

CHAPTER III.

OF CERTAIN MSS. WRITTEN BY THE SAME HAND AS THE LEICESTER CODEX.

THE Leicester Codex, to which we now return, is in some ways the most difficult of the members of the Ferrar-group to treat historically. The absence of synaxarium and menology, the peculiarity of the handwriting and a number of other isolated and unusual features, have perplexed the investigators and made it difficult to find the provenience of the MS.

The first step to the solution of the enigma was taken in my book on *The Leicester Codex*, in which I showed that, however peculiar the handwriting might be, it was not absolutely unique, for there was a Greek Psalter in the library of Caius College, Cambridge, written by the very same hand, and which could be proved to have been at one time in the possession of the Friars Minors of Cambridge. And it was easy to infer, since the Leicester Codex had certainly passed to Leicester from Cambridge, that it also was a Franciscan MS.

Since then another MS. has been found in Cambridge written in the same hand. It, too, is a Greek Psalter, in the Library of Trinity College, and it adds, in all probability, one more volume to the Franciscan collection. Dr James, who drew my attention to this MS., has described it as follows in the Catalogue which he has made of the MSS. from the Gale collection in the possession of Trinity College :

H.

4

[O. 3. 14] Psalterium graece.

Vellum, $11\frac{3}{8} \times 8\frac{1}{4}$, ff. 152 + 7, 19 lines to a page. Cent. xv, in the peculiar hand of the Leicester Codex.

Binding: stamped leather over boards. The principal ornaments on the first cover are

1. a square: a fleur de lys, with one quatrefoil in upper *l.* corner;
- 2, 3. square stamps of leaves and flowers;
4. square stamp of crowned lion.

On the second cover 1, 3 occur, and also a small square stamp of a dolphin, a band of vine-ornament, two large lozenges with 4-petalled flower, and the inscription in black letter

Ἐπάε.

Collation: 4 fly leaves | $\alpha^8 - \iota^6$ | 3 fly-leaves.

The quires are numbered in the original hand in Greek: the first four leaves are marked in this way (e.g. in quire 5),

1 ϵ^{ν} . 2 $\phi\nu\lambda\beta \epsilon^{\nu}$. 3 $\phi\nu\lambda\gamma \epsilon^{\nu}$. 4 $\phi\nu\lambda\delta \epsilon^{\nu}$.

Also they are numbered by a Latin scribe from *a* to *t*: both in ink and with pencil: the latter marking ceases towards the end.

There is a third numbering (partial) in Arabic figures: on the fly-leaves are old press marks, all of xviiith and xviiiith cent.

No. 339.

H. 25.

O. 10. 29.

O. 3. 14.

and on the fourth fly-leaf these notes (c. xvii., xviii.):

- (1) In hoc codice absunt Psalmorum tituli universi,
- (2) $\Sigma\eta\mu\epsilon\iota\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ collatum esse hoc exemplar cum novem codicibus

| | |
|-----------------|-----|
| MS. Regio | MS. |
| Aldina Editione | A. |
| Compl. Editione | C. |
| Romana Editione | R. |
| Chrysostomo | Ch. |
| Theodoreto | Th. |
| Euthymio | Eu. |
| Catena Corderii | Cc. |
| Catena Nicetae | Cn. |

Cod. Ravii in Ps. 18.

As a matter of fact the collation does not extend beyond f. 17 (Ps. xxii. lat.).

At the top of f. 1 in a xviiith cent. hand is

No. 1255.

The initial to each Psalm is on pale red, usually with some foliated ornament; quickly and rather poorly done.

Each verse has a small initial in the same red.

The first quire is written in a hand slightly larger than the rest: but I see no reason to doubt that it is the same hand. It seems not unlikely that the first quire was early worn out or lost and supplied by the same scribe.

With the second quire (Ps. xiv) the Latin *incipits* of the Psalms begin to be added, and are continued to the end of the Psalter. There are none in quire 1. They are in a late xvth cent. hand, in a pale red, not distinguishable from that of the initials.

Contents. The Psalter: various readings from the authorities named above are noted in the margin up to Ps. xxii. Lat. There are interlinear Latin glosses in red (in the hand which wrote the *incipits*) in quire 2: they are few in number in the early part of the book, and soon cease. But in Ps. cxviii. (cxix.)—Ps. cxxii. (cxxiii.) they are fairly continuous; they then cease.

At the end of Ps. cl. in red is written: Finitur psalterium. Then follow:

Ps. cli. Μικρὸς ἤμην.

Song of Moses, (1) Exod. xv.

(2) Deut. xxxiii.

Song of Hannah.

Prayer of Habakkuk.

Isaiah: ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀρθρίζει.

Prayer of Jonah.

Prayer of Azarias.

Song of Three Children.

Magnificat.

Benedicite.

Prayer of Hezekiah.

Prayer of Manasseh.

ending f. 151 a.

f. 151 b and the fly-leaves are blank.

Thus far Dr James. The main points to be noticed are (i) that a new MS. has been added to those known as "Leicester Codices" (xxi.); the facsimile which we give will enable us to verify the identification of the hand; (ii) the marks of the foliation are the same as in the Leicester Codex and Caius Psalter; (iii) as the facsimile shows, the illuminated initials are in an Italian hand.

It will be observed that the evidence furnished by this new MS. is not very clear or striking. The mark of ownership in the binding has not yet led to an identification. And there seem to be no marks of ownership in the text itself. What is really important is that the ornamental initials in the MS. are of a pronounced Italian hand. They must be taken as a proof of the

Italian provenience of the MS. It was either brought from Italy or written by an Italian scribe in England. In the latter case, the occurrence of three Leicester-hand MSS. traceable to Cambridge, or actually existing there, would lead us to assume that they were written there, and to find the Scriptorium from which they emanated in the Cambridge Grey-friars' convent. But we have not yet decided that the MSS. were produced there: they may have been imported.

So we must go further afield again with our enquiries. And the next point gained is that there are two more Greek MSS. in the same peculiar hand in the Chapter Library at Durham. This identification is, I believe, due in the first instance to Dr Sanday, but whether he followed up the clue which they furnish, I do not know.

The two MSS. are described as follows in Thomas Rud's *Catalogue of the Durham MSS.*

C. IV. 2. Platonis libri nonnulli graecè.

Iis praefigitur

This title is not by the first hand.

1. Τιμαίω τῷ Λοκρῷ περὶ ψυχᾶς Κόσμου, καὶ Φύσιος.

Sic incipit: Τιμαίος ὁ Λόκρος τάδε ἔφα δύο αἰτίας εἰμει τῶν σωμάτων.

In editis pro σωμάτων legitur συμπάντων. Titulum hunc (cum nullus sit in M̄sto) apposui ex Platonis operibus, inter quae legitur in Tomo 3^{io}, pag. 93, in editione Henr. Stephani.

2. Πλάτωνος Μένων, ἢ περὶ Ἀρετῆς.

fol. 10.

Titulus hic non est in M̄sto.

Sic incipit Ἐχεις μοι εἰπεῖν, ὦ Σώκρατες, ἄρα διδακτὸν ἡ Ἀρετῆ.

Legitur in operum ejus Tomo 2^{do}, pag. 70.

3. Ἰππίας μείζων, ἢ, περὶ τοῦ Καλοῦ.

fol. 32 b.

Sic incipit: Ἰππίας ὁ καλός τε καὶ σοφός, ὡς διὰ χρόνου.

In Tomo 3^{io} operum ejus, pag. 281.

4. Ἰππίας ὁ ἐλάττων, ἢ, περὶ τοῦ Καλοῦ.

fol. 54 b.

Pro Καλοῦ libri editi habent Ψεύδους.

Sic incipit: Σὺ δὲ δὴ τί σιγᾶς, ὦ Σωκρατες.

In Tomo 1^{mo} operum, folio 363.

5. Ἰωνα, ἢ, περὶ Ἰλιάδος.

fol. 63.

Sic incipit: Ἰωνα χαίρειν· Πόθεν τὰ νῦν ἡμῖν ἐπιδημήμας. —

In Tomo 1^{mo} operum, pag. 530.

6. [Μενέξενος]¹ ἢ, Επιτάφιος. fol. 74.

Sic incipit: [Εξ]αγοβᾶς, ἢ [πόθεν] Μενέξενος. —

Voces uncis inclusae exciderunt e M̄sto.

In operum tomo 2^{do}, pag. 234.

7. Κλειτοφῶν, ἢ, Προτρεπτικός. fol. 88 b.

Sic incipit: Κλειτοφῶντα τὸν Αριστωνύμου τίς ἡμῖν. —

In Tomo 3^{to} operum, p. 406.

8. Πολιτεία, ἢ, περὶ Δικαίου, Διάλογοι ε'. fol. 93.

Sic incipiunt, Κατέβην χθές εἰς Πειραιᾶ μετὰ Γλαύκωνος. —

In operum Tomo 2^{do}, pag. 327.

Scriptus est hic Codex, ut Aristotelis libri Logici (supra, in Pluteo 1. Cod. 15), partim in membranis, sed majorem partem in Chartâ; (eâque, magna libri parte, in summis praesertim foliis, humore corruptâ) lineis continuis, literis cursivis; et eâdem cum Aristotele aetate.

The description which Rud gives of the Aristotle is as follows:

Porphyrii et Aristotelis Libri Logici. (Ὀργανον vulgo dicti) Graece. C. 1. 15 folio.

1. Πορφυρίου Φιλοσόφου Εἰσαγωγή.

Sic incipit: Οντος αναγκαίου, Χρυσασόριε.

2. Αριστοτέλους Κατηγορίαι. fol. 10 b.

Sic incipiunt: Ομωνυμα λέγεται, ὧν ὄνομα μόνον κοινόν.

3. Αριστοτέλους περὶ Ἑρμηνείας. fol. 28.

Sic incipit: Πρῶτον δεῖ θέσθαι, τὸ ὄνομα καὶ τὸ Ρῆμα. —

4. Αριστοτέλους Αναλυτικῶν προτέρων τὸ πρῶτον. fol. 37 b.

Sic incipit: Πρῶτον εἰπεῖν περὶ τῆ, καὶ τινός, ἐστὶν ἡ σκέψις. —

5. Αριστοτέλους Αναλυτικῶν προτέρων τὸ δεύτερον. fol. 73 b.

Sic incipit: Εν πόσοις μὲν οὖν σχήμασι, καὶ διὰ ποίων. —

6. Αριστοτέλους Αναλυτικῶν ὑστέρων τὸ πρῶτον. fol. 97 b.

Sic incipit: Πᾶσα διδασκαλία καὶ πᾶσα μαθησις. —

7. Αριστοτέλους Αναλυτικῶν ὑστέρων τὸ δεύτερον. fol. 120 b.

Sic incipit: Τὰ ζητούμενα ἐστὶν ἴσα τὸν ἀριθμὸν. —

8. — Τοπικῶν τὸ πρῶτον. fol. 132 b.

Sic incipit: Ἡ μὲν πρόθεσις τῆς πραγματείας. —

9. — τὸ δεύτερον. fol. 142 b.

Sic incipit: Ἐστι δὲ τῶν προβλημάτων, τὰ μὲν. —

10. — τὸ τρίτον. fol. 150.

Sic incipit: Πότερον δὲ αἰρετώτερον, ἢ βέλτιον. —

¹ MS. damaged.

11. — τὸ τέταρτον. fol. 154.
 Sic incipit : Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα περὶ τῶν πρὸς τὸ Γένος. —
12. — τὸ πέμπτον. fol. 162 b.
 Sic incipit : Πότερον δὲ ἴδιον ἢ οὐκ ἴδιον. —
13. — τὸ ἕκτον. fol. 173.
 Sic incipit : τῆς δὲ περὶ τοὺς ὄρους πραγματείας μέρη εἰ.
14. τὸ ἑβδομον. fol. 185 b.
 Sic incipit : Πότερον δὲ ταυτὸν, ἢ ἕτερον.
15. Τοπικῶν τὸ Οἴδοον. fol. 190.
 Sic incipit : Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα περὶ τῆς Τάξεως.
16. περὶ τῶν Σοφιστικῶν Ελέγχων. fol. 200.

Scriptus est hic Codex partim in membranis, sed majorem partem in charta; lineis integris; litteris currentibus, non bene formati; ante annos (ut videtur) vix 300.

It will be seen from these descriptions that Rud had noticed (*a*) the similarity between the two MSS., (*b*) the peculiar arrangement of leaves, consisting of mixed paper and vellum, with more paper than vellum; (*c*) the ungainliness of the hand. He does not, however, go so far as to actually identify the hands, one with another. Neither does he explain why the paper is in the case of the Plato MS. in excess of the vellum, through the placing of the two vellum double-leaves in a quire on the inside and outside of the quire, with three paper leaves between these two in a quire of five double leaves. (This is the peculiar arrangement which we described in the Leicester Codex.) Rud has moreover made the two codices younger by nearly a century than they should have been reckoned; for, writing in 1825, he thinks the two volumes under 300 years old, which brings them down to 1525. As we shall see, this is seventy-five or a hundred years later than it should have been.

We will now turn to the Codices themselves, and to the facsimiles that we have made of them. From the latter it is easy to see that the handwriting is the same as that of the Leicester Codex, the Caius Psalter and the Trinity Psalter. We have, therefore, five Greek MSS. written in the same mysterious hand, three of which have been traced to Cambridge, and two of which are in Durham. Moreover, of the five, three, viz. the Leicester Codex and the two Durham MSS., are in paleographical

agreement, by being written on mixed paper and vellum. In the case of the Plato MS. the agreement in the vellum-paper arrangement with the Leicester Codex is exact: in the case of the Aristotle nearly exact. It must be allowed that the evidence for the emanation of the MSS. from a common scriptorium is very strong.

Of the two MSS. the Aristotle is much the finer; it is not only larger, being a folio with fine wide margins, and better preserved, having escaped the damp which has so much damaged the Plato, but it is also much more carefully written. In the Plato, on the other hand, all the severe criticisms which have been passed on the Leicester script are abundantly justified. There is very little difference in the structure of the two Durham MSS.: the Plato comes nearest to the Leicester Codex, with which it agrees in having the half-quire of ten leaves arranged in the sequence V P P P V (i.e. three paper leaves between two vellum leaves). In the Aristotle the central vellum double-leaf is replaced by a paper leaf, giving the half-quire in the form V P P P P. Each of the MSS. has the characteristic Leicester catchwords and leaf-signatures. In the Plato, for instance, where these catchwords are mostly cut away by the binder, we find on fol. 36 r. the note that it is the fifth leaf of the fifth quire¹, and so on with other leaves and quires throughout the book.

The Aristotle has the same leaf numeration, e.g. on fol. 2 we have

$\phi\upsilon\lambda\lambda\ \epsilon\nu\ \tau\upsilon\ \alpha\tau\upsilon'$,

or $\phi\upsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu\ \delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha' \tau\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\delta\iota\omicron\nu$,

and there are also catchwords for the leaves through the first half of the quinion. In the Plato, the catchwords run from quire to quire.

In neither of the two MSS. does there appear to be any mark of authorship or ownership, by which we might be enabled to locate or to date the Leicester group. We do not even know whether the books at Durham came from Cambridge or not, and at first sight it looks as if the problem had been

¹ Perhaps by an error of counting for the fourth quire: on fol. 45r, the count conserves the error, marking $\phi\upsilon\lambda\lambda\ \delta\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon'$, if I have rightly read the abbreviations.

made no easier by the addition of the new members to the group.

We will now turn to the paper-marks of the two Durham MSS. and see what light they throw upon their provenience.

The Plato has for the first 190 leaves a paper which is marked by a pair of crossed arrows in a circle. Can this mark be localised within a given area or placed within outside limits of time? It is well known that in consequence of the extraordinary development in the early paper trade, and the frequent persistence of given marks through long intervals, it is not an easy thing to fix places and dates for paper by merely looking at the water-mark. Special varieties of paper travelled far and wide, both by land and by sea, and the result is that the provenience of the paper mills is obscured by the multiplicity of the markets. In the case of the cross-arrows we have an easy instance before us for investigation. I have not yet found it amongst English papers. Nor is it found amongst the papers of the Low Countries. The whole of the collection made by Mr Ottley in his researches into the origin of printing does not show, amongst the papers of the Netherlands, a single instance. And this is remarkable, in view of the fact that Mr Ottley had access to all the Dutch archives, and that his collection covered the whole period from 1350 A.D. to 1550¹.

This collection of paper-marks is now in the Cambridge University Library [*Add.* 2878 and 2878 a], and we have examined both the volumes in which it is contained. At the close of the collection will be found a few tracings taken from Italian letters; amongst these there is a case of the crossed arrows (not enclosed in a circle), the letter being written from Suana in Tuscany and dated in 1468.

From the circumstance that books and papers of the Low Countries do not show the crossed arrows, we might almost conclude

¹ Sotheby says, in his *Principia Topographica*, Vol. III. p. 2, that "Mr Ottley amassed an interesting and large collection of the specimens of the Paper made in the Netherlands from as early a period as 1350 to 1550: from which, together with the tracings he obtained of marks in dated volumes of accounts, wherein there were no blank

leaves, and also tracings from the Public Account Books preserved at Haarlem and elsewhere, he was enabled to form a series of the drawings of the various water-marks he had met with, arranging them according to dates, and to the different parts of the Netherlands whence the folio books of accounts had been forwarded."

that it was as little a French mark as a Dutch, for there is a great trade in paper between Northern France and the Netherlands, and many of the marks collected by Ottley are in evidence on the point. But to make the point clear, we may examine the collection of marks (filigranes) published by Matton and Midoux from French sources¹.

Amongst the 600 specimens there does not seem to be a single case of crossed arrows.

So far then, our only instance is the Tuscan letter of 1468.

Let us now turn to the collection of marks published by Jansen, in his *Essai sur l'origine de la gravure*. We find two cases of crossed arrows, numbered respectively 55 and 287. Turning to p. 341 we find that No. 55 is an Italian mark, apparently one that is employed by Nicolas Jenson the Venetian printer. The passage runs as follows :

"les Flèches placées en sautoir, No. 55, sont également de 1470, et servent de marque au papier de quelques villes Vénétiennes, ainsi qu'à celui de Bologne et de Rome²."

The other numbered drawing (No. 287) will be found to be a mark from a paper employed by a printer at Treviso, one Bernard Celerino di Luere³.

These two marks then are North Italian.

Next let us try the collection made by Sotheby, in his *Typography of the XVth century*. We find the crossed arrows in the following printed books :

| | | |
|------------------------|------|-------------------|
| Tortellius at Rome in | 1471 | Ulrich Gallus |
| Strabo at Venice in | 1472 | Vindelin de Spira |
| Cicero " " " | 1480 | Jenson? |
| Valerius Maximus " " " | 1471 | Vindelin de Spira |
| Cicero " " " | 1475 | Jenson |
| Dante " " " | 1477 | Vindelin de Spira |

¹ Étude sur les Filigranes des papiers employés en France aux XIV^e et XV^e siècles, accompagnée de 600 dessins lithographiés, par Étienne Midoux et Auguste Matton. Paris, 1868.

² The author is borrowing from Sardini, H.

L'esame sui principii della francese ed italiana tipografia, ovvero storia critica di Nicola Jenson; Lucca, 1797.

³ Here he is borrowing from an *Éclaircissement sur les marques du papier* par M. de la Serna.

to which may be added from Bodemann (*Xylographische und Typographische Incunabeln*):

Augustine: Venice, 1470, by John and Vindelino de Spira.

It will be seen that these marks must be North Italian, and probably not very far, as to their place of manufacture, from Venice. The collection made by Briquet¹ from the Genoese archives, which contains nearly 600 watermarks, ranging from A.D. 1154 to 1700, does not exhibit a single case of the crossed arrows, a result which is very striking as a confirmation of our belief that we have rightly located the paper-mill which used the sign in question in the N.E. of Italy. It is, moreover, striking that they appear to be confined almost to a single decade. Unless, then, we can find earlier specimens, or can trace them further afield, we are almost driven to conclude that the Durham Plato is a North Italian product, and that it is not earlier than the invention of printing.

We have discussed this single watermark at length, because it seems to afford ground for definite conclusions. It is not, to be sure, impossible that Italian paper of the kind described might be exported to England, either from Genoa or Venice. But the evidence, in the shape of extant papers, for such a belief is not forthcoming. We shall conclude, therefore, provisionally that the scriptorium that we are in search of was in some North Italian city, probably in the neighbourhood of Venice².

¹ Papiers et Filigranes des archives de Gènes par C. M. Briquet.

² While we are engaged upon this point, it may be well to recall what we said with regard to the watermarks of the Leicester Codex in our first discussion of that MS. The marks of the paper used in that MS. were not easy to decipher or to locate. The one which is marked A in my book (a trident-shaped mark) is declared by Sir E. M. Thompson to be nothing else than a letter M, and I see now that he is right.

Very similar marks will be found in Briquet, Nos. 403—406, under the dates 1408—1448. A single instance will be found in Midoux and Matton (No. 422) from a MS. at Soissons. The mark is surmounted by a Latin cross as in the case of some of the Genoese examples. I have no doubt of its Italian origin.

The Leicester mark B is suspected by Sir E. M. Thompson to be a faintly impressed bull's head. It is one of the commonest and most widely diffused of paper marks.