drei neuere Kataloge (above n. 3), pp. 394–397. The article is a review of the catalogue of the *Collegio di Spagna* in Bologna; the two volumes published so far of the catalogue of the legal manuscripts of the Vatican Library (Vol. II: see above n. 36); and the catalogue of the legal manuscripts of the Stadtbibliothek in Nuremberg (above n. 104). At pp. 397–402 an Appendix about pecia manuscripts. See also POWITZ, *Pecienhandschriften* (above n. 92), p. 214s.

¹¹⁴ I thank my colleague Prof. Dr. Alain Wijffels (Leiden, Cambridge) who was so kind to improve the English style of this essay. I also thank Dr. Eef Overgaaauw (Berlin) for his useful remarks on the descriptions of the decoration of the manuscripts.