

EVINA STEINOVÁ

Two Carolingian Redactions of Isidore's *Etymologiae* from St. Gallen*

ABSTRACT

The Abbey of St. Gallen was the foremost centre for the study of the *Etymologiae* of Isidore of Seville in the Carolingian period. Not only can more than twenty early medieval manuscripts transmitting material from the *Etymologiae* be associated with Carolingian St. Gallen, but its scriptorium also produced two scholarly redactions of Isidore's encyclopaedia in the second half of the ninth century. The prototype codices of these two redactions survive today in Swiss libraries, one as Zofingen, Stadtbibliothek, Pa 32, the other as St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 231–232. The first redaction represents an attempt to enrich the *Etymologiae* by incorporating Isidore's *De natura rerum* into the encyclopaedia. The second redaction is the result of a collation of four sets of manuscripts of the *Etymologiae*, some of which survive today and bear collation marks and variant readings inserted into the margins. While none of the many hands that were involved in the collation and copying of the two redac-

* The research reflected in this study has been carried out with the financial support of the Andrew W. Mellon Postdoctoral Fellowship from the Pontifical Institute of the Mediaeval Studies in Toronto. Preliminary findings were presented at the Postdoctoral Seminar of the Pontifical Institute in April 2017 and at the Seminar of the Faculty of Geography and History of the University of Salamanca in November 2018. The final study was submitted as a thesis to the Pontifical Institute in June 2019 and the Licence in Mediaeval Studies was awarded in November 2019. I would like to express my gratitude to a number of Swiss libraries who have kindly allowed me to carry out research in their libraries in January 2019. These include the Stadtbibliothek Zofingen (Annina Maria Beck), Stiftsbibliothek Einsiedeln (P. Justinus Pagnamenta, OSB), Stiftsbibliothek St. Gallen (Cornel Dora), and Stadtbibliothek Schaffhausen (Christina Nicolet Wälchli). Special thanks are due to Prof. Greti Dinkova-Bruun and Prof. Bernice Kaczynski, who have read and commented on this work in their capacity as Readers, Prof. Susan Rankin, who has been kind enough to look for Notker Balbulus's hand in some of the manuscripts included in this study, Prof. Carmen Cardelle de Hartmann, who provided useful comments on an earlier version of this article, and Prof. Anna Grotans, who was kind enough to correct it thoroughly.

tions can be attributed to any of the known scholars active at St. Gallen in the ninth century, the redactions seem to have been produced over the course of several decades under the auspices of the *praepositus* and later abbot Hartmut.

Keywords: Isidore of Seville, the *Etymologiae*, St. Gallen, Carolingian manuscripts, Hartmut of St. Gallen, medieval textual criticism, critical signs, Carolingian scholarship

The Abbey of St. Gallen in today's Switzerland provides us with one of the richest records of early medieval book history and intellectual culture.¹ Not only do we possess more than 350 Carolingian manuscripts produced in its scriptorium, but we are also uniquely informed about the intellectual life of the abbey through a fortunate combination of written sources.² First, we possess a unique record of the history of St. Gallen in the form of the *Casus Sancti Galli*, the chronicle of St. Gallen begun by the monk Ratpert (c. 840/50 – c. 900) and continued by Ekkehart IV (c. 980/990–1056).³

¹ Some of the most important scholarly studies of the early medieval book history and intellectual life at St. Gallen include Albert Bruckner, *Scriptoria medii aevi Helvetica*, 14 vols, vols. 2–3, Genève 1938; Walter Berschin, *Eremus und Insula. St. Gallen und die Reichenau im Mittelalter: Modell einer lateinischen Literaturlandschaft*, Wiesbaden 1987; Bernice M. Kaczynski, *Greek in the Carolingian age: the St. Gall manuscripts*, Cambridge, MA 1988; Johannes Duft, *Die Abtei St. Gallen*, 3 vols, Sigmaringen 1994; Peter Ochsenbein, *Cultura Sangallensis. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, St. Gallen 2000; Rupert Schaab, *Mönch in Sankt Gallen: zur inneren Geschichte eines frühmittelalterlichen Klosters*, Ostfildern 2003; Anna Grotans, *Reading in medieval St. Gall*, Cambridge 2006; Anton von Euw, *Die St. Galler Buchkunst vom 8. bis zum Ende des 11. Jahrhunderts*, 2 vols, St. Gallen 2008; and Sven Meeder, *The Irish Scholarly Presence at St. Gall: Networks of Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*, London 2018.

² The twelve volumes of the *Codices latini antiquiores* and the fourth volume of Bischoff's *Katalog* list altogether 361 early medieval manuscripts (8 described in the CLA and 353 described in the *Katalog*) that were produced certainly or likely in St. Gallen; see Elias A. Lowe, *Codices latini antiquiores: a palaeographical guide to Latin manuscripts prior to the ninth century*, 11 vols, Oxford 1934–1966; Elias A. Lowe, *Codices latini antiquiores. Supplement*, Oxford 1971; and Bernhard Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen) IV: Gesamtregister*, ed. B. Ebersperger, Wiesbaden 2017, 308–309. This number is comparable to the estimate of c. 300 early medieval manuscripts made in Bernice M. Kaczynski, *The authority of the fathers: Patristic texts in Early Medieval libraries and scriptoria*, in: *Journal of Medieval Latin* 16 (2006), 1–27 (here 8).

³ The standard edition of Ratpert's text and Ekkehart's extension remains MGH SS II, pp. 59–147. It has been most recently analyzed in Christina Pössel, *The Consolation of Community: Innovation and Ideas of History in Ratpert's Casus Sancti Galli*, in: *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 65 (2014), 1–24.

Second, six ninth-century book catalogues of St. Gallen survive, capturing the growth of the abbey's library, in particular during the second half of the ninth century, the first golden age of the monastic community.⁴ Furthermore, the administrative records of the abbey, among them its charters as well as the ninth-century profession and confraternity books, add to our understanding of the inner life of the St. Gallen community.⁵ Finally, there is the famed plan of St. Gallen, which, albeit no longer considered a plan of an actual monastery, tells us about the ideal disposition and organization of an early medieval monastic community.⁶

Yet, despite this wealth of sources, substantial gaps remain in the intellectual history of the abbey. It is perhaps due to their large number that many of the surviving early medieval manuscripts from St. Gallen have never been thoroughly examined, and we thus remain in the dark about many important aspects of intellectual life at St. Gallen during the early Middle Ages. We are, for example, well-informed by the *Casus Sancti Galli* about the presence of learned individuals among the denizens of the monastery, such as the schoolmasters Iso and the Irishman Marcellus-Moengal, Ratpert, the author of the *Casus sancti Galli*, and his two peers Tuotilo and Notker Balbulus, both accomplished *literati*, as well as the celebrated abbots Grimald, Hartmut, and Solomon. However, we know about their intellectual output only as far as they attached their names to a notable composition (as was the case with Ratpert and Notker Balbulus) or left behind a subscription in a manuscript they

⁴ The earliest library catalogue of St. Gallen from the mid-ninth century (with additions from the 880s) is preserved on pp. 4–21 of St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 728 (<https://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/csg/0728/4/0/Sequence-649>). The second ninth-century library catalogue, listing acquisitions under the abbots Grimald and Hartmut, including donations of their private libraries, is preserved on pp. 3–32 of St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 267 (<https://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/de/csg/0267/3/0/Sequence-451>). A different list of books that were copied under the direction of specific abbots appears in the *Casus sancti Galli*, chapters 26, 29 and 30. These catalogues have been edited in Paul Lehmann, *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz*, vol. 1, Munich 1969. They are analysed in Hannes Steiner, *Buchproduktion und Bibliothekszuwachs im Kloster St. Gallen unter den Äbten Grimald und Hartmut*, in: Ludwig der Deutsche und seine Zeit, ed. Wilfried Hartmann, Darmstadt 2004, 161–183; and more recently in Mark Stansbury, *Sammelhandschriften* and the *Breuiarium librorum* in Sankt Gallen 728, in: *Entangled Manuscripts*, eds. Anna Dorofeeva and Michael Kelly (forthcoming).

⁵ They were masterfully analysed in Schaab (see fn. 1).

⁶ The standard study on the plan remains Walter W. Horn and Ernest Born, *The Plan of St. Gall: A Study of the Architecture and Economy and Life in a Paradigmatic Carolingian Monastery*, Berkeley, CA 1979.

copied (as was the case with Marcellus and Hartmut).⁷ Moreover, these few figures represent just the tip of the iceberg. Bruckner has estimated that at the zenith of its Carolingian glory, more than one hundred scribes were active in the scriptorium of St. Gallen.⁸ Some of them surely counted among the intellectual elite of the monastery. We can identify some of the hands we see in the St. Gallen Carolingian manuscripts as belonging to the persons mentioned by Ratpert, as is the case with the monk-calligrapher Sintram; however, there are many more hands that remain unidentified.⁹ Even when we can assign a name to some of the scribes working in the scriptorium of St. Gallen, for example thanks to charters and other documentary sources, the names rarely reveal the depth and breadth of their intellectual activity and the extent to which they may have aspired to scholarship.

If we wish to illuminate the scholarly activity at St. Gallen, our main avenue is the surviving manuscripts. As the close examination of codices surviving from other early medieval monasteries that hosted scholars and entire circles of intellectual labourers has shown, books are the most likely artifacts to yield traces of local intellectual efforts that reveal contours of minor and

⁷ Iso's career and works have been treated in detail in Johannes Duft, *Der Lehrer Iso*, in: *Die Abtei St. Gallen II: Beiträge zur Kenntnis ihrer Persönlichkeiten*, ed. Johannes Duft, Sigmaringen 1991, 73–117. On Marcellus-Moengal, see Simona Gavinelli, *Irlandesi, libri biblici greco-latini e il monastero di S. Ambrogio in età carolingia*, in: *Il monastero di S. Ambrogio nel medioevo. Convegno di studi nel XII centenario*, 784–1984, Milan 1988, 350–360. On Tuotilo, see the recent volume edited by David Ganz and Cornel Dora, *Tuotilo. Archäologie eines frühmittelalterlichen Künstlers*, St. Gallen 2017. Useful overviews of Notker's career and output include Johannes Duft, *Der Dichter Notker Balbulus*, in: Duft (see fn. 7) 127–147; Walter Berschin, *Notker I. von St. Gallen († 912) überlieferungsgeschichtlich gesehen*, in: *Mittellateinische Studien I*, Heidelberg 2005, 193–202; and Susan K. Rankin, *Notker Bibliothecarius*, in: *Medieval cantors and their craft. Music, liturgy and the shaping of history, 800–1500*, eds. Katie A.-M. Bugyis, Andrew B. Kraebel, and Margot E. Fassler, Woodbridge 2017, 41–58. On the three abbots of St. Gallen, see Johannes Duft, *Die Äbte Gozbert, Grimalt, Hartmut, Salomo*, in: Duft (see fn. 7) 61–72. Grimald is also treated separately in Bernhard Bischoff, *Bücher am Hofe Ludwigs des Deutschen und die Privatbibliothek des Kanzlers Grimalt*, in: *Mittelalterliche Studien III* (1981), 187–212; and Dieter Geuenich, *Beobachtungen zu Grimald von St. Gallen, Erzkapellan und Oberkanzler Ludwigs des Deutschen*, in: *Litterae medii aevi. Festschrift für Johanne Autenrieth zu ihrem 65. Geburtstag*, eds. Michael Borgolte and Herrad Spilling, Sigmaringen 1988, 55–68.

⁸ Bruckner (see fn. 1) vol. 3, 23.

⁹ On Sintram, see Euw (see fn. 1) 162. For a more general overview of scribes known from subscriptions, see Beat M. von Scarpatetti, *Schreiber-Zuweisungen in St. Galler Handschriften des achten und neunten Jahrhunderts*, in: *Codices Sangallenses. Festschrift für Johannes Duft zum 80. Geburtstag*, Sigmaringen 1995, 25–56.

major scholarly projects.¹⁰ We must not, naturally, be too hopeful of identifying the hands of known scholars as scribes of particular texts, a feat that has been attempted many times with St. Gallen codices.¹¹ The task is subtler. It means examining the manuscripts with an eye for features that reveal them to be working copies used for the production or compilation of scholarly works, known and unknown. Even if we are not able to identify the masterminds behind such projects, we can be reasonably sure that they reflect the activities of individuals who can be considered scholars. Moreover, as far as the projects required a group effort, they reveal the presence of scholarly circles at St. Gallen. The aim of this article is to shed light on such a circle that existed there during the second half of the ninth century by looking at the manuscripts of Isidore's *Etymologiae* connected with the abbey in the ninth century.

¹⁰ Such projects have been analysed in Bernice M. Kaczynski, Reading and writing Augustine in medieval St. Gall, in: *Insignis sophiae arcator: Essays in honour of Michael W. Herren on his 65th birthday*, eds. Gernot R. Wieland, Carin Ruff, and Ross Arthur, Turnhout 2006, 107–123; Heidi Eisenhut, Die Glossen Ekkeharths IV. von St. Gallen im Codex Sangallensis 621, St. Gallen 2009; and Anna Grotans, Notker Labeo's Translation/Commentaries: Changing Form and Function over Time, in: *The Annotated Book in the Early Middle Ages. Practices of Reading and Writing*, eds. Mariken Teeuwen and Irene van Renswoude, Turnhout 2017, 427–464.

¹¹ The hand of Notker Balbulus was identified in at least thirty-one manuscripts, see Susan K. Rankin, Ego itaque Notker scripsi, in: *Revue bénédictine* 101 (1991), 268–298; Hartmut Hoffmann, Autographa des früheren Mittelalters, in: *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 57 (2001), 1–62 (here 48–49); and especially Rankin (see fn. 7). Autographs of Hartmut are treated in Samuel Berger, Histoire de la Vulgate pendant les premiers siècles du moyen âge, Hildesheim 1976, 125–127; and Walter Berschin, Fünf Exlibris Hartmuts von St. Gallen (Abt 872–883), in: *Gli Autografi medievali: Problemi paleografici e filologici; atti del convegno di studio della Fondazione Ezio Franceschini, Erice, 25 settembre – 2 ottobre 1990*, eds. Paolo Chiesa and Lucia Pinelli, Spoleto 1994, 167–169. Grimald's hand has not been identified, although we possess his personal notebook, see Bischoff (see fn. 7) 201–205. Marcellus-Moengal's hand was identified in Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, A VII 3 and Zürich, Zentralbibliothek, C 57; see Natalie Daniel, Handschriften des zehnten Jahrhunderts aus der Freisinger Dombibliothek: Studien über Schriftcharakter und Herkunft der nachkarolingischen und ottonischen Handschriften einer bayerischen Bibliothek, Munich 1973, 37–38; and Ew (see fn. 1) 108–110. Bruckner also believed Marcellus may have corrected St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MSS 258 and 286; Bruckner (see fn. 1) vol. 3, 29.

Isidore's *Etymologiae* at St. Gallen

St. Gallen stands out among Carolingian monastic centres as an absolute leader in the number of surviving copies of Isidore's *Etymologiae* produced in its scriptorium or in its possession in the early Middle Ages. If we peruse the handlist of the surviving manuscripts of the *Etymologiae* produced by Gustav Eduard Anspach and account for the new discoveries and changes in dating made by Bernhard Bischoff, we arrive at a total of fifteen manuscripts containing material from the *Etymologiae* that originated at St. Gallen and are still on deposit there.¹² Five of these manuscripts represent either full copies of the twenty-book encyclopaedia or partial copies of the entire text (e. g. only the first or the second half, as the *Etymologiae* were often transmitted in two volumes). Ten manuscripts contain isolated excerpts, collections of excerpts, or transmit only one of the books of the *Etymologiae*.

To these should be added manuscripts that are no longer present at St. Gallen, even though they were copied there in the ninth century, such as Zofingen, Stadtbibliothek, Pa 32 containing the entire encyclopaedia, Zürich, Zentralbibliothek, C 129, a compendium containing excerpts from book VI of the *Etymologiae*,¹³ and a fragment of book IX of the *Etymologiae* surviving as Budapest, Szechenyi National Library, Fragm. E 78.¹⁴ Finally, we need to account for manuscripts that were not produced at St. Gallen but which were in its possession in the ninth century, such as St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 1399 a. 1, a fragment of a seventh-century Irish book, which survived in the binding of two St. Gallen codices.¹⁵ If all manuscripts are counted, we arrive at a total of

¹² Anspach's handlist was published as José Maria Fernández Catón, *Las Etimologías en la tradición manuscrita medieval estudiada por el Prof. Dr. Anspach*, León 1966. Anspach's verdicts on manuscripts, their dates and places of origin were checked against Bernhard Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts: (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen)*, ed. Birgit Ebersperger, 4 vols, Wiesbaden 1998–2017.

¹³ This manuscript is digitized at: <https://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/de/list/one/zbz/C0129>.

¹⁴ The latter fragment is described in Paul Lehmann, *Mitteilungen aus Handschriften*, vol. 5, Munich 1938, 6. Although Bischoff notes that it has been lost since 1945 (Bischoff (see fn. 12) vol. 1, 165), it has never been missing from the National Library in Budapest, and I was able to obtain its digital images in 2019 for the preparation of the present study.

¹⁵ CLA VII 995. This fragment was recently re-examined in Marina Smyth, *Isidorian Texts in Seventh-Century Ireland*, in: Isidore of Seville and his reception in the early Middle Ages, eds. Andrew Fear and Jamie Wood, Amsterdam 2016, 111–130 (here 119–121); and Sven Meeder, *Het oudste Ierse handschrift in St. Gallen*, in: *Kelten 80* (2019), at: <https://kelten.vanhamel.nl/k80-2019-meeder-ierse-geleerdheid-handschriften-st.-gallen-fragmenten>. Another early medieval insular fragment of the *Etymologiae*

nineteen surviving manuscripts containing the *Etymologiae* that are associated with early medieval St. Gallen (see Tab. 1).

shelfmark	content
Budapest, Szechenyi National Library, Fragm. E 78	fragment of book IX
St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 2	excerpts from book XIV
St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 184	excerpts from book XVIII
St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 213	excerpts from book XIV
St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 230	excerpts from books III, VI and VII
St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 231–232	complete (in two volumes)
St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 233	books VI–VIII + XII–XV
St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 235	books XII–XX
St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 236	books XI–XX
St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 237	complete (in one volume)
St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 238	excerpts from book IX
St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 251	excerpts from book XIII
St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 446	excerpts from books VI, VII and VIII
St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 752	book IV
St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 876	excerpts from book I
St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 882	book I
St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 1399 a. 1	fragment of book XI
Zofingen, Stadtbibliothek, Pa 32	complete (in one volume)
Zürich, Zentralbibliothek, C 129	book VI

Tab. 1. Overview of manuscripts from St. Gallen scriptorium or present at St. Gallen in the ninth century containing the *Etymologiae*

that was taken from the bindings at St. Gallen and that may have been present there already in the early Middle Ages is St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 1394, pp. 123–124 from the turn of the ninth century; CLA VII 983.

To appreciate the significance of this number, it can be compared with the number of surviving early medieval copies of the *Etymologiae* associated with scriptoria and libraries of other notable Carolingian monastic centres. According to the most recent overview of the early medieval manuscripts transmitting the *Etymologiae*, fourteen manuscripts were produced in or possessed by Reims, thirteen were copied at Tours and Fleury each, ten manuscripts can be traced back to Corbie, seven can be connected with Verona, and six manuscripts have been localized to Reichenau.¹⁶ Even after we account for the uneven survival rate of early medieval manuscripts, especially as the early medieval collection of St. Gallen survives almost intact while the book collections of other monasteries suffered many losses, the number of surviving copies of the *Etymologiae* at St. Gallen signals that it was an important locus for the reception of Isidore's encyclopaedia in the early Middle Ages.¹⁷ St. Gallen seems to have cultivated a particularly keen interest in the works of the Sevillian bishop (not limited solely to the *Etymologiae*), comparable to the interest in particular authors and genres attested in other early medieval intellectual centres such as Tours, Lorsch, or St. Amand.¹⁸

The impression that Isidore enjoyed an unprecedented popularity at early medieval St. Gallen can be corroborated by a close examination of the nineteen manuscripts mentioned above, especially the full codices of Isidore's major

¹⁶ These numbers were supplied by the database of the oldest manuscripts transmitting the *Etymologiae* that I am currently developing in the framework of the *Innovating Knowledge* project at Huygens Institute in Amsterdam. The database will be made available in the course of 2020 at: etymologiae.ms.

¹⁷ For St. Gallen as an anomaly in survival rates of early medieval manuscripts, see Eltjo Buringh, *Medieval Manuscript Production in the Latin West: Explorations with a Global Database*, Leiden 2010, 205–206. See also the comparative overview provided in David Ganz, *Book production in the Carolingian empire and the spread of Caroline minuscule*, in: *The new Cambridge medieval history 2: c. 700 – c. 900*, ed. Rosamond McKitterick, Cambridge 1995, 786–808 (here 787–788). For the loss of manuscripts in general, see Thomas Haye, *Verlorenes Mittelalter: Ursachen und Muster der Nichtüberlieferung mittellateinischer Literatur*, Leiden 2016.

¹⁸ Tours was made famous by the production of pandect Bibles, but it was also a hub of the production of hagiographic dossiers, see David Ganz, *Mass Production of Early Medieval Manuscripts: The Carolingian Bibles from Tours*, in: *The Early Medieval Bible: Its Production, Decoration and Use*, ed. Richard Gameson, Cambridge 1994, 53–62; and Ganz (see fn. 17) 799–801. Lorsch seems to have been interested in collecting histories and acquiring ancient codices; see Bernhard Bischoff, *Die Abtei Lorsch im Spiegel ihrer Handschriften*, Lorsch 1989, 71–78. St. Amand was producing liturgical manuscripts to be exported to other centres; see André Boutémy, *Le scriptorium et la bibliothèque de Saint Amand d'après les manuscrits et les anciens catalogues*, in: *Scriptorium 1* (1946), 7–16; and Jean Deshusses, *Chronologie des grands sacramentaires de Saint-Amand*, in: *Revue bénédictine* 87 (1977), 230–237.



© Verlag Herder, 2021

work. Several of these full copies of the *Etymologiae* produced in or possessed by St. Gallen in the early Middle Ages contain marginalia and additions suggesting that the engagement with Isidore's encyclopaedia went well beyond mere study. To be sure, many of the early medieval copies of the *Etymologiae* contain traces of readers' engagement. The traces left behind by early medieval users at St. Gallen, however, indicate that the text itself was subjected to a systematic scrutiny of scholars using the most sophisticated philological methods of their day. The main purpose of such an engagement seems to have been to produce a better scholarly text of the *Etymologiae*. In fact, codices reflecting this ›improvement‹ of Isidore's encyclopaedia still survive in Swiss libraries and can be used to reconstruct two redactional projects that were carried out in the scriptorium of St. Gallen in the second half of the ninth century.

The first St. Gallen redaction of the *Etymologiae*

Perhaps because it is currently housed outside of St. Gallen, the Zofingen *Etymologiae* codex has never been studied in detail, and its bearing on the intellectual life of St. Gallen has never been fully appreciated. This manuscript of 293 folia measuring 270 x 210 mm contains the entire *Etymologiae* in a single volume. Although Bischoff rejected attributing it to the St. Gallen scriptorium, as I will show below, it must have been produced there.¹⁹ In fact, it seems that the Zofingen codex was present in the library of St. Gallen continuously from the ninth until the eighteenth century, when it was transferred to Bern and then donated to the city library of Zofingen.²⁰ Perhaps because of the relative remoteness of Zofingen, it was not considered by W. M. Lindsay as a witness for his 1911 edition of the *Etymologiae*, even though other Swiss manuscripts

¹⁹ Bischoff (see fn. 12) vol. 3, 532; referring to Bernhard Bischoff, Die europäische Verbreitung der Werke Isidors von Sevilla, in: *Mittelalterliche Studien I*, Stuttgart 1966, 171–194 (here 192). In this article, Bischoff called Zofingen Pa 32 »eine in Alemannien, jedoch kaum in St. Gallen entstandene Handschrift des frühen IX. Jahrhunderts«. However, in an earlier version of the same article (see fn. 24 below), Bischoff considered this manuscript »eine wohl in St. Gallen entstandene Handschrift des frühen IX. Jahrhunderts«. Bischoff's dating of the manuscript to the beginning of the ninth century is also too early given the conclusions reached below.

²⁰ The manuscript is digitized at: <https://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/list/one/zos/pa0032>. Full description of this codex can be found in Charlotte Bretscher-Gisiger and Rudolf Gamper, *Katalog der mittelalterlichen Handschriften des Klosters Wettingen: Katalog der mittelalterlichen Handschriften in Aarau, Laufenburg, Lenzburg, Rheinfelden und Zofingen*, Dietikon-Zürich 2009, 230–232. The codex is item number 81 in Anspach's handlist; Fernández Catón (see fn. 12) 54. It also features in Beeson's handlist of manuscripts of Isidore's works; Charles H. Beeson, *Isidor-Studien*, Munich 1913, 15.

of the *Etymologiae* were included.²¹ Both Walter Porzig and Marc Reydellet included the Zofingen codex in their studies of the early transmission of Isidore's *Etymologiae*.²² They noticed that it incorporates *De natura rerum* into the *Etymologiae*, but did not draw any conclusions based on this unusual synthesis of Isidore's two scientific works.²³

Zofingen Pa 32 is much more than just a peculiar Carolingian codex containing the *Etymologiae* and the *De natura rerum* within the same book covers, which in itself would be noteworthy, given that the *Etymologiae* travelled almost exclusively alone in this period.²⁴ It is the oldest witness of an early medieval redaction of Isidore's scientific oeuvre, with the purpose of merging the *Etymologiae* and *De natura rerum*. Since the subject of natural science is not particularly developed in the *Etymologiae*, the objective of the early medieval redactors may have been to produce a larger and richer knowledge corpus that would better cover certain areas of early medieval scientific knowledge.²⁵

²¹ Wallace M. Lindsay, *Etymologiarum sive Originum libri XX*, 2 vols, Oxford 1911, xvi.

²² Walter Porzig, *Die Rezensionen der Etymologiae des Isidorus von Sevilla*. Vorbemerkung, in: *Hermes* 72.2 (1937), 129–170; and M. Reydellet, *La diffusion des Origines d'Isidore de Séville au Haut Moyen âge*, in: *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* 78.2 (1966), 383–437. The manuscript is also included in Carmen Codoñer Merino, José Carlos Martín, and Adelaida Andres, *Isidorus Hispalensis ep.*, in: *La trasmissione dei testi latini del Medioevo / Medieval Texts and Their Transmission II*, eds. Paolo Chiesa and Lucia Castaldi, Florence 2005, 274–417. Its standard siglum is Z.

²³ This inclusion was more fully appreciated in Veronika von Büren, *Isidore, Végèce et Titanus au VIIIe siècle*, in: *Hommages à Carl Deroux V. Christianisme et Moyen Âge Néolatin et survivance de la latinité*, ed. P. Defosse, Brussels 2003, 39–49. However, von Büren's hypotheses about the relationship of the Zofingen manuscript to Paris, BnF, Lat. 10616 discussed below and to the *Liber glossarum* need to be taken with a grain of salt. Perhaps the most important discussion of the Zofingen manuscript and the inclusion of the *De natura rerum* into the *Etymologiae* in this codex appears in Isidore of Seville. *On the nature of things*, trans. Calvin B. Kendall and Faith Wallis, Liverpool 2016, 60–63.

²⁴ There are two notable exceptions to this rule. Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 224 (9th century, 1/3, France) is an Isidorian corpus consisting of *Etymologiae*, *Prooemia*, *De vita vel obitu sanctorum*, *Allegoriae*, *De natura rerum*, *Differentiae*; see Bernhard Bischoff, *Die europäische Verbreitung der Werke Isidors von Sevilla*, in: *Isidoriana: colección de estudios sobre Isidoro de Sevilla*, ed. Manuel C. Díaz y Díaz, León 1961, 317–344 (here 338–339). Moreover, the *De natura rerum* was incorporated into another group of manuscripts of the *Etymologiae*, the oldest of which is Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Lat. Fol. 641 (mid-9th century, northern Italy).

²⁵ For this point, see Carmen Cardelle de Hartmann, *Wissensorganisation und Wissensvermittlung im ersten Teil von Isidors Etymologiae (Bücher I–X)*, in: *Exzerpieren – Kompilieren – Tradieren: Transformationen des Wissens zwischen Spätantike und Frühmittelalter*, eds. Stephan Dusil, Gerald Schwedler, and Raphael Schwitter, Berlin 2017, 85–104.

The intention of the early medieval redactors is particularly visible in the organization of Zofingen Pa 32. Traditionally, the *Etymologiae* was divided into twenty books, even though several of them consisted of shorter thematic sub-units that were recognized by medieval users, and perhaps also by Isidore himself, as distinct and self-sufficient.²⁶ Thus, while book I dealing with *grammatica* consisted of only one thematic block divided into twenty-five or twenty-six *capitula*, book II dealing with the two remaining disciplines of the *trivium* was in fact divided into two blocks, *retorica* (twenty-one *capitula*) and *dialectica* (ten *capitula*), and book III, which dealt with the *quadrivium*, was divided into four blocks, *arithmetica* (ten *capitula*), *geometria* (three *capitula*), *musica* (nine *capitula*), and *astronomia* (forty-nine *capitula*). The importance of the thematic blocks for the structure of the *Etymologiae* is nowhere more apparent than in book V, whose two blocks, the *De legibus* on laws and law-keeping (twenty-seven *capitula*) and the *De temporibus* on time and time-keeping (twelve *capitula*), seem to have been put together artificially and often treated as two separate entities in the Middle Ages.²⁷

In Zofingen Pa 32, too, these two thematic blocks are separated, so that book V.2 (*De temporibus*, fols. 76r–81v) precedes not only book V.1 (*De legibus*, fols. 88r–95r) but also book IV (*De medicina*, fols. 81v–87r, see Tab. 2). The reason for this re-organization of the content of the *Etymologiae* can be gleaned from the fact that the *De natura rerum*, thematically more closely attached to time and time-keeping than to medicine or law, was inserted on fols. 56r–75v, between book III (fols. 41v–56r) and the reshuffled book V.2 (fols. 76r–81v). Furthermore, while the title of the *De natura rerum* appears at the beginning of the inserted text on fol. 57r²⁸ (*Incipit liber Ysidori de rerum natura ad Syseputum regem*, Fig. 2), another title for the same work appears on fol. 50r (*Incipit excarpsum de libro rotarum sancti Ysidori episcopi*, Fig. 1), preceding the fourth section of book III (III.4: *De astronomia*, fols. 50r–56r), as if this section was part of Isidore's *De natura rerum*.²⁹ It is rather clear that

²⁶ Carmen Codoñer Merino, Transmisión y recepción de las *Etimologías*, in: Estudios de latín medieval hispánico. Actas del V Congreso Internacional de Latín Medieval Hispánico, eds. José Martínez Gázquez, Óscar de la Cruz Palma, and Cándida Ferrero Hernández, Florence 2011, 5–26; and Carmen Cardelle de Hartmann, Uso y recepción de las *Etymologiae* de Isidoro, in: *Wisigothica*. After M. C. Díaz y Díaz, ed. Carmen Codoñer and Paulo Farmhouse Alberto, Florence 2014, 477–502.

²⁷ Cardelle de Hartmann (see fn. 26) 485; and John J. Contreni, The Carolingian renaissance: education and literary culture, in: *The new Cambridge medieval history II*, Cambridge 1995, 709–757 (here 749).

²⁸ Folia 56r–56v contain the overview of the *capitula* of the *De natura rerum*.

²⁹ The name *Liber rotarum* was commonly used for the *De natura rerum* in the early Middle Ages because of its circular diagrams; Jacques Fontaine, *La diffusion de l'oeuvre*

order of thematic blocks in Zofingen Pa 32
prefatory material (fols. 1r–4r)
book I (fols. 4r–24v)
book II (fols. 25r–41v)
book III.1–3 (fols. 41v–49v)
<i>Incipit excarpsum de libro rotarum</i> (fol. 50r)
book III.4 (fols. 50r–56r)
<i>De natura rerum</i> (fols. 56r–75v)
book V.2 (fols. 76r–81v)
book IV (fols. 81v–87r)
book V.1 (fols. 88r–95r)
book VI (fols. 95v–110v)
book VII (fols. 111r–128v)
book VIII (fols. 129r–144r)
book IX (fols. 144v–161r)
book X (fols. 161r–172r)
book XI (fols. 172r–182v)
book XII (fols. 182v–200r)
book XIII (fols. 200r–210r)
book XIV (fols. 210r–223v)
book XV (fols. 224r–235v)
book XVI (fols. 236r–248r)
book XVII (fols. 248r–261v)
book XVIII (fols. 261v–269v)
book XIX (fols. 269v–282r)
book XX (fols. 282r–289v)
<i>addenda</i> (fols. 290r–292r)

Tab. 2. Order of books in Zofingen Pa 32

re d'Isidore de Séville dans les scriptoria helvétiques du haut Moyen Âge, in: Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Geschichte 12 (1962), 305–322 (here 310 and 325).

whoever prepared this redaction wished to bring together different Isidorian accounts of heavenly and earthly phenomena, and by emphasizing their association to time and time-keeping hoped to create a bridge between one account and another.

The inclusion of the *De natura rerum* in the *Etymologiae* is the most recognizable trait of an early medieval redaction of Isidore's encyclopaedia, of which Zofingen Pa 32 is the oldest witness. However, this redaction is also characterized by other innovations in the text and the structure of the work.³⁰ For example, the *capitula* of book I appear in the Zofingen codex in an eccentric order found in no other eighth- or ninth-century manuscripts of the *Etymologiae*. Chapter 4 (*De litteris latinis*) is placed between chapters 14 (*De interiectione*) and 16 (*De syllaba*), replacing the missing chapter 15 (*De litteris apud grammaticos/De voce et littera*), whose title is found in the overview of *capitula* of book I in all early medieval manuscripts, but whose text is absent from them.³¹ While this arrangement of chapters is found in some early medieval manuscripts, especially in compendia in which the first book of the *Etymologiae* is transmitted separately as an *ars grammatica*,³² the absence of

³⁰ The order of the chapters of the *De natura rerum* in the Zofingen manuscript is also non-standard. The *praefatio* and the first fourteen chapters (on time and the world, fols. 56r–63v) are followed by chapters 22–28 (on stars, fols. 63v–66v), 48 (*De partibus terrae* not found in all text-versions of the *De natura rerum*, fol. 66v), additions (fols. 66v–67r), chapters 29–47 (on atmospheric and natural phenomena, fols. 67r–72v), and 15–21 (on the Sun and Moon, fols. 72v–75v). Moreover, the overview of the *capitula* of the *De natura rerum* on fols. 56r–56v contains two chapters entitled *De recapitulatione superscripturarum* (as *capitulum* VIII preceding chapter 8 and as *capitulum* LVIII at the very end of *De natura rerum*). Only one of these two *recapitulationes* appears in the body of the text. On fol. 60v, chapter 8 is preceded by a passage with a rubricated title *Item recapitulatio superscripturarum*, which, however, is not a separate chapter, but rather a part of chapter 7, here separated from the rest of this chapter by the rubric. There is no similar rubric at the end of the *De natura rerum* on fol. 75v, nor any section that could be considered a *recapitulatio*. This discrepancy between the overview of the *capitula* and the main body of the *De natura rerum* perhaps indicates that the plan had been initially to reorder chapters slightly differently, so that ch. 1–7 (covering time) would appear at the end of the *De natura rerum*. This would make sense as far as the adjoining book of the *Etymologiae* deals likewise with the reckoning of time. See also Kendall and Wallis (see fn. 23) 62–63 and 275–277.

³¹ On the problem of chapter 15 of book I of the *Etymologiae* and how it perhaps goes back to a draft version of the first book, see Porzig (see fn. 22) 168–169; Reydellet (see fn. 22) 420; and more recently Olga Spevak, *Les additions dans Isid. Etym. I: témoins d'un travail rédactionnel*, in: *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 75 (2017), 59–88 (here 37–40).

³² On the separate transmission of the first book in grammatical context, see Beeson (see fn. 20) 83; Louis Holtz, *Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical: étude sur l'Ars Donati et sa diffusion (IVe – IXe siècle) et éd. crit.*, Paris 1981, 260; and Martin

chapters 18 (*De accentibus*), 19 (*De figuris accentuum*), a greater part of chapter 20 (*De posituris*), and chapters 22 (*De notis vulgaribus*), 24 (*De notis militaribus*), and 30 (*De glossis*) from their usual sequence in book I is particular to this redaction. All of these chapters appear inserted between chapters 33 (*De soloecismis*) and 34 (*De vitiis*) on fols. 15r–17r, as does a second chapter 21 (*De notis sententiarum*), substituting or supplementing an abbreviated version of the same chapter in its proper place on fol. 12r (see Tab. 3).³³ This transposition of chapters is unique among early medieval manuscripts containing the first book of the *Etymologiae*, be it those containing only this book or those that transmit the entire encyclopaedia.

The eccentric order of book I in Zofingen Pa 32 is not the result of a deliberate design, as was the case with the inclusion of the *De natura rerum*. For the greater part, it is due to a physical manipulation of the codex, arising from the interaction between the two scribes responsible for copying most of the first book who can be easily recognized today on the basis of both their distinct ductus and the colour of the ink they used. The first scribe (h1), who used lighter ink, was responsible for most of the current first four folia of the manuscript and fols. 6r–8r, 9r–10v, and 12r–14v. A second scribe (h2) using darker ink copied what are now fols. 5, 10v–11v, and 15r–23v. However, as is revealed by the remnants of cut-out leaves between current fols. 5 and 6 and 8 and 9, the insertion of new sheets (fol. 11), and many other traces of physical intervention (e. g. crossing out of *Etym.* 1.3.1–6 on fol. 9r, and a major erasure on fol. 10v), the order of these folia had at one time been different (see Figs. 3 and 4).

The original make-up of book I can be reconstructed from the clues left behind by h1 and h2. In the beginning, the first book had been entrusted entirely to h1, who had copied its text from a highly non-standard exemplar missing or abbreviating some of the chapters. This scribe was able to fit his copying stint on a quire consisting of ten leaves (current folia I + 1–4, 9–10 and 12–14), as his exemplar contained only the prefatory material to the *Etymologiae*, the first four chapters of book I dealing with the liberal arts and letters followed by chapter 16 (*De syllabis*) and abbreviated versions of chapters 17, 18, 20

Irvine, *The Making of Textual Culture: ›Grammatica‹ and Literary Theory 350–1100*, Cambridge 1994, 209–212. The arrangement, in which chapter 4 precedes chapter 16 appears in Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 207 (9th century, Fleury) and Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Voss. Lat. Q 86 (mid-9th century, France, perhaps Fleury, prov.: Fleury). It is also the order of chapters in a sister-manuscript of the Zofingen codex, St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 237 (the 830s, St. Gallen), which is the only other known ninth-century codex of the entire *Etymologiae* displaying this arrangement.

³³ This unusual order of chapters is noted in Porzig (see fn. 22) 169–170.

and 21, and full chapters 23, 25–29, and 31–33. Perhaps because the scribe realized that many of the chapters of the first book were missing or incomplete, the book had to be redone: six more leaves were inserted in the middle of the original quire to provide room for the copying of additional chapters. Both h1 and h2 worked on this new quire: h2 copied the content of the current fol. 5, while h1 copied the text on the remaining folia (current fols. 6–8). It also seems that the two scribes overestimated the amount of parchment that the copying of the missing chapters would take. They cut out two leaves from the newly added quire because they were not needed. What remained to be done was to harmonize the manuscript by crossing out a part of chapter 3 that showed that fol. 4v once adjoined fol. 9r (Fig. 3). The abbreviated chapters 17, 18 and 20 copied originally by h1 were erased on fol. 10v and chapter 17 was copied here by h2 (Fig. 4), so that the same hand could then fluently copy the rest of this chapter on the newly inserted leaf (current fol. 11). A quire of eight leaves copied entirely by h2 was then added after fol. 14 to supply the chapters still missing and to complete the first book (current fols. 15–22). The last five chapters were copied on two loose leaves added to the two quires (current fols. 23–24) partially by h2 and partially by a third hand (see Tab. 3).

The fact that the eccentric order of the chapters of the first book of the *Etymologiae* in Zofingen Pa 32 is not the result of copying from an exemplar that already followed this particular order of chapters, but rather the handiwork of two scribes who attempted to resolve practical problems arising in the scriptorium at the time of production, provides a crucial clue for the creation of the redaction of the *Etymologiae* that incorporates the *De natura rerum*. The Zofingen manuscript is clearly not merely the oldest witness but also the prototype of the redaction or, to be more precise, it is the working copy that preserves layers of decision-making that stem from the interaction of the redactors. Indeed, taken as a whole, the Zofingen manuscript, despite the high quality of diagrams both in the *Etymologiae* and *De natura rerum*, does not strike one as a deluxe copy of Isidore's encyclopaedia, such as were produced in scriptoria elsewhere.³⁴ Zofingen Pa 32 does not stand out because of its decoration, the quality of parchment, or the calligraphic skill of its copyists, but because of the amount of work that went into its production and into the

³⁴ Several of the surviving Visigothic manuscripts of the *Etymologiae* seem to be such deluxe copies, for example Madrid, Real Academia de la Historia, MS 25 (c. 946, San Millán de la Cogolla), Madrid, Real Academia de la Historia, MS 76 (c. 954, San Pedro de Cardena), and Paris, BnF, n.a.l. 2169 (c. 1072, Santo Domingo de Silos). Manuscript Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, II 4856 (end of the 8th century, Corbie) copied in AB-script may be also considered a deluxe copy of Isidore's encyclopaedia.

chapters in Lindsay's critical edition	folia and hands	chapters in Zofingen Pa 32	
De disciplina et arte (1)	4	De disciplina et arte (1)	
De septem liberalibus disciplinis (2)		De septem liberalibus disciplinis (2)	
De litteris communibus (3)		De litteris communibus (3.1–6)	
De litteris latinis (4)	5 added later	3.6–11	
De grammatica (5)		–	
De partibus orationis (6)		De grammatica (5)	
De partibus orationis (6)	6–8 added later	De partibus orationis (6.1–2)	
De nomine (7)		6.2	
De pronomine (8)		De nomine (7)	
De verbo (9)		De pronomine (8)	
De adverbio (10)		De verbo (9)	
De participio (11)		De adverbio (10)	
De coniunctione (12)		De participio (11)	
De praepositione (13)		De coniunctione (12)	
De interiectione (14)		De praepositione (13)	
De interiectione (14)		De interiectione (14, <i>fol. 8v blank</i>)	
*De litteris apud grammaticos (15)		9–10	De litteris communibus (3.6–11, <i>crossed out</i>)
De syllaba (16)			De litteris latinis (4, <i>acting as chapter 15</i>)
De pedibus (17)			De syllaba (16)
De pedibus (17)			De pedibus (17.1–4, <i>abbreviated 18 and beginning of 20 erased and replaced by 17.4–9 copied by h2</i>)
De accentibus (18)	11	17.10–30	
De figuris accentum (19)		–	
De posituris (20)	12–14	–	
De notis sententiarum (21)		De posituris (20.1, <i>abbreviated</i>)	
De notis vulgaribus (22)		De notis sententiarum (21, <i>abbreviated</i>)	
De notis iuridicis (23)		–	
De notis militaribus (24)		De notis iuridicis (23)	
De notis litterarum (25)		–	
De notis litterarum (25)		De notis litterarum (25)	

chapters in Lindsay's critical edition	folia and hands	chapters in Zofingen Pa 32
De notis digitorum (26)		De notis digitorum (26)
De orthografia (27)		De orthografia (27)
De analogia (28)		De analogia (28)
De aethimologia (29)		De aethimologia (29)
De glosis (30)		–
De differentiis (31)		De differentiis (31)
De barbarismis (32)		De barbarismis (32)
De soloecismis (33)		De soloecismis (33)
	15–22	De voce (<i>from Donatus, often substituted for chapter 15</i>)
		De accentibus (18)
		De figuris accentum (19)
		De posituris (20)
		De notis sententiarum (21)
		De notis vulgaribus (22)
		De notis militaribus (24)
		De glosis (30)
De vitiis (1.34)		De vitiis (34)
De metaplasmis (1.35)		De metaplasmis (35)
De scematibus (1.36)		De scematibus (36)
De tropis (1.37)		De tropis (37)
De prosa (1.38)	–	
De metris (1.39)	De metris (39)	
De fabula (1.40)	23	De fabula (40)
		De prosa (38)
De historia (41)		De vocabulo historiae (41)
De primis auctoribus historiarum (42)		De primis auctoribus historiarum (42)
De utilitate historiae (43)	24	De utilitate historiae (43)
De generibus historiae (44)		De generibus historiae (44, <i>fol. 24v empty</i>)

Tab. 3. Structure of the first book of the *Etymologiae* in Zofingen Pa 32 (white: h1, light grey: h2, dark grey: h3)

continuous tinkering with its content and structure, perhaps for several years or decades after the original sheets or quires were copied.³⁵

How the decision-making was made can be gleaned from the final form of book I, which presupposes the use of two different exemplars for its production. The first of these was the book used by h1 to produce the original ten-leaf quire containing the first book. This could not have been a manuscript of the entire *Etymologiae* since the first book is always present in such manuscripts in its entirety. We know, however, that when transmitted separately as a grammatical handbook, as often happened in the Carolingian environment, the first book of the *Etymologiae* was commonly transmitted in an abbreviated form with chapters omitted or shortened.³⁶ The exemplar used by h1 was almost certainly such a manuscript, either a grammatical compendium containing the first book of the *Etymologiae* or a booklet consisting of only the first book. The second exemplar was a book used together by h1 and h2 to add what was missing in the first exemplar, most likely a manuscript of the full *Etymologiae*.

Herein lies a paradox: If the scriptorium of St. Gallen possessed a complete manuscript of the *Etymologiae* with a complete and satisfactory version of book I (the second posited exemplar), why did the copyist decide to use a grammatical handbook or a booklet containing an incomplete copy of book I (the first posited exemplar) as the basis for the production of the redaction? This could not be a matter of lacking access to suitable manuscripts, as is indicated not only by the existence of the second exemplar but above all by the wealth of manuscripts of the *Etymologiae* present at St. Gallen mentioned above. Zofingen Pa 32 could not have come into existence before the mid-ninth century, at which time, at least three St. Gallen copies of Isidore's encyclopaedia had been produced: St. Gallen 233 (8th/9th century, books VI–VIII and XII–XV), St. Gallen 235 (8th/9th century, books XII–XX) and most importantly St. Gallen 237 (the 830s), which contained all twenty books of the work.³⁷ As is explained below, by the time the Zofingen manuscript was cop-

³⁵ It can be further added that with its page dimensions (270 x 210 mm), it is the smallest single-volume copy of the *Etymologiae* produced in the Carolingian period. The size of the Zofingen codex strikes one as a part of its innovative character, see Evina Steinová, 'The materiality of innovation: formats and dimensions of the *Etymologiae* of Isidore of Seville in the early Middle Ages', in: *Entangled Manuscripts*, eds. Anna Dorofeeva and Michael Kelly (forthcoming).

³⁶ I am currently preparing an article on the subject of the separate transmission of the first book of the *Etymologiae* as a grammatical handbook in the Carolingian period.

³⁷ Bischoff dated St. Gallen 237 to the first half of the ninth century on palaeographical grounds; Bischoff (see fn. 12) 316. While Bischoff was not certain about the St. Gallen origin of the manuscript and Schmuki has tentatively rejected it in his online description of the manuscript (<https://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/list/one/csg/0237/>), Anton

ied, there were at least a few more codices containing the full book I present at St. Gallen.

Thus, the decision to prefer a grammatical handbook over a full codex of the *Etymologiae* must have been dictated by other concerns. Perhaps, the book that served as h1's exemplar was judged more valuable or more important than other manuscripts of the *Etymologiae* because of its age, its significance, or its association with an important owner. Such concerns seem to have played a role in choosing the exemplar from which the *De natura rerum* was copied into Zofingen Pa 32. As Jacques Fontaine showed, this exemplar was Paris, BnF, Lat. 10616, a manuscript produced in the late eighth or the early ninth century for bishop Egino of Verona either in Verona or by a Veronese scribe who followed Egino into exile at Reichenau.³⁸ This manuscript was certainly present at Reichenau from early on and later found its way to St. Gallen, which was tied to Reichenau by many personal friendships and book exchanges.³⁹

The telling clue that Paris Lat. 10616 was the source for the text of the *De natura rerum* in the Zofingen codex is the additional material attached to the end of the *De natura rerum* in Paris Lat. 10616 found on fols. 90v–93v: an excerpt from Vegetius's *Epitome rei militari*, a T-O map, and an excerpt *De trinitate* from book VII of the *Etymologiae*. The same texts also follow the last chapter of the *De natura rerum* in Zofingen Pa 32 on fols. 66v–67r. However, the Zofingen codex includes two editorial notes that point to the draft character of this manuscript. First, the T-O map is missing, and, instead, a rubric reading *require dehinc superius formam totius mundi* is present where the map would otherwise have been inserted. Second, the following excerpt *De trinitate* was obelized in the margin to indicate that it was an error and the marginal note [C]apitulum in suo ordine [inve]nies [in li]bro .VII. was added by a corrector (Fig. 5).

Similar editorial interventions correcting or guiding the copyists can be found throughout the entire body of Zofingen Pa 32. On fol. 12r, for exam-

von Euw rather confidently assigns its production to the later years of abbot Gozbert (816–837) and identifies it with the entry *Libros ethimologiarum Isidori in volumine I* in the oldest library catalogue of St. Gallen; Euw (see fn. 1) 176.

³⁸ See Fontaine (see fn. 29) 316 and 324. Paris Lat. 10616 is described in CLA V 601 and Bischoff (see fn. 12) vol. 3, 165.

³⁹ On the relationships between the two Bodensee monastic communities, see Berschin (see fn. 1). The fact that Paris Lat. 10616 was used for the production of the Zofingen codex indicates beyond doubt that this manuscript was at St. Gallen in the ninth century, itself an indication of book exchange between St. Gallen and Reichenau. Another book from Egino's circle produced either in Verona or by Veronese scribes at Reichenau, St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 110, likewise ended up in the library of St. Gallen where it is still kept.

ple, an abbreviated version of chapter *De notis sententiarum* (*Etym.* 1.21) was also obelized and equipped with a contemporary marginal note *hoc capitulum in sequentibus plenius invenies* pointing to the presence of a full version of the same chapter on fols. 16r–16v (Fig. 6). On fols. 245r–245v, the chapter *De aere* (*Etym.* 16.20) was likewise obelized, and a contemporary corrector added a marginal note *hoc capitulum p[le]nius habetur in [fine] voluminis ad [li]teram B* (Fig. 7). Indeed, fols. 290r–292r contain a list of *errata* that could not be corrected directly in the body of the manuscript (including the chapter *De aere* that should be replaced on fols. 245r–245v), perhaps also for the benefit of those who wished to make copies from the prototype (Fig. 8).

Apart from these major changes to the text itself, many contemporary additions were also inserted into the margins, suggesting that the whole volume may have been checked against other manuscripts of the *Etymologiae* and that this may have been done on more than one occasion. Long additions are particularly plentiful in the last five books of the *Etymologiae* (fols. 236r–289v), which seem to have been copied from an exemplar with many gaps or containing a short text-version of the *Etymologiae* (such as a member of family β , which was diffused from northern Italy in the eighth century).⁴⁰ It might be fruitful to analyze both the base text of these books and the layers of their addition in order to examine further the working method of the redactors and the kind of manuscripts they used for their enterprise.

Minute traces of editorial work present in the Zofingen manuscript include single *obeli* that were added to multiple lines indicating textual problems and *require* sigla indicating where further checking was necessary. How these signs worked in the context of the editorial activity of redactors can be gleaned from fol. 10v. Here, an erased *require* is visible next to a larger erasure of text copied originally by h1 and overwritten by h2. The placement of the sign and the colour of ink suggest that h1 first copied the original text (an abbreviated version of chapters 18 and 20 of book I), but then realized that something was wrong with the text and marked the spot for future inquiry. Later, h2 erased the problematic passage and replaced it with the correct text, also removing the *require* to indicate that the problem had been resolved (see Fig. 4). These editorial signs were first placed and then erased, once a textual question had

⁴⁰ On this family, see principally Wallace M. Lindsay, *The editing of Isidore Etymologiae*, in: *The Classical Quarterly* 5 (1911), 42–53 (here 46–47); and Reydellet (see fn. 22) 403–404. Family β of the *Etymologiae* is well attested at St. Gallen from the beginning of the ninth century and appears in the three oldest complete manuscripts of the *Etymologiae* from the abbey's scriptorium, St. Gallen 233, 235, and 237; see Bischoff (see fn. 24) 340; and Reydellet (see fn. 22) 397.

been resolved also elsewhere, e. g., on fols. 142r and 143r.⁴¹ While, thus, the first impulse for the production of this redaction may have been the desire to enrich Isidore's encyclopaedia with the text of the *De natura rerum*, this enterprise seems not to have stopped there, as the working copy ultimately attracted many additions and corrections. In fact, the editorial work may have continued for a long period of time, leading to the organic growth of the Zofingen codex.

This St. Gallen redaction, it should be clear, has no single author or compiler. The main body of the text alone was copied by more than twenty different scribes using a minuscule characteristic of the St. Gallen scriptorium in the second half of the ninth century, during the abbacies of Grimald (841–872) and Hartmut (872–883).⁴² Additional hands can be recognized among the correctors and annotators, raising the number of those who seem to have been involved even further. The large number of hands that were involved in the copying, correcting, and additional tinkering with the manuscript suggests that the project was above all a collective undertaking, the work of an entire scriptorium or its substantial part.

Most of the hands that appear in Zofingen Pa 32 did not copy more than a quire or two. There are nevertheless three hands that seem to be more significant and may be identified as the hands of main scribes or managers behind this redactional project. We have already met two of these hands earlier as h1 and h2 who cooperated on the copying of book I. Scribe h1, recognizable because of his use of a spiky open cc, *e caudata* with a hanging eye, and a *pro* abbreviation with a long wiggly tail, returns at a place of a significant break on fol. 50r, where the first title of the *De natura rerum* occurs. He copied the beginning of book III.4 up to the quire break on fol. 52v when another scribe replaced him, but then returned to copy quires 20 and 21 (fols. 160r–175v) containing the end of book IX, book X, and the beginning of book XI. H1 appears for the last time on fols. 186v–187r to copy a short and otherwise unremarkable part of book XII. Scribe h2, recognizable due to his heavy minuscule, wedge-shaped stems of s and f, pronouncedly clubbed ascenders and the formation of letter x with a pronounced ›tail‹ descending below the line on the left, also recurs several times throughout the manuscript on fols. 73v–74r, l. 9; 226r–234r, l. 9;

⁴¹ The margins of Zofingen Pa 32 also contain variant readings that can be distinguished from other marginalia because of the introductory *al* standing in all likelihood for *alibi*, transposition signs indicating when word order should be altered, and critical signs that mark certain words and passages as dubious. They do not belong to the layers of scribal activity related to this redaction, but rather provide evidence for the existence of another redaction, which is discussed below.

⁴² Bruckner (see fn. 1) vol. 3, 39–40.

and 261v–266v. Given the prominent role that these two scribes played in the assembly of book I as well as the amount of text that they both copied, it is plausible to assume that they may have been the chief scribes, although they may not have been the main decision-makers or planners of the project.

The pride of place belongs to a hand that appears throughout the entire manuscript, although it never copies passages of significant length. It is the very first hand in Zofingen Pa 32, copying the first six lines on fol. 1r in a Carolingian minuscule, which seems to be somewhat ›purer‹ than the minuscule of the other scribes. This hand copied the first four or five lines of many of the quires: on fol. 53r (opening of quire 8, Fig. 9), 71r (quire 10), 88r (quire 12), 113r (quire 14), 176r (quire 22), 192r (quire 24), 210r (quire 26), 226r (quire 28), 242r (quire 30), and 267r (quire 33). This hand presumably belongs to the master scribe who supervised the production of the redaction of the *Etymologiae* carried out in the Zofingen codex or perhaps even to one of the masterminds behind this project. Indeed, Notker Balbulus similarly copied the first lines and opening pages of manuscripts that were produced during his time as a librarian in the 880s and 890s.⁴³ Our master scribe was not Notker, but the similarity in the working method suggests that he may have been one of Notker's predecessors in the office of librarian or another senior figure in the scriptorium, and thus an individual whose name we most likely know, although we cannot associate it with his hand.⁴⁴

While, thus, none of the many scribes involved in the copying, correction, and annotation of the Zofingen manuscript can be identified by name, and while none of the hands resemble the hands of well-known scribes and scholars as they have been identified by modern scholarship, this does not mean that nothing can be said about the ›who, when, and why‹ of the production of this first St. Gallen redaction of the *Etymologiae*. The very fact that many scribes were involved, that they seem to have been carefully coordinated, and that the project required planning and perhaps depended on procurement of manuscripts (such as Paris Lat. 10616 and presumably several other codices containing the *Etymologiae*) suggest that it was no side project. For the same reason, it is likely that the senior personnel of the scriptorium, such as the *librarius*,

⁴³ Rankin (see fn. 7). It was common for master scribes to copy the first lines of new quires or new codices; see Ganz (see fn. 17) 790–791. Other examples from the same period include the scribe Waltheri from Freising active in the third quarter of the ninth century; Bernhard Bischoff, *Die südostdeutschen Schreibschulen und Bibliotheken in der Karolingerzeit*, vol. 1, Wiesbaden 1974, 69.

⁴⁴ Besides Notker, we know by name two other librarians of St. Gallen: Uto, who is attested as a *bibliothecarius* in the early 860s and died around 869, and Liuthart, who was a librarian in the 870s; see Euw (see fn. 1) 142.

would have been involved or at least aware of the project. We might assume that the same applies to Hartmut, who, as we know from the *Casus sancti Galli*, was deeply involved in the activities of the scriptorium both as a deputy of Grimald in the 840s–860s and as the abbot in the 870s and early 880s.⁴⁵ Indeed, the production of the redaction may have been the brainchild of Hartmut, who was the patron of several major projects including the copying of two sets of Bibles (the small Hartmut-Bible and the large Hartmut-Bible) and a production of the complete series of Augustine's *Ennarationes in Psalmos*.⁴⁶

Here, the early medieval library catalogues of St. Gallen serve as a great help. Since the script of the Zofingen manuscript suggests that it was copied in the second half of the ninth century, we can expect to find it in one of the ninth-century catalogues and thus to date its production rather precisely. Lehmann believed that the Zofingen codex might be identical with the item *Aethimologiarum librum XX et ratio horologii et glosa grecorum verborum in volumine I* from the oldest library catalogue that records the library's holdings around the mid-century before it was expanded under Grimald and Hartmut.⁴⁷ However, this description would better suit St. Gallen 237, a manuscript in one volume produced in the first half of the ninth century that contains a glossary of Greek grammatical terms on p. 326. Zofingen Pa 32, which could not be copied in the first half of the ninth century based on palaeographic grounds, should rather be identified with *Libros ethimologiarum Isidori in volumine I* mentioned in the catalogue of books produced during Grimald's abbacy in the third quarter of the ninth century (Fig. 10), that is, at the time when Hartmut supervised the St. Gallen scriptorium.⁴⁸ The energetic *praepositus* and later abbot may indeed have been involved, even if only as a patron or the main decision-maker.

We are very fortunate that a manuscript such as the Zofingen codex survives, for it furnishes an important piece of evidence that Carolingian scholars

⁴⁵ Ratpert writes explicitly that Hartmut was responsible for the copying of books both under Grimald and during his own abbacy, and that he had manuscripts copied both for communal and personal use: *Alios quoque libros proprii causa videlicet usus iocunda patravit scriptura*; MGH SS *Reichs-Geschichte* Germ. 75, p. 226. Berger wished to read this last statement to mean that Hartmut copied manuscripts with his own hand (Berger (see fn. 11) 125), but it should be understood to mean simply that he had them copied.

⁴⁶ Kaczynski (see fn. 2) 21–22; Kaczynski (see fn. 10); and Euw (see fn. 1) 95–97.

⁴⁷ Lehmann (see fn. 4) 75.

⁴⁸ See St. Gallen 267, p. 27 as well as the *Casus Sancti Galli*, MGH SS *Reichs-Geschichte* Germ. 75, p. 210. Ratpert is explicit that manuscripts produced at St. Gallen during the abbacy of Grimald were copied under Hartmut's supervision. *Librorum etiam non parvam copiam sub eodem abbate Hartmotus composuit*; MGH SS *Reichs-Geschichte* Germ. 75, p. 204. The title of the library catalogue in St. Gallen 267, p. 25, mentions Hartmut as an assistant: *Hos libros patravit Grimoldus abba in monasterio sancti Galli in diebus Hludouui regis Germaniae cum adiutorio Hartmoti praepositi sui per annos XXX et unum*.

redacted the *Etymologiae* and that one locus of this early medieval editorial activity was St. Gallen. That redactions of the *Etymologiae* were produced in the early Middle Ages can be gleaned from the textual evidence which attests time and again to hybridization of the textually distinct regional families of Isidore's encyclopaedia and to willful changes to the text and its structure that can only be the work of intelligent redactors.⁴⁹ We have plenty of evidence indicating that early medieval users of the *Etymologiae* compared their manuscripts to other manuscripts to ›improve‹ Isidore's text, that they produced their copies from multiple copies or copies that contained additions and corrections inserted in the margins, and that they interpolated the text with material from other sources.⁵⁰ However, such editorial efforts were relatively small-scale and localized, having a limited impact on the textual tradition of the *Etymologiae*. The Zofingen manuscript indicates that by the Carolingian period, more ambitious redactional enterprises were underway, aiming not only to benefit particular communities of readers by emending copies of the *Etymologiae* but producing a new scholarly redaction that may have been intended for dissemination.⁵¹

It is somewhat surprising that the effort that seems to have gone into the production of and tinkering with Zofingen Pa 32 did not culminate in the production of a clean copy of the redaction in the Carolingian period. We could, naturally, postulate that there once was such a copy, but it did not withstand the vagaries of time, that the masterminds behind the entire enterprise never intended to produce a clean copy, or perhaps that a clean copy had been planned but was never produced because of a change of plans. There is one intriguing piece of evidence suggesting that the last scenario may be the most correct and the redaction of the *Etymologiae* so meticulously carried out in the Zofingen codex may have been either discontinued or side-lined. At around the same time or slightly after the Zofingen codex was copied, the scriptorium of St. Gallen began to work on a second redaction of the *Etymologiae*, which may have been intended to supersede the first redaction.

⁴⁹ Reydellet (see fn. 22) 388 and 433; and Cardelle de Hartmann (see fn. 25) 90.

⁵⁰ Porzig (see fn. 22) 133–135; and Codoñer Merino (see fn. 27) 11–14.

⁵¹ This can be said about the fourth major textual family of the *Etymologiae*, the family ξ identified by Porzig and Reydellet (see below). This family seems to be of Carolingian origin and became widespread in the later Middle Ages. Veronika von Büren's thesis that Theodulf of Orléans redacted the *Etymologiae* at the end of the eighth century and that he is responsible for the division of the *Etymologiae* into twenty books, rather than this being the ancient division imposed on Isidore's encyclopaedia by Braulio of Zaragoza, should not be taken too seriously; Veronika von Büren, La place du manuscrit Ambr. L 99 sup. dans la transmission des Étymologies d'Isidore de Séville, in: Nuove ricerche su codici in scrittura latina dell'Ambrosiana, eds. Mirella Ferrari and Marco Navoni, Milan 2007, 25–44.

The second St. Gallen redaction of the *Etymologiae*

We need not look far for traces of this second St. Gallen redaction of the *Etymologiae*. It may seem surprising that among the many layers of scribal activity in the Zofingen codex are mixed traces of a redactional effort that do not belong to the first redaction. They stand out only once the Zofingen manuscript is compared with several other early medieval manuscripts of the *Etymologiae* which contain identical traces of scribal activity: transposition signs, variant readings in the margins introduced by *al.* (for *alibi*), and critical signs entered in the main text block in order to indicate uncertain or problematic readings. While transposition signs and variant readings can occasionally be found in the margins of early medieval manuscripts, including those of the *Etymologiae*, critical signs are exceptionally rare in this period.⁵² To my knowledge, there are no other manuscripts of the *Etymologiae* equipped with them apart from the Zofingen codex and the following five manuscripts:⁵³

Schaffhausen, Stadtbibliothek, MS Min. 42 (books I–X): copied in Mainz in the second quarter of the ninth century.⁵⁴ Bischoff notes that this manuscript contains additions made by hands from the Bodensee area in the second half of the ninth century, indicating that at the time, Schaffhausen Min. 42 was no longer in Mainz.⁵⁵ Bischoff's additions in question must be the variant readings, transposition signs, and critical signs discussed below, as there are few other ninth-century marginalia in the Schaffhausen codex. The codex was present in the Allerheiligen Abbey in Schaffhausen founded in 1049 by the fifteenth century at the latest.

St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 236 (books XI–XX): copied in the second half of the ninth century at St. Gallen.⁵⁶ St. Gallen 236 contains the second half

⁵² The few known examples of critical signs used for textual criticism in the early Middle Ages are mentioned in Evina Steinová, *Notam superponere studui: The Use of Technical Signs in the Early Middle Ages*, Turnhout 2019, 114–117.

⁵³ I was able to examine most of the 84 fully preserved pre-1000 manuscripts and 24 pre-1000 fragments of the entire *Etymologiae* before the completion of this study.

⁵⁴ This manuscript is not digitized. It is described in Rudolf Gamper, Gaby Knoch-Mund, and Marlis Stähli, *Katalog der mittelalterlichen Handschriften der Ministerialbibliothek Schaffhausen*, Dietikon-Zürich 1994, 134–135. The codex was assigned number 328 in Anspach's handlist in which it was dated to the end of the eleventh century and the siglum S in the overview of the most important manuscripts of the *Etymologiae*; Fernández Catón (see fn. 12) 122–123; and Codoñer Merino, Martin, and Andres (see fn. 22) 275. It is also discussed in Beeson (see fn. 20) 14–15.

⁵⁵ Bischoff (see fn. 12) vol. 3, 345.

⁵⁶ This manuscript is digitized at: <https://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/de/list/one/csg/0236>. Bischoff dated it more precisely in the mid-ninth century or the third quarter of the ninth

of the *Etymologiae* and may have been produced specifically to complement Schaffhausen Min. 42. The variant readings inserted into this codex are roughly contemporary with it.

St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MSS 231–232 (books I–XX): a two-volume full set of the *Etymologiae* produced at St. Gallen in the 880s.⁵⁷ This double volume has been identified with the item *Ethimologiarum Isidori volumina II* from the 883 catalogue of the books from the private library of Grimald's successor Hartmut (872–883).⁵⁸ Some scholars think that this manuscript may have been produced during the librarianship of Notker Balbulus and that a cryptographic notice on the front pastedown of St. Gallen 232 refers to Notker.⁵⁹ Variant readings in this codex seem to have been entered both by the main hands and other, slightly younger hands.

Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 167 (books I–XX): a tenth-century copy of Zofingen Pa 32 produced at Einsiedeln.⁶⁰ It contains only two passages marked by *obel/metobeli* and only a handful of passages equipped with variant readings.⁶¹ Both the critical signs and the variant readings were cop-

century, suggesting, therefore, that it was copied during the abbacy of Grimald; Bischoff (see fn. 12) vol. 3, 316. It is Anspach's item number 192; Fernández Catón (see fn. 12) 89.

⁵⁷ These manuscripts are digitized at: <https://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/list/one/csg/0231> (231) and <https://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/list/one/csg/0232> (232). Their most recent description can be found in Euw (see fn. 1) 444–446. They were assigned number 54 in Anspach's handlist and the modern siglum G in standard literature; Fernández Catón (see fn. 12) 48; and Codoñer Merino, Martin, and Andres (see fn. 22) 275. See also Beeson (see fn. 20) 13–14.

⁵⁸ Bruckner (see fn. 1) vol. 3, 42. See also editor's comment on the *Casus sancti Galli*; MGH SS *Reer. Germ.* 75, p. 228.

⁵⁹ Euw (see fn. 1) 176.

⁶⁰ This manuscript is not digitized. There is still not a more recent published standard description than the one found in Gabriel Meier, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum qui in Bibliotheca monasterii Einsidensis OSB servantur*, Wiesbaden 1899, 133–134. The manuscript was assigned number 113 in Anspach's handlist and is known under the siglum z; Fernández Catón (see fn. 12) 62; and Codoñer Merino, Martin, and Andres (see fn. 22) 275. It is also discussed in Anton von Euw, *Die Einsiedler Buchmalerei zur Zeit des Abtes Gregor (964–996)*, in: *Festschrift zum tausendsten Todestag des seligen Abtes Gregor*, ed. Odo Lang, Sankt Ottilien 1996, 183–241. See also Beeson (see fn. 20) 13.

⁶¹ The passages marked with critical signs appear on pp. 139 (*Etym.* 6.7.2) and 306 (*Etym.* 16.1.6). The variant readings appear on pp. 50 (*Etym.* 2.21.4), 52 (*Etym.* 2.21.31), 137 (*Etym.* 6.2.31), 141 (*Etym.* 6.11.3), 155 (*Etym.* 7.1.39), 227 (*Etym.* 10.266), 231 (*Etym.* 11.1.71), 241 (*Etym.* 11.3.28), 250 (*Etym.* 12.4.1), 251 (*Etym.* 12.4.32), 258 (*Etym.* 12.7.10), 259 (*Etym.* 12.7.27), 287 (*Etym.* 14.6.19), 300 (*Etym.* 15.4.2), 305 (*Etym.* 15.15.6), and many more.

ied by the main hand. As the same variant readings and critical signs can be found in Zofingen Pa 32, the traces of the second St. Gallen redaction in this manuscript are certainly a result of copying from its exemplar and not an indication that this manuscript was collated against the others. Einsiedeln 167 is thus an outlier, as is also evident from the fact that it was copied about a century after the other manuscripts and not in St. Gallen.

The presence of the critical signs in these manuscripts is extremely significant for two reasons. First, the critical signs (and the variant readings and transposition signs) tie the five ninth-century manuscripts together, suggesting that they were at a certain point at the same location and annotated by the same group of users. Since four of the five manuscripts (St. Gallen 236, St. Gallen 231, St. Gallen 232, and as we have seen Zofingen Pa 32) were produced at St. Gallen and kept there during the entire Middle Ages, it is rather clear that the location of this unusual activity must have been St. Gallen (this conclusion is also consistent with Bischoff's verdict about Schaffhausen Min. 42). Since some of the ninth-century manuscripts in the group were not copied before the second half of the ninth century, but all seem to have been annotated before the beginning of the tenth century, the marginalia must have been inserted into them at some point in the second half of the ninth century. It, thus, seems that the St. Gallen scribes, perhaps the very same individuals who copied the Zofingen manuscript, collated several of the full manuscripts of the *Etymologiae* that were available in their library against each other and perhaps against other manuscripts, which have not yet been traced or which are now lost.

The other reason why the presence of critical signs in these six manuscripts is remarkable is that critical signs were a tool of those who aspired to the highest degree of learning and therefore point to the activities of top-level scholars.⁶² To fully appreciate their significance it may be useful to recount that they go back to one of the most illustrious Christian scholars of the Patristic era: Origen. The Alexandrian scholar used them in his six-column *Hexapla*, a critical redaction of the Old Testament, to compare several Greek text versions of the Old Testament with the Hebrew text. In a synoptic version of this *Hexapla*, Origen later presented the redacted text in a single text block. To distinguish textual variants particular only to a specific version of the Greek Old Testament, he used two critical signs: the *obelus* (—) to mark the lines that were found only in the Septuagint but not in other Greek versions of the Old Testament and the *asteriscus* (※) to mark those that were not found in the Sep-

⁶² Steinová (see fn. 52) 125–126.

tuagint but only in these other Greek versions.⁶³ Origen, thus, produced a critical text of the Greek Old Testament in which the signs inserted in the margins next to certain lines functioned as a primitive *apparatus criticus*.

Origen's critical method inspired scholars both in the East and the West to undertake their own philological projects in the following centuries. At first, such projects were limited to the collation of different text versions of the Bible which could then be put into circulation equipped with critical signs (e. g. Lucian of Antioch, Jacob of Harqel, Jerome).⁶⁴ By the early Middle Ages, scholars in the Latin West made the important realization that if critical signs could be used for the collation of the Bible, they could also be used for any text that existed in multiple substantially different versions.⁶⁵ The first humble traces of such experimentation with critical signs appeared in the pre-Carolingian period.⁶⁶ However, the full potential of the Origenian critical method was realized only in the Carolingian environment, in which the first critical redactions of entire texts emerged. Perhaps the most famous is the critical redaction of the Rule of St. Benedict, preserved in St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 914.⁶⁷ This redaction is a direct result of the diffusion of the Monte Cassino text of the

⁶³ On the *Hexapla* and its synoptic version, as well as the critical signs, see Anthony Grafton and Megan Williams, *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea*, Cambridge, MA 2008, 105–119; and Francesca Schironi, *The ambiguity of signs: critical σημεῖα from Zenodotus to Origen*, in: *Homer and the Bible in the Eyes of Ancient Interpreters*, ed. Maren Niehoff, Leiden 2012, 87–112.

⁶⁴ It was particularly important that Jerome chose to include critical signs in his second revision of the Latin Bible based on Origen's *Hexapla*. Jerome was instrumental for the integration of Origenian critical method into the Western patristic intellectual tradition, both by means of his biblical revisions and via his writings, in which he made many references to critical signs. For Jerome's role in transmitting the Origenian critical method to the Latin West, see Adam Kamesar, *Jerome*, in: *The New Cambridge History of the Bible. From the Beginnings to 600*, eds. James Carleton Paget and Joachim Schaper, Cambridge 2013, 653–675 (here 660–664).

⁶⁵ By this time, the Origenian obelus began to resemble the modern division sign (÷), and both the *asteriscus* and the *obelus* began to be inserted into the main text rather than placed in the margins. For this reason, too, the *metobelus* (:) began to be used as an end-stop to signalize where the passage added *sub asterisco* or *sub obelo* terminated.

⁶⁶ An example is the Bobbio Orosius (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, MS D 23 sup.), a seventh-century Irish manuscript, in which three problematic passages were marked with *obeli*; see David Ganz, *The Literary Interests of the Abbey of Corbie in the First Half of the Ninth Century*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oxford 1980, 78; and Steinová (see fn. 52) 115.

⁶⁷ The manuscript is digitized at: <https://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/de/list/one/csg/0914>. Its commented facsimile was printed as Germain Morin, *Benedikt Probst*, and Ambrogio Amelli, *Regula Benedicti: de codice 914 in Bibliotheca Monasterii S. Galli servato quam simillime expressa*, Sankt Ottilien 1983.

Rule, which differed significantly from the text that had been available until then in the Carolingian lands.⁶⁸ In St. Gallen 914, the discrepancies between the Monte Cassino text and the Carolingian text of the Rule were expressed by *obeli* (÷) and *metobeli* (:), which marked passages not found in the Monte Cassino text (i. e. either omission or addition), and by variant readings inserted in the margin, which indicated where one version contained readings different from the other (i. e. variation, see Fig. 11).

St. Gallen 914 and the five ninth-century manuscripts of the *Etymologiae* equipped with transposition signs, variant readings, and critical signs may be connected. In the first place, St. Gallen 914 is a manuscript from the Bodensee region. Traube assigned it to Reichenau,⁶⁹ but as Bischoff argued, it was more likely copied at St. Gallen from a Reichenau exemplar in the first third of the ninth century.⁷⁰ It was, thus, produced only several decades before the critical signs and other marginalia were inserted in the same scriptorium into the manuscripts of the *Etymologiae*. Second, the *apparatus criticus* present in St. Gallen 914 consists of critical signs and variant readings just as the *apparatus* present in the manuscripts of the *Etymologiae*. The annotators of both the Rule and the *Etymologiae* used the same working method. This is noteworthy, especially as combining critical signs with variant readings inserted in the margins was not a standard scholarly working method in the early Middle Ages nor is it attested in such a systematic fashion in manuscripts outside of the Bodensee region.⁷¹ Third, St. Gallen 914 contains a letter-prologue that men-

⁶⁸ The critical redaction of the Rule in this manuscript was studied in Ludwig Traube, *Textgeschichte der Regula S. Benedicti*, in: *Abhandlungen der Historischen Klasse der Königlich-Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 21 (1898), 599–731 (here 631–632, 649–653, 664–667 and 673–679); reprinted as Ludwig Traube, *Textgeschichte der Regula S. Benedicti*, Munich 1910.

⁶⁹ Traube (see fn. 68) 664.

⁷⁰ Morin, Probst, and Amelli (see fn. 67) viii–ix; and Bischoff (see fn. 12) vol. 3, 335–336.

⁷¹ The combination of critical signs and variant readings can be found in several other manuscripts from St. Gallen. In the grammatical compendium St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 876 (8th/9th century, St. Gallen), *obeli* and *metobeli* as well as variant readings appear in Pompeius's commentary on Donatus. In another grammatical compendium, St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 882 (9th century, 3/4, St. Gallen), parts of the works of Donatus and Eutyches were similarly marked with *obeli* and *metobeli* and equipped with variant readings. In St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 14 (9th century, 1/3, St. Gallen), a manuscript containing the Book of Job, an addition to Jerome's prologue was also marked with critical signs. Critical signs can even be found in St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 728 (9th century, 2/2, St. Gallen) in the oldest manuscript catalogue of St. Gallen. Unlike the case of the manuscripts of the *Etymologiae*, however, there is no obvious link between these manuscripts containing *obeli* and *metobeli*, other than that they were produced and kept in St. Gallen during the ninth century. In those codices that contain variant reading, these additions seem to come from the ninth century.

tions that the critical redaction of the Rule was produced on behalf of Reginbert, the famous *bibliothecarius* of Reichenau, by two Reichenau monks, Tatto and Grimald, who were sent to Aachen in the 810s to consult the copy of the Monte Cassino text kept there. Scholars have identified the Grimald who took part in the production of the critical redaction of the Rule with Grimald, who was the abbot of St. Gallen from 841 to 872, that is at the time when the annotations may have been entered into the codices of the *Etymologiae*.⁷² Given the proximity of the two projects in their aims, methods, and historical context, it seems highly unlikely that the redactors of the *Etymologiae* were unaware of the earlier redaction of the Rule. Perhaps, we should imagine that the latter proved a model for the former.

How the critical signs and variant readings function in the context of the five codices of the *Etymologiae* can be illustrated with the example of *Etym.* 2.28.4 as it is found in Schaffhausen Min. 42 and Zofingen Pa 32 (see the appendix, item I.14):

Schaffhausen Min. 42 (fol. 44v, Fig. 12)

Omne iustum honestum: (nullum honestum turpe *add. in marg.*): nullum igitur iustum turpe

Zofingen Pa 32 (fol. 37r, Fig. 13)

Omne iustum honestum: ÷nullum honestum turpe:: nullum igitur iustum turpe

In this particular case, the two manuscripts were compared and an addition reflecting this comparison was inserted into each of them. Thus, a reading absent in Schaffhausen Min. 42 was added in the margin from Zofingen Pa 32, while the same reading was marked with critical signs in Zofingen Pa 32 to indicate its absence in Schaffhausen Min. 42 (unless we want to presume the existence of additional manuscripts that contained the identical readings and informed the interventions seen in the two manuscripts, but such a proposition would only multiply virtual manuscripts used for the collation of which no trace survives).

The five ninth-century manuscripts listed above contain 145 passages marked with critical signs (see the appendix).⁷³ By analysing these passages, it is possible to examine the objectives, the working method, and the context of the activ-

⁷² Wilhelm Wattenbach, *Das Schriftwesen im Mittelalter*, Leipzig 1896, 331; Traube (see fn. 68) 631; Bruckner (see fn. 1) vol. 3, 24. However, Geuenich (see fn. 7) is sceptical about the two Grimalds being the same person.

⁷³ The full appendix is available for download at: ■FILL. The passages equipped with variant readings are more numerous. It would be interesting to examine them as well, but this is beyond the scope of this project.

ity of the St. Gallen collators who left behind their traces in Zofingen Pa 32, Schaffhausen Min. 42, St. Gallen 236, and St. Gallen 231–232. We can begin by aligning the five manuscripts into three complete sets of the *Etymologiae*. Schaffhausen Min. 42 and St. Gallen 236 form one complete set, which I shall call series A. Zofingen Pa 32, which contains all twenty books in one volume, constitutes a second set, which I shall refer to it as to series B. St. Gallen 231 and St. Gallen 232 form a two-volume set, which I shall call series C.

A comparison of the three series tells us exactly how the five manuscripts were used. In the first place, with the exception of books IV (*De medicina*) and VIII (*De ecclesia et sectis*), all books contain critical signs, as does the prefatory section of the *Etymologiae* consisting of *tituli* and letters exchanged between Isidore and his close friend and first editor, Braulio of Zaragoza (Tab. 4). Nevertheless, not all books were worked on to the same extent, as is most obvious from the fact that while only 45 passages were equipped with critical signs in the books I–X, 100 passages were marked in books XI–XX. Some books received significantly more attention than others, especially books II (*De rhetorica et dialectica*, 13 passages marked with critical signs), XV (*De aedificiis et agris*, 16 marked passages), XVI (*De lapidibus et metallibus*, 24 marked passages), XVII (*De rebus rusticis*, 14 marked passages) and XIX (*De navibus, aedificiis, et vestibis*, 14 marked passages). Tab. 4 also shows that the passages marked with critical signs are distributed unevenly across the three series. Almost two thirds of the signs have been inserted in series A, while there are only seven passages marked with critical signs in series C. The distribution of critical signs among the three series should not be taken as an indication of the extent to which specific manuscripts were used for the collation. All manuscripts seem to have been utilized from cover to cover, which is made particularly clear by the distribution of variant readings in each of them. Rather, the signs provide a good measure of the relative textual distance between the manuscripts involved in the collation. Series A, it seems, was particularly removed from the other manuscripts used for this project.

To be clear, the early medieval collators could not have been aware of the modern textual families of the *Etymologiae* identified by W. M. Lindsay,⁷⁴ nor were they interested in collating families but rather in collating individual manuscripts in their library. Nevertheless, through a careful selection of manuscripts or by sheer luck they achieved results comparable to those of a modern editor. Unwittingly, they found a good representative of the family ξ in series A and a good representative of family α in series B.⁷⁵ What is even

⁷⁴ Lindsay (see fn. 21) v–xiii; and Lindsay (see fn. 40).

⁷⁵ Porzig (see fn. 22) 142; and Reydellet (see fn. 22) 398.

book	series A	series B	series C	total
<i>tituli</i> and letters	3	0	0	3
I	2	1	1	4
II	6	6	1	13
III	2	1	2	5
IV	0	0	0	0
V	1	2	0	2
VI	5	2	0	7
VII	3	2	0	5
VIII	0	0	0	0
IX	2	0	1	2
X	3	1	1	4
XI	1	1	0	2
XII	5	7	0	12
XIII	4	2	0	5
XIV	2	1	1	3
XV	13	6	0	16
XVI	19	7	0	24
XVII	9	7	0	14
XVIII	2	2	0	4
XIX	13	1	0	14
XX	4	2	0	6
total	99	51	7	145
%	63.5 %	32 %	4.5 %	

Tab. 4. Distribution of critical signs in the three series A, B, and C and the different sections of the *Etymologiae*

more, the comparison of the passages marked by critical signs and equipped with variant readings in the five manuscripts associated with St. Gallen reveal that the early medieval collators of St. Gallen employed for their work additional manuscripts of the *Etymologiae* that no longer survive. The charac-

ter of these additional manuscripts can be partially reconstructed from the critical signs and variant readings that cannot be explained by means of the three above-mentioned series alone. An instructive example in this regard is *Etym.* 12.1.52, which reads in the three fully preserved series as follows (see also the appendix, item II.3):

<p>St. Gallen 236 (p. 33, Fig. 14)</p> <p>qui frontem albam ÷calidi (al. calliti vel candidi <i>in marg. int.</i>). Cervinus est</p>	<p>Zofingen Pa 32 (fol. 185r, Fig. 15)</p> <p>qui frontem albam calidi (al. calliti vel candidi <i>in marg. ext.</i>). Cervinus est</p>	<p>St. Gallen 232 (p. 43, Fig. 16)</p> <p>qui frontem albam calidi (al. calliti vel candidi <i>in marg.</i>). Cervinus est</p>
---	--	---

As all three series feature the same base reading (*calidi*) and were equipped with the same two variant readings (*al. calliti vel candidi*), none of them could have provided the variant readings, which must have come from one or more other manuscripts. The reading *calliti* can be found in the *Karolinus* (Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, MS Weiss. 64), an eighth-century manuscript of the *Etymologiae* from Bobbio and one of the most important witnesses of the Hiberno-Italian family β of the text.⁷⁶ This family was also available at St. Gallen, as is evidenced by two early incomplete copies of the *Etymologiae* copied there: St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 233 (c. 800, books VI–VIII + XII–XV) and St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 235 (c. 800, books XII–XX).⁷⁷ The variant readings attached to *Etym.* 12.1.52 and elsewhere suggest that a manuscript or manuscripts from the Hiberno-Italian family were used by the St. Gallen collators in their project. For this reason, I include St. Gallen 233 and 235 as well as the *Karolinus* (to supplement the gaps in St. Gallen 233 and 235) in my analysis as representatives of this additional manuscript or manuscripts. As far as certain critical signs and variant readings do not find echo in series A, B, and C, but match manuscripts from family β, we may presume that they were derived from this now lost manuscript of Hiberno-Italian type, a book that has not survived, but which was perhaps the parent of St. Gallen 233 and 235. I will refer to this virtual manuscript/s as series D*.

⁷⁶ Lindsay (see fn. 21) ix–x; Hans Butzmann, *Die Weissenburger Handschriften*, Frankfurt am Main 1964, 204–210, and CLA IX 1386.

⁷⁷ On these manuscripts, see Bruckner (see fn. 1) vol. 3, 72–73; Bischoff (see fn. 24) 340; and Reydellet (see fn. 22) 433. They are digitized at: <https://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/list/one/csg/0233> (233) and <https://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/list/one/csg/0235> (235).

As for the manuscript (or perhaps manuscripts) that provided the variant reading *candidi*, Jacques André's critical edition of book XII of the *Etymologiae* indicates that this reading can be found as a correction in the *Toletanus* (Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, Vitr. 14–3), the most important ninth-century Visigothic manuscript of the *Etymologiae* and an excellent witness of the Spanish family γ .⁷⁸ This family is represented at St. Gallen by St. Gallen 237, which displays many Spanish readings and seems to be related to the *Toletanus* and other Visigothic manuscripts.⁷⁹ Since St. Gallen 237 does not contain any critical signs, we can assume that the manuscript or manuscripts that provided this and some of the other variant readings and critical signs now recorded by the series A, B, and C has not survived. Only its (or their) shadow can be perceived in the five St. Gallen manuscripts examined here. I refer to this other source of critical signs and variant readings, which may have been the exemplar of St. Gallen 237, as series E*. I will treat it as a single set of manuscripts (even though, we must remain open to the possibility that this category reflects more than one set). Whenever particular critical signs or variant readings cannot be explained from the collation of the series A, B, and C, nor from the collation against the series D*, I assign these readings/signs to series E*. For example, Schaffhausen Min. 42 contains a variant reading to *Etym.* 2.2.1: *vel pro scientia vel pro loquacitate verborum* that is distinct from the text of this passage in Zofingen Pa 32 (*vel pro scienti autem pro loquacitate verborum*), nor can it be found in manuscripts from family β that do not contain this passage at all (see the appendix, item I.9) – it must come from series E*.

While, thus, the collators working in St. Gallen in the second half of the ninth century may have not aimed to do so, they effectively collated the four early medieval families of the *Etymologiae* (α , β , γ , and ξ). This was a remarkable achievement in a period when a collation of two manuscripts against each other or the production of a systematic florilegium or a collection based on multiple manuscripts could count as a major intellectual effort. Recent research has emphasized that the Carolingian intellectuals who can be connected with intellectual projects of similar sophistication as their peers from St. Gal-

⁷⁸ Jacques André, *Isidore de Séville, Étymologies: Livre XII, des animaux*, Paris 1986, 75. For the description of the Spanish family, see Lindsay (see fn. 21) xi.

⁷⁹ Lindsay placed St. Gallen 237 into family γ ; Lindsay (see fn. 21) xi. Reydellet has shown that it is not a pure Spanish manuscript, but rather a hybrid sharing some traits with family γ and some traits with family β ; Reydellet (see fn. 22) 422. For the textual assessment of this manuscript, see also Porzig (see fn. 22) 167–168; and Michel Huglo, *The Musica Isidori Tradition in the Iberian Peninsula*, in: *Hispania Vetust: Musical-Liturgical manuscripts from Visigothic origins to the Franco-Roman transition (9th–12th centuries)*, ed. Susana Zapke, Bilbao 2007, 61–92 (here 67).

len working on Isidore's encyclopaedia worked rarely alone, making use of amanuenses or entire workshops that were at their disposal.⁸⁰ Indeed, the large number of manuscripts involved in the St. Gallen collation project presupposes that it was a demanding undertaking with regards to both manpower and resources of a scriptorium as well as the intellectual labour involved in planning and coordination. Even more so than the first St. Gallen redaction of the *Etymologiae*, this second redactional project must have been a carefully orchestrated effort that required such a degree of scholarly supervision and decision-making, that it is impossible that it would not have involved the senior echelons of the monastery and the most able-minded individuals at St. Gallen – the *bibliothecarius* and the masters of the scriptorium as well as of the two schools that existed there in this period. For this reason, the individuals whose lives are praised by Ratpert and Ekkehart in the *Casus sancti Galli*, both those who are known as authors of surviving works and those who are not, should be suspect of being involved, even though we will probably never be able to assign names to the hands that entered the critical signs and variant readings in the five surviving St. Gallen manuscripts.

If such a first-rate intellectual undertaking as the collation of five complete sets of the *Etymologiae* at Carolingian St. Gallen has thus far managed to go undetected, it is largely due to the fact that we possess limited evidence for it apart from the breadcrumb path of variant readings and critical signs scattered across several manuscripts preserved across three libraries. We miss, above

⁸⁰ The most notable example is perhaps that of Florus, the deacon from Lyon; Klaus 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; Célestin Charlier, *Les manuscrits personnels de Florus de Lyon et son activité littéraire*, in: *Revue bénédictine* 119 (2009), 252–267; and Pierre Chambert-Protat, *Florus de Lyon, lecteur des Pères. Documentation et travaux patristiques dans l'Église de Lyon au neuvième siècle*, Ph.D. dissertation, Paris EPHE 2016. Other examples include that of the workshop that produced the pseudo-Isidorian decretals, the so-called circle of Sedulius, and the work of Ratramnus of Corbie and Alcuin on their theological oeuvre; Klaus Zechiel-Eckes, *Ein Blick in Pseudoisidors Werkstatt. Studien zum Entstehungsprozeß der falschen Dekretalen. Mit einem exemplarischen editorischen Anhang (Pseudo-Julius an die orientalischen Bischöfe, JK 196)*, in: *Francia* 28.1 (2002), 37–90; John J. Contreni, *The Irish in the Western Carolingian Empire (According to James F. Kennedy and Bern, Burgerbibliothek 363)*, in: *Die Iren und Europa im Früheren Mittelalter II*, ed. Heinz Löwe, Stuttgart 1982, 758–798; David Ganz, *Corbie in the Carolingian Renaissance*, Sigmaringen 1990, 75–77; Warren Pezé, *A New Manuscript Annotated by Ratramnus and the Making of His *De Praedestinatione**, in: *The Annotated Book in the Early Middle Ages. Practices of Reading and Writing*, eds. Mariken Teeuwen and Irene van Renswoude, Turnhout 2017, 125–156; and Bernhard Bischoff, *Aus Alkuins Erdentagen*, in: *Mittelalterliche Studien II*, Stuttgart 1967, 12–19.

all, written evidence for the execution of the project comparable to the letter-prologue of the critical redaction of the Rule of St. Benedict in St. Gallen 914.⁸¹ Furthermore, we possess no easily identifiable deluxe manuscript of the *Etymologiae* from the Carolingian period (akin to St. Gallen 914) that could be easily identified as an end-product of a major scholarly enterprise. Yet, the analysis of the 145 passages marked with critical signs in series A, B, and C (and a further comparison with St. Gallen 233, St. Gallen 235, St. Gallen 237, and Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 64, as well as with Lindsay's critical edition of the *Etymologiae*) makes it clear that St. Gallen produced such a deluxe copy after all. This deluxe copy and the end-product of the collation project is the series C, or else St. Gallen 231–232. This conclusion can be reached by analysing the function of critical signs (Tab. 5).

About 45 % of passages marked with critical signs reflect cases of collation that cannot be explained from the three series A, B, and C, but show perfect alignment with series D*, as represented by St. Gallen 233, St. Gallen 235 and/or Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 64. The prominence of this category is not a consequence of the collators employing series D* more industriously than other series, but an indication of the relative textual distance of series D* from the other series, especially from series A, which contains most instances of collation against series D* (and we should assume that the manuscript/s from series D* would have contained many critical signs and variant readings stemming from series A).

About 17 % of the passages can best be explained as stemming from the collation of series A against series B. These passages display the kind of chiasmus that was illustrated in the example above. A word or words missing in Zofingen Pa 32 or Schaffhausen Min. 42 / St. Gallen 236 are marked by critical signs in the other manuscript series. The missing words are then supplied *sup. lin.* or *in marg.* from the series that contains them. This is the case even when these words contain minute errors or represent readings particular to that one manuscript rather than to a specific manuscript family or cluster.

⁸¹ Because of the prologue that connects the critical edition with well-known Carolingian figures (Reginbert of Reichenau, Tatto of Reichenau, Grimald of St. Gallen), St. Gallen 914 was judged valuable enough for the production of a facsimile in the 1980s (see fn. 67). Similarly, manuscripts associated with the intellectual circle of Sedulius Scottus were accorded this honour in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; Herman Hagen, *Codex Bernensis 363 phototypice editus*; Augustini de dialectica et de rhetorica libros, Bedae historiae ecclesiasticae librum I, Horatii carmina, Ovidii Metamorphoseon fragmenta, Servii et aliorum opera grammatica, cet. continens, Leiden 1897; Ludwig Stern, *Epistolae Beati Pauli glosatae glosa interlineali: Irisch-lateinischer Codex der Würzburger Universitätsbibliothek*, Halle 1910; and Ludwig Bieler, *Psalterium Graeco-Latinum: codex Basiliensis A. VII. 3*, Amsterdam 1960.

For example, only St. Gallen 236 contains the variant *apud nos* rather than *apud Indos* in *Etym.* 12.2.14 (see the appendix, item II.5). This seems not to be a variant reading common to family ξ , but rather a reading particular to the St. Gallen manuscript (perhaps stemming from an incorrect rendering of an unfamiliar script or abbreviation system). This reading was entered as a variant into Zofingen Pa 32, while its base reading *Indos* appears *sup. lin.* in St. Gallen 236.

About 15 % of the passages reflect textual variation found only in one manuscript, which can be either considered errors specific to a certain copy or could have easily been interpreted as errors by the early medieval collators. These passages are marked in a single manuscript with an *obelus* and a *metobelus* and did not result in any further intervention in the other surviving manuscripts. The majority of such ›mistakes‹ occur in Zofingen Pa 32. They also constitute the single most prominent category of passages marked with critical signs in St. Gallen 231–232.

About 14 % of the critical signs cannot be explained either by the collation of the three series A, B, and C or by the collation of these series against the series D*. These 14 % indicate beyond doubt that at least one further manuscript series was employed for the collation, the series E*. Most of the passages in this category can, once again, be found in series A, confirming its relative distance from other manuscript sets used for the collation.

About 6 % of cases can be explained either as stemming from a collation of series A against series B or as stemming from the collation of either of these two series against series D*. These are cases when one of the two series, A and B, contains the same base reading as series D* and therefore the influence of the latter cannot be distinguished from the former.

In only 5 % of the cases, the critical signs cannot be explained by series A or B, but point to one of the three remaining series. More specifically, 4 % can derive either from series C or E*, and 1 % either from C or D*.⁸²

The relative distribution of different categories allows for a crucial observation: series C seems to occupy a rather marginal place in the St. Gallen collation project. As has already been pointed out, it is this series that contains only seven passages marked with critical signs, significantly less than the 99 passa-

⁸² The total sum of per cents amounts to 102 % because in three instances, a single passage falls into two categories. One of such passages is *Etym.* 12.1.52, which, as was shown above, was equipped with variant readings stemming from the collation against both series D* and series E*. The other two passages having this feature are *Etym.* 6.16.13 (Schaffhausen Min. 42 records readings of both series B and D*, see the appendix, item I.31) and *Etym.* 17.5.9 (St. Gallen 236 records the readings of both series D* and E*, see the appendix, item II.63).

category	proportion of variant readings
collation against a ›Hiberno-Italian‹ manuscript (series D*)	45 %
collation of series A against series B	17 %
mistake/low-rate variant in a single manuscript	15 %
variant readings stemming from series E*	14 %
collation of series A against series B OR collation against a ›Hiberno-Italian‹ manuscript (series D*)	6 %
variant readings that could be explained from series C or series E*	4 %
variant readings that could be explained from series C or series D*	1 %

Tab. 5. Main categories of variant readings marked by critical signs in series A, B, and C

ges marked in series A or 50 passages marked in series B. Moreover, four of these passages are instances of *obeli* and *metobeli* marking what seems to be an error particular to this series. The three remaining cases of obelization are all instances that mirror the placement of critical signs in series A. They were either taken over from series A, or since both series A and series C contained the same readings, they cannot be distinguished. We have just seen, moreover, that while about 45–52 % of critical signs can be explained from series D*, 17–23 % from series A and B, and 14–15 % from series E*, series C would have contributed at most 5 % of signs. Importantly, unlike in the other cases, none of the signs need to derive from series C. All can be accounted for by collation of four series: A, B, D*, and E*.

Further evidence that series C is the end-product of the collation carried out in series A, B, D* and E* is provided by palaeography. While variant readings in series A and B were added by secondary hands, most of the variant readings in series C seem to have been added by the main hands. In this regard, St. Gallen 231–232 resemble the tenth-century Einsiedeln 167, into which critical signs and variant readings were copied from Zofingen Pa 32, rather than the other ninth-century manuscripts involved in the collation. Indeed, upon closer look, series C does not look like a manuscript set that provided variant readings to other manuscripts but like one that received them from the other four series. For all intents and purposes, it is the prototype of a critical redaction of

the *Etymologiae* produced in St. Gallen in the second half of the ninth century alongside the earlier redaction represented by Zofingen Pa 32.

If we revisit the 145 passages marked with critical signs and treat series C as the desired end-product of the collation, new patterns emerge that reveal additional details about the working method of the St. Gallen collators. It becomes clear that series C contains readings that could not be found in any single early medieval manuscript, but rather represent attempts to combine distinct readings stemming from different textual families into a single whole, a clear indication of editorial activity. The definition of the word *thesaurus* (*Etym.* 16.18.6, see the appendix, item II.59) in St. Gallen 232, for example, is a combination of the standard definition found in families α and β (*compositum. Nam thes Greci repositum dicunt, Latini aurum, quod iunctum sonat repositum aurum*) with a deviant definition found in St. Gallen 236, our representative of family ξ (*compositum, quod nos dicere possumus repositum aurum*). In this case, the early medieval editors working at St. Gallen simply appended the latter definition after the former to form a richer definition (*compositum. Nam thes Greci repositum dicunt, Latini aurum, quod iunctum sonat repositum aurum, quod nos dicere possumus repositum aurum*), even though it repeats the same information twice. A similar merging of two distinct descriptions into a longer one occurs in *Etym.* 17.9.77 (the description of the herb *titimallum*, see the appendix, item II.75) and in *Etym.* 19.29.5 (the definition of *fila*, see the appendix, item II.93).

Two instances of errors in St. Gallen 232 demonstrate convincingly that series C is the end-product of the collation rather than its constituent. Both result from a confusion of a critical *obelus* (\div) with the graphically similar Tironian *est* (\div), an abbreviation symbol used by the copyists of series C. Thus, *Etym.* 15.3.2 in both St. Gallen 236 (series A) and Zofingen Pa 32 (series B) reads: *Omne aedificium \div domus: antiqui aedem apellaverunt* (see the appendix, item II.29). Here, the *obelus* with *metobelus* mark *domus* because this word is superfluous (indeed, it is not found in manuscripts from family β). However, St. Gallen 232 takes over the same passages as: *Omne aedificium est domus antiqui aedem appellaverunt*. As is evident from the fact that the *est* is written by the main hand and in full rather than abbreviated, the copyist must have mistaken an *obelus* in the manuscript from which he was copying for a Tironian abbreviation symbol. The copyist was likewise confused by an *obelus* attached in St. Gallen 236 (series A) to *Etym.* 16.4.30 (see the appendix, item II.50): *gignitur in Egipto vel Arabia. \div vi: nascitur in Aethiopia*. He rendered the same passage as: *gignitur in Egipto vel Arabia. est vi nascitur in Aethiopia*. Since only St. Gallen 236 attaches an *obelus* to this passage, it is clear that this was one of the manuscripts with which the copyist was working. We have already seen that *obeli* were taken over from series A to series C in other cases as well.

Two additional observations about the working method of the early medieval collators can be made. In the first place, when they used critical signs to mark certain passages, it was usually not to indicate that they were errors. They used other methods such as crossing out, erasure, underlining and expunction for this purpose. Likewise, the same collator-scribes were perfectly capable of correcting omissions by adding the omitted text in the margin and attaching it to the *lacunae* by *signes de renvoi*. Critical signs were reserved for readings in specific manuscripts that were found to be correct, but which disagreed with each other and therefore needed to be reconciled. The collators considered these readings, at least at the moment of the addition of the signs, as of comparable if not equal value textually, and they could not immediately reject any of them. It is the same attitude as the one expressed in St. Gallen 914 or in Origen's synoptic *Hexapla*. Nevertheless, it is clear that the collators did not treat all passages marked with critical signs as equivalent in the long run. On the contrary, one can recognize three grades of quality of variants equipped with critical signs based on whether and how they were rendered in St. Gallen 231–232.

The lowest grade accounts for the 15 % of passages to which *obeli* and *metobeli* were added to mark variant readings appearing in only one of the four series. While the collators chose to mark these passages with critical signs rather than treat them as outright errors (and therefore erasing, crossing them out, underlining or expuncting them), they did not seem to attribute very high value to them textually, even in those cases when these readings could not be dismissed as erroneous. These variant readings never generated marginal variants that could be inserted in the margins of other manuscripts. In four cases, such passages marked initially with critical signs, that is, identified as variants rather than as errors, were later downgraded by being crossed out or underlined. As these variants/errors were deemed not valuable enough to inform marginalia in other manuscripts, they were also not considered for implementation in St. Gallen 231–232.

The medium grade is reflected in passages that were treated as interesting and valuable during the collation of series A, B, D* and E*. Such passages were marked by critical signs in one or more series to indicate their absence from other series, and they also generated marginal variant readings that were entered into these series. In contrast to the first grade, this treatment suggests that readings found in particular manuscript were not only considered variants rather than errors, but they were also seen as comparable in value to readings found in other manuscripts and therefore transferable into their margins. Nevertheless, the scribes responsible for the copying of St. Gallen 231–232 decided not to include the critical signs or variant readings produced in this manner into St. Gallen 231–232. Rather, they chose one preferred reading

from among up to four supplied by series A, B, D*, and E*, which became the base reading now visible in St. Gallen 231–232. Thus, it seems, while several variant readings were judged valuable during the initial collation, a second decision process took place during the preparation of St. Gallen 231–232, in which only one reading was chosen as the best and most valuable.

Finally, there is the highest grade, which looks similar to the medium grade as far as the collation of series A, B, D* and E* is concerned. Collators assessed several base readings as comparable in value and as a result deemed them worthy of generating critical signs and marginal variants in other manuscripts. Potentially, these readings could be treated in the same manner as the readings discussed in the previous paragraph, one of them being preferred to others in the final decision taken in the course of the production of St. Gallen 231–232. However, the copyists of St. Gallen 231–232 chose not to make such a decision, perhaps because they saw the different readings as particularly valuable, and rather included the whole *apparatus* into series C. These are the passages equipped with variant readings in series C. As we have seen, in three cases, copyists of St. Gallen 231–232 carried over not only variant readings but also critical signs from series A. Indeed, by looking at the 65 variant readings present in St. Gallen 232, it becomes clear that the copyists overwhelmingly favoured series A as their model in this case, copying what they found in St. Gallen 236 into St. Gallen 232. The chief difference between the two manuscripts is that what is found entered in the margins of St. Gallen 236 by a second hand appears copied by the main hands in St. Gallen 232.

As is evident from the existence of these three grades of variants, St. Gallen scribes involved in the production of the second redaction of the *Etymologiae* worked in two discernible stages. In the first, preparatory stage, series A, B, D*, and E* were collated. The immediate outcome of this stage was the *apparatus* of variant readings, critical signs, and transposition signs entered in the manuscripts belonging to these series. In the second, completion stage, St. Gallen 231–232 was produced in the scriptorium of St. Gallen based on the results of the collation. Given the relative alignment of St. Gallen 231–232 with series A, it is plausible to assume that series A was to serve as the main depository of the variant readings gathered from the collation against the three other manuscript sets of the *Etymologiae* and that St. Gallen 231–232 followed this manuscript set as its basic blueprint.⁸³ Every time that the copyists encountered a variant reading in the margin or critical signs, they consulted the accumulated *apparatus* and made a decision about what should or should not be implemented in the redaction they were producing.

⁸³ For this reason, too, there seems to be a rather close textual agreement between St. Gallen 231–232 and Schaffhausen Min. 42 as reported in Reydellet (see fn. 22) 413.

The production of the second St. Gallen redaction of the *Etymologiae* thus involved two lines of decision-making: one involved at the preparatory stage and another at the completion stage. Moreover, it is clear from modifications made by certain hands both in the four series involved in the collation and in St. Gallen 231–232 that additional decisions were taken at both stages. As could be noticed in the case of *Etym.* 12.1.52, for example, the two variant readings in Zofingen Pa 32 were added by two different hands, suggesting that the variant reading *calliti* was inserted in the margin first and the second variant reading *candidi* was supplemented only later, perhaps an indication that only three manuscript series were collated initially (A, B, and D*), and that series E* was included in the collation only at a later date. Similarly, while the majority of the 65 variant readings in St. Gallen 232 were entered by the main hand or a hand that is probably the main hand, at least some of the marginalia were added by a different hand and therefore presumably at a later date. Some of these later variant readings in St. Gallen 232 can be attributed to a single hand using a Bodensee type of minuscule, but somewhat distinct from the main hands copying the manuscript. Notable is the difference in the shape of the suspension stroke, which the main hands always draw straight and finish with a downward move, while this identifiable second hand uses a wavy form (Fig. 17).

Both stages, but especially the preparatory stage, seem to have been executed over a longer period of time. The collation may have taken, in fact, fairly long, perhaps several years, and may have involved a gradual open-ended inclusion of particular manuscript sets deemed valuable for such a project. At one time, a decision was taken to begin with the production of St. Gallen 231–232, even though the collation could have continued, so that the *apparatus* generated after the production had begun could have been implemented at a later stage.

Here, an important question needs to be asked about the collators' choice of manuscripts. As we have seen, at the time that the collation project was initiated, St. Gallen possessed at least six complete copies of the *Etymologiae* (and series D* and E* confirm the existence of two other, now lost sets of Isidore's encyclopaedia). Not all of them, however, were involved in the collation. The omission of St. Gallen 233 and 235 can be explained for by the use of their exemplar. The omission of St. Gallen 237, which is included in part II of the appendix to show that its text version is not reflected in the layers of critical signs, transposition signs and variant readings, is more difficult to explain. Perhaps the series E* was indeed its exemplar and thus St. Gallen 237 was judged to not be textually interesting. In any case, the collators clearly chose only some of the manuscripts available to them for the collation.

Moreover, it is intriguing that they happened to include a manuscript that came from Mainz. Did this manuscript wander to the abbey of St. Gallen be-

fore the collation project was conceived, or is it perhaps possible that it was purposefully procured from Mainz, which was tied to St. Gallen via abbot Hartmut, a pupil of Hrabanus Maurus?⁸⁴ The latter scenario should be seriously considered, especially as the analysis of the passages equipped with critical signs shows that the manuscripts involved in the collation represent different families of the *Etymologiae*. True, this may be an accident, but it is equally possible that the relative value of the manuscripts selected for collation was recognized.

The number of hands visible both in the three surviving manuscripts utilized for the collation and in St. Gallen 231–232, both as copyists and as supplementary hands, indicates that a larger number of individuals was involved in the production of the second St. Gallen redaction of the *Etymologiae* – just as in the case of the first redaction. On the first one hundred folia of Schaffhausen Min. 42 (series A), which contain the first six books of the *Etymologiae*, I was, for example, able to observe at least four hands adding variant readings (which does not exclude the possibility that more hands are present but cannot be distinguished). Nevertheless, it should be added that in the case of Schaffhausen Min. 42 one of these hands is responsible for most of the interventions, as also seems to be the case in Zofingen Pa 32 and in St. Gallen 232 (this is the hand using the wavy suspension stroke). Similarly, St. Gallen 231 was copied for the most part by one and St. Gallen 232 by two hands. It, thus, seems that, just as in the case of the Zofingen manuscript, although multiple individuals were involved in the St. Gallen collation project and in the compilation of the critical redaction of the *Etymologiae* represented by St. Gallen 231–232, the work on each manuscript, whether collation or copying, was assigned to one or two chief collators/scribes. I was unable to identify overlaps between the hands working in individual manuscripts, although this has to do with the relatively low degree of distinguishability of hands across the five manuscripts examined here.⁸⁵ All can be broadly classified as Carolingian hands using the Bodensee type of minuscule such as would have been used at St. Gallen in the second half of the ninth century and in the first decades of the tenth century.

⁸⁴ Duft, Die Äbte Gozbert, Grimalt, Hartmut, Salomo (see fn. 7) 64–65; and Anton Gössi, Äbte, in: Die Abtei St. Gallen: Abriss der Geschichte; Kurzbiographien der Äbte; das stift-sanktgallische Offizialat, eds. Johannes Duft and Werner Vogler, St. Gallen 1986, 107–109. The ties between St. Gallen and Mainz in this period were due not only to Hartmut's school days. Grimald was a dedicatee of Hrabanus Maurus's works and some of the manuscripts from Grimald's personal library seem to have been produced at Mainz; Bischoff (see fn. 7) 197. Tuotilo mentioned earlier was active at Mainz in the second half of the ninth century; Euw (see fn. 1) 85.

⁸⁵ Compare to Bruckner (see fn. 1) vol. 3, 25.

While the palaeographic and codicological analysis does not provide information about the reasons for the production of the second St. Gallen redaction of the *Etymologiae*, nor about the identity of those involved in its execution, be it only the masterminds that supervised its making, we are fortunate to have additional sources that allow for the contextualization of this undertaking. In particular, the chronology of its completion can be approximated, given that we can be reasonably certain that St. Gallen 231–232 is the two-volume copy of the *Etymologiae* mentioned in the *Casus sancti Galli* to have been prepared for the personal library of abbot Hartmut (Fig. 18).⁸⁶

The second St. Gallen redaction of the *Etymologiae*, thus, seems to have been the brainchild of the same man who may have orchestrated the production of the first redaction. The extraordinary interest in the text of Isidore's encyclopaedia at St. Gallen seems to have been due to the energies of a single man, who was in a position to steer the intellectual interests and the activities of the scriptorium to his liking, much like seems to have been the case at scriptoria elsewhere. This does not preclude the likelihood that other leading figures from St. Gallen were involved. In light of the fact that St. Gallen 231–232 is not just an ordinary manuscript of the *Etymologiae*, but rather a prototype of a critical redaction, its potential connection to Notker Balbulus should be taken seriously. Notker was certainly a scholar of the highest calibre, who possessed the necessary intellectual skills to perform and supervise a collation of manuscripts.⁸⁷ It is possible that his hand will someday be identified among the collators of Schaffhausen Min. 42, St. Gallen 236, and Zofingen Pa 32.⁸⁸

Two redactions in a single scriptorium?

Now that I have analysed the two redactions of the *Etymologiae* that were produced at St. Gallen in the second half of the ninth century, two pressing questions remain to be answered: what is the relationship between these two redactions and why did the monks of St. Gallen produce two redactions of the same text in a relatively short span of time? If the Zofingen manuscript was produced under Grimald, it must have been copied in the early 870s at the latest, while St. Gallen 231–232 was presumably not completed until the

⁸⁶ MGH SS Rer. Germ. 75, p. 228.

⁸⁷ Anton von Euw believes that the two manuscripts were produced in the last years of Hartmut's abbacy, in the early 880s, that is at the time when Notker may already have been the librarian of St. Gallen; Euw (see fn. 1) 177–178.

⁸⁸ Susan Rankin has informed me that Notker's hand is not among the hands that copied Zofingen Pa 32.

early 880s. In fact, palaeographic evidence suggests that the production of the two redactions took place at the same time and in tandem. The relevant piece of evidence can be found on fol. 9r of Zofingen Pa 32, where a critical *obelus* and a *metobelus* mark *Etym.* 1.3.8: *Secunda Θ, quae mortem ÷significat*: (the verb *significat* is, indeed, missing from most manuscripts). The obelized passage features on a page that was crossed out by h2. The manuscripts must have been therefore used for collation before it was completed. Since the execution of both redactions might have taken place over a longer time, these periods of production may have overlapped, either because two groups of scribes were truly working in the same scriptorium side by side or because the work on one project was interrupted at one point and then resumed.

We should perhaps assume that the two projects were largely independent on each other. Indeed, each redaction had a different purpose: the first redaction seems to have been geared towards macro interventions involving manipulation with large units of text, such as the insertion of *De natura rerum* into the *Etymologiae*; while the second redaction seems to be a feat of microsurgery, a result of a careful probing of minute variants and their thoughtful weighing. These two modes of working are not necessarily compatible. Furthermore, while a large number of scribes were involved in both the first and the second redaction, I was unable to detect hands that indisputably took part in both projects. None of the numerous hands that copied the Zofingen codex can be identified as a hand that copied St. Gallen 231 or as either of the two hands that copied St. Gallen 232.⁸⁹

It is also possible that the second redaction was meant to replace or at least to improve on the first redaction. The contrast between Zofingen Pa 32 and St. Gallen 231–232 in this regard is suggestive. As was mentioned earlier, the former manuscript does not seem to be the final product of the redactional activity, but rather resembles a working version or a draft copy. This is suggested by the strategy of production quire by quire, within which each quire, or two, were entrusted to a different group of scribes. While a significant amount of effort went into the Zofingen codex, the quality of parchment and copying is inconsistent. By contrast, St. Gallen 231–232 was planned and executed on a grander scale. It is less the extent of decoration than the superb training of scribes and especially the cleanness of copying that give St. Gallen 231–232 a balanced and consistent look which allows it to be called both a scholarly redaction and a deluxe book. Only St. Gallen 231–232 looks like a project that was successfully completed, while Zofingen Pa 32 looks like a project that may

⁸⁹ Anton von Euw has proposed that the scribe that copied St. Gallen 231 may have been Sintram, scribe mentioned in the *Casus sancti Galli*, who also copied St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 53; Euw (see fn. 1) 177.

have been partially executed, but which was perhaps never truly completed. The second St. Gallen redaction of the *Etymologiae* may, thus, represent a more mature redaction of the same text, reached after earlier experimentation with the text as captured in the Zofingen manuscript. This is also reflected in the method used there, which progressed from manipulation with larger units of text to the surgical treatment of individual variant readings.

The second scenario would explain the mystery of the missing clean copy of the Zofingen codex. St. Gallen 231–232 may be the real clean copy, utilizing the experience gathered in the process of the production of Zofingen Pa 32. As Anton von Euw remarks, for example, the diagrams in St. Gallen 231–232 were taken from the Zofingen codex.⁹⁰ Both manuscripts may have also included a portrait page depicting Isidore and Braulio, which now survives only in Einsiedeln 167 and whose source in the St. Gallen area would have been the Zofingen manuscript.⁹¹ At the same time, as was noted above, St. Gallen 231–232 is textually more closely dependent on manuscripts from family ζ, and as a result was classified as a witness of this family by both Walter Porzig and Marc Reydellet.⁹² In reality, it is one of those clever hybrids that were generated in the Carolingian period by scholarly users, who took the best readings from several manuscripts (and thus several distinct families), albeit no longer including *De natura rerum*. In the two redactions from St. Gallen, and in the two prototype manuscripts, we, thus, see not only two fascinating Carolingian editorial enterprises, but also how scholarly programs may have developed in a single scriptorium in the course of a decade or so.

The impact and diffusion of the two St. Gallen redactions of the *Etymologiae*

While the second St. Gallen redaction may have been perceived as superseding the first redaction at the time of its production, it was, paradoxically, the latter that proved more influential in the long run. It seems that there were no copies made of the text in St. Gallen 231–232, although it should be added that to judge whether the second redaction generated offspring, a large-scale and detailed philological analysis of particular passages would be necessary. Such an analysis is difficult to imagine given the large number of manuscripts of the *Etymologiae* surviving from the High Middle Ages. By contrast, the first redaction can be discerned rather easily on account of the unmistakable presence

⁹⁰ Euw (see fn. 1) 177.

⁹¹ Bischoff (see fn. 24) 341; and Euw (see fn. 1) 177.

⁹² Porzig (see fn. 22) 142–144; and Reydellet (see fn. 22) 398–399.

of *De natura rerum* inserted after the third book of the *Etymologiae*. Isidore's work on natural phenomena appears in this position in at least eight post-Carolingian manuscripts, which certainly descend from the Zofingen codex.

The oldest of these descendants is the already mentioned Einsiedeln 167, which was copied directly from Zofingen Pa 32 shortly after the foundation of the Abbey of Einsiedeln in the second half of the tenth century. Its direct dependency on the Zofingen codex can be traced in how it handles the various editorial notices that were embedded in the prototype of the first St. Gallen redaction of the *Etymologiae*. The Einsiedeln manuscript, for example, lacks the abbreviated version of book I, chapter 21, which is marked in the Zofingen manuscript by *obeli*, because the scribe of this manuscript understood these *obeli* as a command to not copy the passage. Similarly, the Einsiedeln manuscript lacks those additions to the last chapter of *De natura rerum* that were obelized in Zofingen Pa 32, even though it contains the short addition from Vegetius which was not obelized in the Zofingen codex (Fig. 19). Einsiedeln 167 is a clean copy produced from Zofingen Pa 32, only not in the Carolingian period, but about a century later.

Einsiedeln 167 is surely the response to a request from the newly-founded abbey to a more senior house, a house with which Einsiedeln had substantial ties, to supply exemplars for its newly established library.⁹³ It thus seems that while St. Gallen 231–232 may have been produced in the last decades of the ninth century to supersede the redaction represented by the Zofingen codex, the St. Gallen community preferred to send to Einsiedeln the Zofingen codex rather than any other of its many copies of the *Etymologiae* in the second half of the tenth century. Was it perhaps because by the second half of the tenth century, it was the first rather than the second redaction that was perceived as being more accomplished or at least its text version more desirable to have? Other aspects may have played a role. The Zofingen codex contained the entire text of the *Etymologiae* in a single volume rather than in two, as St. Gallen 231–232 or, say, Schaffhausen Min. 42 and St. Gallen 236. The presence of *De natura rerum*, moreover, may have made the Zofingen codex a two-in-one deal for a young monastic community in dire need of good texts. Perhaps, too, the first redaction had acquired a special value for the St. Gallen community by the time of its dispatching that other versions did not possess.

Einsiedeln was not the only monastic community to which St. Gallen dispatched the first redaction. Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, MS Weiss. 2 is an eleventh-century descendant of the Zofingen manuscript copied at the Abbey of Wissembourg in Alsace.⁹⁴ Wissembourg was closely tied

⁹³ Compare with Euw (see fn. 60) 184.

⁹⁴ This manuscript is described in Butzmann (see fn. 76) 86–88.

to St. Gallen during the second half of the ninth century via the person of Grimald, who was made abbot of both communities.⁹⁵ Indeed, scribes from Wissembourg can be shown to have worked in St. Gallen and vice versa, and Grimald was the dedicatee of works of the most important Carolingian writer from Wissembourg, Otfrid.⁹⁶ Otfrid was also a student of Hrabanus Maurus in Fulda just as Grimald's successor, Hartmut, and there were, therefore, grounds for continued intellectual cooperation between the two monasteries after Grimald's death.

Given the time-frame of the exchange between the two communities, it is possible that Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 2 is a copy of a ninth-century manuscript that was itself copied from the Zofingen codex, either by Wissembourg scribes visiting St. Gallen or by St. Gallen scribes who made a copy for Wissembourg. This impression is strengthened by the fact that, similar to Einsiedeln 167, Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 2 contains variant readings in the margin copied by the main hand and matching the variant readings present in the Zofingen manuscript.⁹⁷ The parent of Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 2, it seems, was produced only after the collation project has been initiated at St. Gallen, confirming further that the production of the two redactions took place around the same time and over a longer period of time.

This parent of Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 2 was a slightly different book than its sibling, Einsiedeln 167. Its copyists either did not understand or chose to disregard some of the editorial instructions entered in the margins of Zofingen Pa 32. Thus, while Einsiedeln 167 omits the abbreviated chapter 21 in book I, it can be found on fol. 9r of Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 2, as can be the note inserted in the margin of fol. 12r in the Zofingen manuscript: *hoc capitulum in sequentibus plenius invenies* (Fig. 20). This remark, which was meant only as an editorial comment in the Zofingen manuscript, was incorporated into the main text block of Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 2 as a rubric.

The real success of the first St. Gallen redaction of the *Etymologiae*, however, came only in the twelfth century. Five of its descendants were produced in this century: London, British Library, Harley 2660 copied around 1136 in western Germany,⁹⁸ Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Perizoneus F 2 copied in

⁹⁵ Geuenich (see fn. 7) 62–64.

⁹⁶ Bischoff (see fn. 7) 211.

⁹⁷ On fols. 15r (*Etym.* 1.37.15), 71v (*Etym.* 6.7.2), 72v (*Etym.* 6.11.3), 115v (*Etym.* 10.14), 118r (*Etym.* 10.109), and 164v (*Etym.* 15.1.5). All of these variant readings are identical to those present in Zofingen Pa 32, as are several marginalia that seem to have been added not by the main hand (e. g. on fols. 79v, 95v, 120v and 128r).

⁹⁸ This manuscript is described and digitized at: http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Harley_MS_2660.

the first half of the twelfth century in an unidentified German scriptorium,⁹⁹ Bonn, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, S 193 copied in the last third of the twelfth century in the Cistercian abbey of Altenberg close to Cologne,¹⁰⁰ Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek, Sal. IX 39 copied at the end of the twelfth century in the Cistercian abbey of Salem near Konstanz,¹⁰¹ and Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 360 produced between 1143 and 1178 at Engelberg Abbey, which was founded from Muri Abbey, a daughter house of Einsiedeln.¹⁰² Based on how these manuscripts render chapter 21 of the first book of the *Etymologiae*, it can be shown that the London and the Leiden manuscripts are related to the manuscript from Wissembourg, while the Engelberg manuscript is a copy of Einsiedeln 167. The Altenberg and Salem manuscripts retained *De natura rerum*, but otherwise normalized the structure of the *Etymologiae*. They, nevertheless, seem to be descendants of the Wissembourg manuscript. The four twelfth-century German witnesses of the first St. Gallen redaction may have been copied by Cistercian scriptoria.¹⁰³

The youngest witness of the first St. Gallen redaction of the *Etymologiae* is London, British Library, Harley 3035 copied in 1496 in western Germany, perhaps in the Augustinian monastery of Eberhardsklausen (today Klausen close to the German border with Luxemburg) founded in 1461.¹⁰⁴ Given that the first St. Gallen redaction seems to have been copied up until the end of the fifteenth century, it is likely that there exist other twelfth-, thirteenth-, fourteenth-, and fifteenth-century witnesses of this redaction that remain as yet unidentified.¹⁰⁵ It is clear that this ninth-century redaction of the *Etymologiae*

⁹⁹ This manuscript is described in K. A. de Meyier, *Codices Perizoniani*, Leiden 1946, 1–2.

¹⁰⁰ Sample folia from this manuscript are digitized at: <http://www.manuscripta-mediaevalia.de/dokumente/html/obj31275205>. Its description is provided in Günter Gattermann and Heinz Finger, *Handschriftencensus Rheinland: Erfassung mittelalterlicher Handschriften im rheinischen Landesteil von Nordrhein-Westfalen mit einem Inventar*, vol. 1, Wiesbaden 1993, 88.

¹⁰¹ This manuscript is described and digitized at: <https://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/sal IX39/0057>.

¹⁰² This manuscript is described and digitized at: <https://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/list/one/sbe/0360>.

¹⁰³ If this was the case, London Harley 2660 dated to c. 1136 could have been produced only at Kamp (founded in 1123), Altenberg (founded in 1133), Himmerod (founded in 1134/35) or Eberbach (founded in 1136).

¹⁰⁴ This manuscript is described at: <https://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/record.asp?MSID=4062&CollID=8&NStart=3035>.

¹⁰⁵ One such witness may be Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek Erlangen-Nürnberg, MS 186 produced in the second half of the twelfth century in the Cistercian abbey of Heilsbronn. This manuscript of the *Etymologiae* should contain *De natura rerum*, but it is unclear whether it is textually related to the first St. Gallen redaction; see Hans Fischer, *Die lateinischen Pergamenthandschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Erlangen*, Wiesbaden 1928, 207.

from St. Gallen became quite influential in the German area, a region where St. Gallen played a prominent role in the early Middle Ages.¹⁰⁶ The late dissemination, nevertheless, suggests that it may have been more due to the tastes of younger generations than to the ambitions of Carolingian scholars that the first St. Gallen redaction achieved its regional success – thus its popularity among the Cistercians. It is an important reminder of how Carolingian tinkering could have affected, sometimes unintentionally, the transmission of particular texts in the following centuries.

Conclusion: St. Gallen redactions in the broader context of the dissemination and appropriation of the *Etymologiae* in the early Middle Ages

More than 450 manuscripts containing the *Etymologiae* or parts of it survive from before the end of the tenth century.¹⁰⁷ This study has examined in detail a small number of them: a cluster of Carolingian manuscripts that were present at St. Gallen in the second half of the ninth century. It is now time to take a step back to see how the conclusions of my analysis fit into the broader picture of the transmission and appropriation of Isidore's encyclopaedia in the early Middle Ages, especially during the Carolingian period.

The St. Gallen manuscripts are not unique in showing traces of extensive interaction by early medieval users.¹⁰⁸ On the contrary, tinkering with the text of the *Etymologiae* seems to have been the norm rather than an exception. As

¹⁰⁶ It can be added that the *editio princeps* of Isidore's *De natura rerum* printed by Günther Zainer in Augsburg in 1472 is based on a manuscript of the first St. Gallen redaction, as is clear from the fact that it reproduces the eccentric order of chapters of the *De natura rerum* originating in the Zofingen manuscript; see Kendall and Wallis (see fn. 23) 100.

¹⁰⁷ See the overview in Cardelle de Hartmann (see fn. 26) 477–482, and Evina Steinová, The Oldest Manuscript Tradition of the *Etymologiae* (Eighty Years after A. E. Anspach), in: Visigothic Symposium 4 (2020), 100–143.

¹⁰⁸ For example, the first folia of the eighth-century copy of a contracted text-version of the *Etymologiae* in Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Weiss. 64 (mid-8th century, northern Italy, perhaps Bobbio) has been expanded and corrected by a group of ninth-century hands using Carolingian minuscule. The first folia of Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS II 4856 were similarly supplied with corrections and variant readings by two scribes using Carolingian minuscule. Ninth- and tenth-century correctors have also added variant readings in the margins of Laon, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 447 (Mainz, 9th century, 2/3), London, British Library, Harley 3941 (9th/10th century, Brittany), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 6250 (9th century, 1/2, Freising), and many other manuscripts of Isidore's encyclopaedia. See also Porzig (see fn. 22) 133–135.

W.M. Lindsay observed, the state of Isidore's encyclopaedic text in the oldest surviving eighth-century generation of manuscripts shows that redaction of this essential knowledge corpus took place already before 800, as they reveal irreconcilable differences between textual families that can be explained only as being editorial in nature.¹⁰⁹ Readers' engagement and rewriting further accelerated in the Carolingian period, which is sometimes called the *aetas Virgiliana*, but which could very well also be called the *aetas Isidoriana*, given its fondness for the Sevillian bishop. The tremendous popularity of Isidore's *magnum opus* is best attested by the fact that more than two-thirds of the surviving early medieval copies of the *Etymologiae* were produced by Carolingian scriptoria.¹¹⁰ Most intellectual centers of the ninth century acquired at least one manuscript of the *Etymologiae* and as we have seen some possessed as many as three, five or even seven copies of this essential knowledge corpus. More important still, Carolingian scriptoria began to churn out anonymous compilations that were assembled from bits and pieces of the *Etymologiae* but focus on a single topic (rather than being encyclopaedic), a clear indication of the perceived utility of Isidore's text that was now appropriated for new purposes. It should not surprise us that redaction activity intensified in this period as well. At least three redactions of the *Etymologiae* other than those from St. Gallen were completed in the ninth and the tenth centuries. One was a result of the collation of the Frankish family α and the Spanish family γ in Switzerland or Germany in the first half of the ninth century and gave birth to the family ξ of the *Etymologiae*.¹¹¹ Another was put together in northern Italy before or around the mid-ninth century.¹¹² The third one was compiled in northern Spain around the mid-tenth century.¹¹³ The redactional activity at

¹⁰⁹ Lindsay (see fn. 40) 45.

¹¹⁰ Steinová (see fn. 107) 117.

¹¹¹ Reydellet (see fn. 22) 419 and 433. Walter Porzig, who was the first to identify family ξ , thought that it represents the Braulionic redaction of the *Etymologiae* and that it branched out from northern Italy or Germany at the beginning of the ninth century; see Porzig (see fn. 22) 165–167.

¹¹² This date is based on its oldest witness, Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Lat. Fol. 641 (mid-9th century, northern Italy) mentioned in fn. 25. The hallmark of this northern Italian redaction is also the inclusion of the *De natura rerum* into the *Etymologiae*. However, it uses a different version of the *De natura rerum* than the first St. Gallen redaction and, moreover, places it after book III rather than between two sections of book III. Given the exchange of material between the monasteries in the Bodensee region and northern Italy, it remains to be seen whether there is a relationship between this northern Italian redaction and the first St. Gallen redaction, for example because the former inspired the makers of the latter.

¹¹³ This date is based on its two earliest witnesses: Madrid, Real Academia de la Historia, MS 25 (c. 946, San Millán de la Cogolla) and Madrid, Real Academia de la Historia,

St. Gallen, thus, did not take place in a vacuum, nor was it unique. Nevertheless, the two St. Gallen redactions have features that set them apart both from other early medieval redactional projects and the more general trends of engagement with the *Etymologiae* in the Carolingian period.

In the first place, certain books of the *Etymologiae* were more popular in the Carolingian environment than others. Already Henry Beeson, who produced the first substantial overview of the early medieval manuscripts of Isidore's works at the beginning of the twentieth century, noticed that the first ten books of the *Etymologiae* were more popular than the second half of the work.¹¹⁴ My own examination of the manuscripts of the *Etymologiae* also showed that Carolingian users had a predilection for the first half of Isidore's encyclopaedia that covered the traditional disciplines familiar to early medieval readers: the seven liberal arts, medicine, law, time-keeping, and theology.¹¹⁵ The second half of the encyclopaedia which treats the human body, animal and plant realms, precious stones and metals, geography and natural phenomena, agriculture, human pursuits and man-made objects, subjects that had not been a part of the traditional curriculum nor systematically treated in Latin literature on a scale comparable to grammar or music, seem not to have possessed a similar allure. The chief reason for this disparity seems to be that in the Carolingian zone, and especially in the Frankish lands, which were the largest producer of manuscripts transmitting material from the *Etymologiae* in the Carolingian period, Isidore's encyclopaedia began to be used as a pedagogical text, whether in schools (grammar and rhetoric), for the instruction of clergy (theology), or in certain professional contexts (law, music, computus).¹¹⁶

Both St. Gallen redactions, however, engage, more with the subjects of the second half of the *Etymologiae* than with those of the first. Even though the first redaction inserts *De natura rerum* after book III (rather than after book XIII dealing with many of the natural phenomena treated in *De natura rerum*, where it would fit equally well), it is obvious that the purpose of this insertion was to expand the amount of information about the natural world in Isidore's encyclopaedia. Furthermore, the most significant interventions made in this redaction concerned the last books. Similarly, the collators responsible for the second redaction invested substantially more effort in books XI–XX than books I–X,

MS 76 (c. 954, San Pedro de Cardena). This Spanish redaction contains many additions to the *Etymologiae*, for example musical diagrams added to the third section of book III; see Huglo (see fn. 79) 73–74.

¹¹⁴ Beeson (see fn. 20) 83.

¹¹⁵ See Steinová (see fn. 107) 135.

¹¹⁶ John J. Contreni, *The Pursuit of Knowledge in Carolingian Europe*, in: *The Gentle Voices of Teachers: Aspects of Learning in the Carolingian Age*, ed. Richard Sullivan, Columbus, OH 1995, 106–141 (here 117); and Contreni (see fn. 28) 726.

an indication that their interest lay therein. It seems that Isidore was sought at St. Gallen as a source of information that lay beyond the boundary of standard handbooks, perhaps precisely because he was seen as the only or the most reliable source of knowledge on them. This is a pattern that seems to have been present at St. Gallen before the second half of the ninth century. Two of the oldest surviving manuscripts of the *Etymologiae* from its library, St. Gallen 233 and St. Gallen 235, transmit a set of annotations to the second half of the *Etymologiae* of northern Italian origin.¹¹⁷ They were surely copied from their eighth-century exemplar because they were found useful and relevant.

In contrast to the Frankish area, we find little evidence from St. Gallen that suggest that Isidore was read here as a school author or in a context of instruction. For example, the inclusion of the first book of the *Etymologiae* (*De grammatica*) into Frankish grammatical handbooks and school compendia as well as the appearance of school glosses to this book of the *Etymologiae* suggest that the *Etymologiae* was introduced into the classroom in northern France.¹¹⁸ St. Gallen seems to have followed suit and possessed at least two grammatical handbooks transmitting the first book of the *Etymologiae* as an *ars grammatica* (St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 876 and St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 882). Nevertheless, there are no school glosses to this text in either of the two grammatical handbooks, even though other grammarians in the same manuscripts were heavily glossed.¹¹⁹ The appropriation of Isidore's encyclopaedia for educational purposes seems not to have been nearly as strong a trend here as in Frankish monasteries. The fact that the abbey was keen to obtain at least six full and two more incomplete copies of the *Etymologiae* (this count includes the surviving manuscripts as well as the now lost manuscripts of series D* and E*) indicates that the interest in Isidore at St. Gallen was a matter of scholarly pursuit rather than of classroom use.

The two redactions from St. Gallen can be likewise contrasted with the other early medieval redactions of the *Etymologiae*. All of these redactions reflect two distinct approaches to editing, which may be called Alcuinian and Theodulfian in homage to the authors of the two influential Carolingian revisions of the Bible, whose distinct approaches illustrate the differences between the various redactions.¹²⁰ With the exception of a short window of time in the

¹¹⁷ See Bischoff (see fn. 24) 340, n. 119; and Evina Steinová, Annotation of the *Etymologiae* of Isidore of Seville in Its Early Medieval Context (in preparation).

¹¹⁸ See Steinová (see fn. 117).

¹¹⁹ St. Gallen 882, for example, contains glosses to both Donatus and Eutyches. See the digitized manuscript at: <https://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/searchresult/list/one/csg/0882>.

¹²⁰ A detailed account of these two biblical recensions is provided in Bonifatius Fischer, *Bibeltext und Bibelreform unter Karl dem Grossen*, in: *Karl der Große. Lebenswerk und Nachleben. II. Das geistige Leben*, eds. Helmut Beumann et al., Düsseldorf 1965, 156–216.

Carolingian environment, the redaction of Isidore's encyclopaedia seems to have been geared towards correcting errors, improving the presentation of the text (e. g. by experimentation with layout and reordering of the material) and expanding the text as editors thought was appropriate based on their personal judgment. The salient feature of such an editorial approach was the interpolation of new material taken from other texts, often with the aim to enhance the encyclopaedic quality of Isidore's work. This is an approach not substantially different from that of Alcuin when revising the Bible in the late eighth century, whose interventions primarily concerned the structure of the text, its physical formatting and the standardization of orthography.¹²¹ Both the northern Italian and the Spanish redactions of the *Etymologiae* have this Alcuinian form.

From the Carolingian period onwards, we begin to see a new attitude to the redactional enterprise that involves a philological comparison of manuscripts and a critical assessment of text. Such an approach was taken by Theodulf of Orléans, whose Bibles reflect a collation of manuscripts and contain variant readings in the margins. Each copy of the Theodulfian Bible, moreover, is unique in that it represents a critical text in a constant development fuelled by the acquisition of ever new manuscripts and continuous critical work.¹²² The Theodulfian manner of editing was made possible by the new reality of the Carolingian period, namely that a single library, perhaps for the first time since Antiquity, could possess multiple manuscripts of a key text (the Bible, the Rule of Benedict). An awareness of major discrepancies between text-versions coming from various regions could thus be formed among those who possessed the necessary scholarly acumen (Theodulf of Orléans, Grimald and Tatto of Reichenau).

Both St. Gallen redactions discussed in this study are Theodulfian in their nature as is the oldest ninth-century redaction.¹²³ In this regard, they represent a specifically Carolingian trend. They cannot be separated from two aspects of the phenomenon sometimes called the Carolingian Renaissance – the extraordinary growth of monastic libraries sustained by a systematic acquisition of

¹²¹ Fischer (see fn. 120) 160.

¹²² Elisabeth Dahlhaus-Berg, *Nova antiquitas et antiqua novitas: typologische Exegese und isidorianisches Geschichtsbild bei Theodulf von Orléans*, Cologne 1975, 39–91.

¹²³ While it may seem that this is not true for the first St. Gallen redaction – after all, its main innovation was to insert *De natura rerum* into the *Etymologiae*. However, it needs to be pointed out that it, too, could not be produced with a comparison of manuscripts, as is clear from the analysis of book I, and also from the presence of obelized passages and editorial instruction that indicate that substitute passages should be taken from other manuscripts. The first St. Gallen redaction, thus, may have been originally planned to embody the Alcuinian approach, but seems to have undergone a development towards a Theodulfian form.

manuscripts and the emergence of a learned monastic elite that had not only the resources but also the necessary skill and ambition to engage in new intellectual experiments. The accumulation of no less than six complete sets of the *Etymologiae* by the St. Gallen community (raising the total number of codices of Isidore's encyclopaedia present at St. Gallen before the end of the ninth century to an astonishing twenty-two) seems less an accident and more a necessary precondition for the production of both redactions described in this study.

It is quite tempting to seek a link between the older ninth-century redaction that generated the family ξ and the two St. Gallen redactions. Not only do they reflect the same philological attitude towards Isidore's text, but they also come from the same region of the Carolingian world. Moreover, Schaffhausen Min. 42, a representative of the family ξ , was used as the leading manuscript of the second St. Gallen redaction of the *Etymologiae*. Just as the second St. Gallen redaction may have grown out of the experience of producing the first redaction, it, thus, benefited from the earlier redaction. It almost seems as if the three redactions from the German area represented a continuation of a particular intellectual trend, which was preoccupying scholarly-minded individuals in the Carolingian German zone for several decades. The culmination of this scholarly pursuit in the form of the second St. Gallen redaction was made possible due to the influx of manuscripts from other regions, enhanced connectivity between intellectual centres in the Carolingian zone, and the productivity of Carolingian scriptoria. We do not know, unfortunately, where and in what context the first Carolingian redaction of the *Etymologiae* was produced, but it nevertheless confirms that the German region (rather than Francia, which was the leading producer of manuscripts) was a hotbed of scholarly engagement with Isidore's *Etymologiae* in the early Middle Ages.¹²⁴

The St. Gallen manuscripts of the *Etymologiae* provide us with an important insight into how scholarly readers engaged with Isidore's encyclopaedia in the Carolingian period. Their value lies, above all, not only in preserving the end product of a scholarly undertaking, but also in tracing the activity itself, which allow us to reconstruct the workings of one of the most celebrated Carolingian scriptoria. While we will probably never know whom to credit with initiating and carrying out this major intellectual enterprise, it deserves to be counted among the great achievements of the Carolingian revival of learning. The second St. Gallen redaction, in particular, shows that Carolingian masters were competent text critics who dared to undertake even large-scale collation. Origen would be proud.

¹²⁴ Together with northern Italy, which expressed its scholarly interests in Isidore in a different fashion; see Steinová (see fn. 107) 136; and Steinová (see fn. 117).

Appendix: a selection of passages marked with critical signs in St. Gallen manuscripts

This appendix is an abbreviated version of the complete appendix that can be found at ■ADD. It consists of 35 selected instances of collation of manuscripts used for the production of the second St. Gallen redaction of the *Etymologiae* that allow demonstrating how the collators worked and what were their aims. The first seven sections (A–G) illustrate the seven categories of variant readings described on pp. ■ADD. Section H contains the three important cases when critical signs and variant readings mirror the readings of two different series. Section I includes the two instances of errors in series C due to the incorrect resolution of critical signs. Section J includes the three cases of innovative readings in series C due to compounding of readings of several manuscripts. Finally, sections K and L demonstrate two interesting byproducts of the collation: the former contains two instances of collation where the collation can be explained from St. Gallen 237 because this manuscript seems to reflect the readings of series E*; the latter provides two instances of collation, which affected St. Gallen 235, a manuscript not used for the production of the second St. Gallen redaction.

The passage of the *Etymologiae* to which each of the 35 cases of collation corresponds is provided at its head, as is an identifier pointing to the complete appendix. The readings of each manuscript are given as found in these manuscripts, including their orthography and any errors. However, the punctuation was altered to reflect the punctuation of the critical edition of W. M. Lindsay to make the comprehension of the text easier. Folio or page numbers are provided for each reading separately. Standard abbreviations are used to indicate the presence of additions, corrections, and erasures. Words crossed out or underlined in the manuscripts are marked as such. Words ■-marked with critical signs: are marked with signs and highlighted in the text below.

A. Variant readings and critical signs stemming
from a collation against the series D*

Etym. 2.31.4 (I.20)¹

Schaffhausen Min. 42 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 231 (series C)	St. Gal- len 233	Wolfenbü- ttel Weiss. 64
et simplum, nisi ad duplum (aut eius, cui opponitur, ipsum, quod opponitur <i>add.</i>). Nam relativum (rativum <i>a.c.</i>) ipso relativo ita opponitur ut hoc ipsum, quod opponitur, ei, cui opponitur (opponit aut eius quid opponitur <i>a.c.</i>), (<i>eras. sup. lin.</i>) quocumque modo referatur (49r)	et simplum, nisi ad duplum aut eius, cui opponitur, ipsum, quod opponitur. Nam relativum (ipso <i>add. sup. lin.</i>) relativo ita opponitur ut hoc ipsum, quod opponitur, \neq ei, cui opponitur <i>p.c.</i> , aut eius, cui opponitur, qui opponit nisi conexe dici non possunt <i>a.c.</i> : quocumque modo referatur (41v)	et simplum, nisi ad duplum (aut eius, cui opponitur, ipsum, quod opponitur <i>add. in marg. inf.</i>). Nam relativum ipso relativo ita opponitur ut hoc ipsum, quod opponitur, aut eius, cui opponitur, qui opponit nisi conexe dici non possunt quocumque modo referatur (98)	–	et simplum, nisi ad duplum. Nam relativam ipsi relativo ita opponitur ut hoc ipsum, quod opponitur quocumque modo referatur (32r)

Etym. 15.1.42 (II.25)²

St. Gal- len 236 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gal- len 232 (series C)	St. Gallen 233	St. Gallen 235	Wolfen- büttel Weiss. 64	St. Gallen 237
Constantinopolim urbem \neq Greciae: (al. Traciae <i>add. sup. lin.</i>) Constantinus ex nomine suo instituit (122)	Constantinopolim urbem Graeciae (Traciae <i>add. sup. lin.</i>) Constantinus ex nomine suo instituit (226r)	Constantinopolim urbem Graecae (al. Traciae <i>add. sup. lin.</i>) Constantinus ex nomine suo instituit (147)	Constantinopolim urbem Tracie Constantinus ex nomine suo instituit (195–196)	Constantinopolim urbem Traciae Constantinus ex nomine suo instituit (130)	Constantinopolim urbem Traciae Constantinus ex nomine suo instituit (224v)	Constantinopolim urbem Tratie Constantinus ex nomine suo instituit (238)

¹ The reading of St. Gallen 231 is an unusual compound containing the same phrase *aut eius, cui opponitur* twice because of what seems to be a faulty reading of Zofingen Pa 32. Crucially, the Zofingen manuscript was later corrected, but the corrected read-

Etym. 16.1.6 (II.39)³

St. Gallen 236 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 232 (series C)	St. Gallen 233	St. Gallen 235	Wolfen- büttel Weiss. 64	St. Gallen 237
eo quod nitorem argento reddat. ÷ Altera nitorem argento reddat: Terra Samaia (144)	(eo quod nitorem argento reddat <i>add. in marg.</i>). ÷ Altera nitorem argento dat: Terra Samaia (236r)	eo quod nitorem argento reddat. Altera nitorem argento reddat: Terra Samaia (172–173)	–	eo quod nitorem argento reddat. Terra Samia (155)	eo quod nitorem argento reddat. Terra Samia (238v)	eo quod nitorem arto reddat. Terra Samia (252)

Etym. 17.7.51 (II.68)⁴

St. Gallen 236 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 232 (series C)	St. Gallen 233	St. Gallen 235	Wolfen- büttel Weiss. 64	St. Gallen 237
unde et lentum vimen (et <i>add. sup. lin.</i>) vitis (vitis est <i>a.c.</i> <i>eras.</i>) (al et vites <i>add. in marg.</i>). Virgilius (196)	unde et lentum vimen ÷ vitis est: (al. et vites <i>add. sup. lin.</i>). Virgilius (254v)	unde et lentum vimen (<i>p.c.</i>) et vitis. Virgilius (231)	–	unde et lentum vimen et vites. Virgilius (209)	unde et lentum vimen et vites. Vergilius (278r–278v)	unde et lentum vimen et vites. Virgilius (281)

ing did not make it into St. Gallen 231. This is an important indication that St. Gallen 231 was produced before Zofingen Pa 32 was corrected, i. e., the two St. Gallen projects seem to have been carried out in parallel.

² This is a rare case of St. Gallen 232 preserving two readings, both copied by the main hand.

³ The obelized passage in St. Gallen 236 and Zofingen Pa 32 are almost certainly variant readings that sneaked into the main text. This was recognized by the correctors of St. Gallen 232.

⁴ The correction and the variant reading in St. Gallen 236 seem to suggest that this manuscript was checked against two different sources, one reading *et vitis*, the other containing *et vites*. The variant *et vitis* is presumably the reading of series E.

Etym. 17.9.91 (II.76)⁵

St. Gallen 236 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 232 (series C)	St. Gallen 233	St. Gallen 235	Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 64	St. Gallen 237
vitis alba: <u>bacas</u> ÷ <u>vel ramos</u> : similiter habens (211)	vitis alba: <u>bacas vel ramos</u> similiter habens (260r)	vitis alba: <u>bacas vel ramos</u> similiter habens (247)	–	vitis alba: <u>bacas similiter</u> habens (224)	–	vitis alba: <u>bacas similiter</u> habens (288)

B. Variant readings and critical signs stemming
from a collation of series A against B

Etym. 2.28.4 (I.14)

Schaffhausen Min. 42 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 231 (series C)	Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 64
Omne iustum honestum: (nullum honestum turpe <i>add. in marg.</i>): nullum igitur iustum turpe (44v)	Omne iustum honestum: ÷ <u>nullum honestum turpe</u> :: nullum igitur iustum turpe (37r)	–	Omne iustum honestum: nullum igitur iustum turpe (28v)

Etym. 2.30.2 (I.18)⁶

Schaffhausen Min. 42 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 231 (series C)	Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 64
cum is, qui se defendit aut negat factum esse, (aut factum <i>add. sup. lin.</i>) iure (in re <i>a.c.</i>) defendit (47v)	cum is, qui se defendit aut negat factum, ÷ <u>aut factum</u> : in re (<i>in marg.</i> vel iure) defendit (40r)	cum is, qui se defendit aut negat factum (esse <i>eras.</i>), aut factum esse in se defendit (95)	cum his, qui se defendi abnegat aut factum esse in re defendit (31r)

⁵ The reading *vel ramos* seems to have been first introduced into St. Gallen 232 on the basis of St. Gallen 236 and Zofingen Pa 32, but then judged erroneous on the basis of series D*.

⁶ The reading *in se* in St. Gallen 231 seems to stem from an incorrect reading of a letter r as s. Since it is found in another manuscript, it may have been actually taken from the series E*.

Etym. 9.5.14 (I.40)

Schaffhausen Min. 42 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 231 (series C)	Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 64
Unigenitus ÷post quem nullus (: <i>eras.</i> , <i>in marg. inf.</i> al. quod sit unicus nec ante nec post nullus). Medius (149v)	(Unigenitus <i>add. sup. lin.</i>) quod sit unicus, nec ante nec post nullus. Medius (156v)	Unigenitus quod sit unicus, nec ante nec post nullus ÷post quem nullus: Medius (334)	Medius (138r)

Etym. 12.214 (II.5)

St. Gallen 236 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 232 (series C)	St. Gallen 233	St. Gallen 235	Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 64	St. Gallen 237
Apud nos (Indos <i>add. sup. lin.</i>) autem a voce barro vocatur (36)	Apud ÷Indos: (nos <i>add. sup. lin.</i>) autem a voce barro (<i>p. c.</i>) vocatur (186v)	Apud indos autem a voce barro vocatur (46)	Apud Indos autem a voce barro vocatur (98)	Aput Indos autem a voce barro vocatur (19)	Aput Indos autem a voce burro vocatur (174v)	Apud Indos autem a voce barro vocatur (190)

C. Mistakes and low-grade variants in a single manuscript

Etym. 3.5.8 (I.22)

Schaffhausen Min. 42 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 231 (series C)	Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 64
ad quindecim vero si comparatus fuerit, secundus est et compositus (52r)	ad XV vero si comparatus fuerit, secundus est et compositus (43r)	ad quindecim vero si comparatus fuerit, ÷se comparatus fuerit: secundus est et compositus (104)	ad XV vero si comparatus fuerit, secundus est compositus (34r)

Etym. 7.3.28 (I.35)

Schaffhausen Min. 42 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 231 (series C)	St. Gallen 233	Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 64
et significat quod fit in anima (107r)	et significat quod fit ÷ de eadem trinitate ⁷ : in anima (116r)	et significat quod sit in anima (232)	et significat quod sit in anima (51)	et significat quod sit in anima (88v)

Etym. 15.4.17 (II.30)

St. Gallen 236 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 232 (series C)	St. Gallen 233	St. Gallen 235	Wolfen- büttel Weiss. 64	St. Gallen 237
et ipsum altius simum est. (132)	et ipsum altius simum est ÷ ut in eo lector vel psalmista posi- tus conspici a populo possit quod liberius au- diatur: (231v)	et ipsum altius simum est (161)	quod ipso al- tius sit simum (210)	quod ipso al- tius sit simum (143)	quod ipso al- tius sit simum (232r)	et ipsud altius simum (245)

Etym. 17.8.8 (II.70)

St. Gallen 236 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 232 (series C)	St. Gallen 233	St. Gallen 235	Wolfen- büttel Weiss. 64	St. Gallen 237
et ser- pentes igne (igni a. c.) fugantur; et inde ex flamma ni- grum piper efficitur (effetitur a. c.) (201)	et serpentes igni fugantur; ÷ Sponte man- ans preciosior est oblicita corticis vulnere vilior iudica- tur sarmenta eius: et inde ex flamma nigrum piper efficitur (256r)	et ser- pentes igne fugan- tur; et inde ex flamma nigrum piper efficitur (235)	–	et ser- pentes igne fugan- tur; et exinde ex flamma nigrum piper efficitur (213)	et ser- pentes igne fugan- tur; et exinde ex flamma nigrum piper efficitur (281r)	et ser- pentes igne fugan- tur; et inde ex flamma nigrum piper efficitur (283)

⁷ *De eadem trinitate* is the title of *Etym.* 7.4. The title appears properly on fol. 116v of the same manuscript.

D. Variant readings and critical signs stemming
from a collation against the series E*

Etym. 14.4.24 (II.22)⁸

St. Gallen 236 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 232 (series C)	St. Gallen 233	St. Gallen 235	Wolfen- büttel Weiss. 64	St. Gallen 237
Campania habet terras in hieme ÷anni: atque estate vernantes (100)	Campania habet terras <i>add. sup. lin.</i> hieme anni atque aestate vernantes (vernante <i>a. c.</i>) (216r)	Campania habet terras hieme ÷anni (<i>exp.</i>) atque estate vernantes (123)	Campania (171)	Campania (107)	Campania (212r)	Campaniam habet terras hieme anni atque estate vernantes (226)

Etym. 16.5.18 (II.52)

St. Gallen 236 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 232 (series C)	St. Gallen 233	St. Gallen 235	Wolfen- büttel Weiss. 64	St. Gallen 237
nomen accepit. ÷Est et Linien-sis: (al. Tefrian <i>add. in marg.</i>) appellatus a calore cineris (153)	nomen accepit. Est et Linien-sis (<i>p. c.</i>) ([Tef] <i>add. in marg.</i>) appellatus a calore cineris (239v–240r)	nomen accepit. Est et Linien-sis appellatus a calore cineris (182)	–	nomen accepit. Est et Linien-sis. Tefrian appellatus a calore cineris (164)	nomen accepit. Est et Linien-sis. Tefrian appellatus a calore cineris (243v)	nomen accepit. Est et Lunien-sis. Tefrian appellatus a calore cineris (257)

⁸ The word *anni* was first copied into St. Gallen 232 and then obelized and expuncted, suggesting a change of mind.

Etym. 17.7.17 (II.66)⁹

St. Gallen 236 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 232 (series C)	St. Gallen 233	St. Gallen 235	Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 64	St. Gallen 237
humoris pondere ÷ praegravari : (al. residere <i>add. sup. lin.</i>) Antea athletae (191)	humoris pondere praegravari (pregravari <i>a.c.</i>). Antea athletae (252v)	humoris pondere pregravari. Antea athletae (225)	–	humoris pondere desiderere. Antea athletae (acletae <i>a.c.</i>) (204)	humoris pondere desiderere. Antea athlete (275v)	humoris pondere desiderere. Antea athlete (278)

E. Variant readings and critical signs stemming
from a collation of series A against B or against the series D*
(agreement between A/B and D*)

Etym. 2.2.2 (I.10)

Schaffhausen Min. 42 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 231 (series C)	Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 64
recordatio omnis ÷ hominis : elabitur (32r)	recordatio omnis (hominis <i>add. sup. lin.</i>) elabitur (25r)	recordatio omnis elabitur hominis (64)	recordatio omnis elabitur (20r)

Etym. 17.9.56 (II.74)

St. Gallen 236 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 232 (series C)	St. Gallen 233	St. Gallen 235	Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 64	St. Gallen 237
Strutios, quam quidam herbam lanariam vocant, eo quod ex ea plerique (208)	Strutios (Structius <i>a.c.</i>), ÷ quae herba lanaria vocatur : (al. quam quidam herbam lanariam vocant <i>add. sup. lin.</i>), eo quod ex ea plerique (259r)	Strutios, quam quidam herbam lanariam vocant, eo quod ex ea plerique (244)	–	Stutius, quam quidam herbam lanariam vocant, eo quod plerique (222)	–	Strucies, quam quidam herbam lanariam vocant, eo quod plerique (287)

⁹ The variant reading *residere* in St. Gallen 236 must come from series E*.

Etym. 19.7.1 (II.84)

St. Gallen 236 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 232 (series C)	St. Gal- len 233	St. Gallen 235	Wolfen- büttel Weiss. 64	St. Gallen 237
Incus est in quo ferrum ÷ferro: tu- ditur (241)	Incus est in quo ferrum (ferro <i>add.</i> <i>sup. lin.</i>) tunditur (272v)	Incus est in quo ferrum ferro tundi- tur (<i>p.c.</i>) (283)	–	Incus est in quo ferrum ferro tunditur (255)	Incus est in quo ferrum tunditur (292r)	Incus est in quo ferrum tunditur (305)

F. Variant readings that can be explained
from series C or series E*

Etym. 1.35.7 (I.6)

Schaffhausen Min. 42 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 231 (series C)	Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 64
Inter barbarismum et figuras, ÷hoc est: latinam et perfectam elocutionem (constat <i>add. sup. lin.</i>), metaplasmum esse (24r)	Inter barbarismum et figuras, hoc est latinam et perfectam locutionem, meta- plasmum esse (18r)	Inter barbarismum et figuras latinam et perfectam elocutio- nem constat meta- plasmum esse (48)	–

Etym. 2.2.1 (I.9)¹⁰

Schaffhausen Min. 42 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 231 (series C)	Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 64
sed ita copiose ita varie (vel pro scientia vel pro loquacitate verborum <i>add. in. marg. inf.</i>) ut eam lectori admirari in promptu (prumptu <i>a.c.</i>) sit (32r)	sed ita copiose, ita variae ÷vel pro scienti autem pro loquacitate ver- borum: ut eam lectoru admirari in promptu sit (25r)	sed ita copiosae ita varie vel pro scientia vel pro lo- quacitate verborum ut eam lectori ad- mirari in promptu sit (64)	sed ita cupiose ita variae ut eam lectoru admirari in prumptu sit (20r)

¹⁰ The variant reading *vel pro scientia vel pro loquacitate verborum* found in Schaffhausen Min. 42 and St. Gallen 231 cannot come from series B, and therefore points to an alternative source, which must be the series E*. The reading of series B (*vel pro scienti autem pro loquacitate verborum*) is almost certainly an error due to an incorrect resolving of an abbreviated *vel* (as *v̄l*) and the last letter of *scientia* as *autem*.

Etym. 15.6.4 (II.31)

St. Gallen 236 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 232 (series C)	St. Gallen 233	St. Gallen 235	Wolfen- büttel Weiss. 64	St. Gallen 237
sed pistores dicti, quasi ÷finsores: (al. pinsores <i>add.</i> <i>sup. lin.</i>), a ÷findendis: (pinsendis <i>add. sup. lin.</i>) granis fru- menti (134)	sed pis- tores dicti, quasi fin- sores (pin- sores <i>a.c.</i>), a finden- dis granis frumenti (232r)	sed pis- tores dicti, quasi pin- sores (<i>p.c.</i>), a pinsen- dis (<i>p.c.</i>) granis frumenti (162)	sed pi- stores dicti, quasi pinsores, a pisen- dis granis frumenti (211)	sed pi- stores (<i>p.c.</i>) dicti, quasi pinsores, a piscen- dis granis frumenti (144)	sed pi- stores dicti, quasi pinsores, a pisen- dis granis frumenti (233r)	sed pi- stores dicti, quasi pins- tores, a pinsen- dis granis frumenti (246)

G. Variant readings that can be explained
from series C or series D*

Etym. 7.5.27 (I.36)

Schaffhausen Min. 42 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 231 (series C)	St. Gallen 233	Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 64
Et cum sint om- nibus ÷officio: communia, pro- prie (proprie <i>a.c.</i>) tamen haec (109r)	Et cum sint (om- nibus <i>add. sup.</i> <i>lin.</i>) officio com- munia, proprie tamen (haec <i>add.</i> <i>sup. lin.</i>) (118v)	Et cum sint omnibus commu- nia, proprie tamen haec (237)	Et cum sint officio com- munia, pro- prie tamen et (55)	Et cum sint omnibus communia, proprie (<i>p.c.</i>) tamen hec (98v)

H. Variant readings and critical signs that mirror collation
against two series

Etym. 6.16.13 (I.31): series B and D*

Schaffhausen Min. 42 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 231 (series C)	St. Gallen 233	Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 64
sicut a conventu co- etus, ita et concilium (sicut conventus et concilium <i>a.c. sup.</i> <i>lin.</i>) a societate multo- rum ÷in unum: (93v)	sicut con- ventus vel concilium a societate multorum in unum (103v)	sicut a con- ventu coetus ita et concil- ium a soci- etate multo- rum (198)	sicut a con- ventu (coventui <i>a.c.?</i>) coetus, ita et concil- ium a societate multorum (21)	sicut a con- ventu coetus, ita et concil- ium a soci- etate multo- rum (75v)

Etym. 12.1.52 (II.3): series D* and E*

St. Gallen 236 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 232 (series C)	St. Gallen 233	St. Gallen 235	Wolfen- büttel Weiss. 64	St. Gallen 237
qui fron- tem albam ÷calidi (al. calliti vel candidi <i>in marg. int.</i>). Cer- vinus est (33)	qui fron- tem albam calidi (al. calliti vel candidi <i>in marg. ext.</i>). Cer- vinus est (185r)	qui fron- tem albam calidi (al. calliti vel candidi <i>in marg.</i>). Cervinus est (43)	qui fron- tem album calliti. Cervinus est (94)	qui fron- tem album calliti. Cervinus est (14)	qui fron- tem album calliti. Cervi- nus est (173r)	qui fron- tem albam (album <i>a.c.</i>) calidi (calidam <i>a.c.</i>). Cer- vinus est (188)

Etym. 17.5.9 (II.63): series D* and E*

St. Gallen 236 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 232 (series C)	St. Gallen 233	St. Gallen 235	Wolfen- büttel Weiss. 64	St. Gallen 237
quod nomen parago- g÷orum: (um <i>add. sup. lin.</i>) dicitur (al. quod nomen per ramos circumducit- tur <i>add. in marg.</i>), quod a palma di- rivetur (184)	quod nomen paragogo- rum dicitur quod a palma dirivetur (quod palma delebitur <i>a.c.</i>) (250r)	quod nomen peragogum dicitur (al. quod nomen per ramos cir- cumducitur <i>add. sup. lin.</i>) quod a palma dirivetur (217)	–	quod nomen per ramos circum- ducitur quod a palma dirivetur (196)	quod nomen per ramos circum- ducitur quod a palma derivetur (270v)	quod nomen para- gogum dicitur, quod a palma dirivetur (274)

I. Errors in C stemming from an incorrect resolution of the collation

Etym. 15.3.2 (II.29)¹¹

St. Gallen 236 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 232 (series C)	St. Gallen 233	St. Gallen 235	Wolfen- büttel Weiss. 64	St. Gallen 237
Omne aedifitium ÷domus: antiqui aedem ap- pellaver- unt. (129)	Omne aedificium ÷domus: antiqui aedem apel- laverunt. (230r)	Omne aedificium est domus antiqui aedem ap- pellaver- unt. (157)	Omnem edificium antiqui edem ap- pellaver- unt. (206)	Omnem edifitium antiqui aedem ap- pellaver- unt. (139)	Omnem aedificium antiqui aedem ap- pellaverunt. (229r)	Omne edificium antiqui edem appel- laverunt. (243)

Etym. 16.4.30 (II.50)¹²

St. Gallen 236 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 232 (series C)	St. Gallen 233	St. Gallen 235	Wolfen- büttel Weiss. 64	St. Gallen 237
sed durior, gignitur in Egypto vel Arabia. ÷vi: nascitur in Aethiopia (151)	sed durior (duor <i>a. c.</i>), gignitur (in <i>add. sup. lin.</i>) Aegypto vel Arabia. (vi nascitur in Aethiopia <i>add.</i> <i>in marg. inf.</i>) (239r)	sed durior, gignitur in Egypto vel Arabia. est vi nascitur in Aethiopia (179)	–	sed durior, gignitur in Aegypto vel Arabia nascitur in Ethiopia (162)	sed durior, gignitur in Aegypto vel Arabia nascitur in Ethiopia (242r– 242v)	sed durior, in Egypto et Arabia nascitur in Ethiopia (255)

¹¹ An obvious example of a mistake made by the copyists of St. Gallen 232 due to misinterpreting the ÷ as an abbreviation for *est* rather than a critical *obelus*.

¹² The *est* in St. Gallen 232 is abbreviated with an ÷ and should be considered a mistake that crept in because of the misinterpretation of the *obelus* in St. Gallen 236.

Etym. 17.9.77 (II.75)

St. Gallen 236 (series A)	Titimallum vocabulum sumpsit, quod comam foliorum (florum a.c.) ad radium solis circumactam convertat. Nam Greci solem titan vocant, mallo-nem comam; ex quo confectum est, ut titimallum (al. tamallum in marg.) dicitur. +Nascitur in locis humectibus: Utilis in confectioe ad purganda onera ventris. Huius species septem in diversis locis nascentes. (210)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	Titimallus nascitur in locis humectibus utilis in confectioe ad purganda onera ventris. Huius species sunt septem sed diversis in locis nascentes. (259v)	St. Gallen 232 (series C)	Titimallum vocabulum sumpsit, quod comam foliorum ad radium solis circumactam convertat. Nam Greci solem titan vocant, mallo-nem comam; ex quo confectum est ut titimallum diceretur. Nascitur in locis humectibus. Utilis in confectioe ad purganda onera ventris. Huius species septem in diversis locis nascentes. (246)	St. Gallen 233	-	St. Gallen 235	Titimallum vocabulum sumpsit, quod comam foliorum ad radium solis circumacta convertat. Nam Greci solem titan vocant, mallo-nem comam; ex quo confectum est ut titimallum diceretur. Huius species septem diversis in locis nascentis. (223)	Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 64	-	St. Gallen 237	Titimallum vocabulum sumpsit, quod comam foliorum ad radium solis circumactam convertat. Nam Greci solem titan vocant, mallo-nem comam; ex quo confectum est ut timallum diceretur. Huius [sic!] species VII diversis in locis nascentes. (288)
---------------------------	---	---------------------------	---	---------------------------	---	----------------	---	----------------	--	------------------------	---	----------------	---

Etym. 19.29.5 (II.93)

St. Gallen 236 (series A)	et inpensa. Netum. ÷ Fila dicta vel quia ex pilis tenui- bus constant in modum pilorum. (al. Fila dicta vel quia ex pilis ani- malium sunt, vel quia laneficium filis tenuibus con- stat in modum pilorum quasi filorum <i>add.</i> <i>in marg. inf.</i>) Mataxa (261)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	et pensa. Fila dicta vel quia ex pilis tenuibus constant in- modum pilorum. Mataxa (280r)	St. Gallen 232 (series C)	et inpensa. Netum. Fila dicta vel quia ex pilis animalium sunt, vel quia laneficium filis tenuibus constat in modum pilo- rum quasi filo- rum. Fila dicta vel quia ex filis tenuibus con- stant in modum pilorum. Mataxa (306)	St. Gallen 233	-	St. Gallen 235	et inpensa. Netum. Fila dicta vel quod ex pilis animalium sunt, id est quasi florum. Mataxa (273)	Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 64	et inpensa. Netum. Fila dicta vel quod ex pilis animalium sunt, id est quasi filo- rum. Mataxa (305v)	St. Gallen 237	et inpensa. Netum. Fila dicta quod ex pilis an- imalium sunt, id est quasi filorum. Mataxa (316)
------------------------------	--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------	--	----------------	---	----------------	---	---------------------------	---	----------------	---

K. Variant readings and critical signs that mirror
the readings of St. Gallen 237 (because of the agreement
between St. Gallen 237 and series E*)

Etym. 15.9.3 (II.36)

St. Gallen 236 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 232 (series C)	St. Gallen 233	St. Gallen 235	Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 64	St. Gallen 237
unde fossae aut valles possunt repleri ÷ ab agregando: (ageregando <i>a.c.</i>). Agger proprie (137)	unde fossae aut valles (<i>ras.</i>) possunt repleri ÷ ab agregando: (ageregando <i>a.c.</i>). Agger proprie (233r)	unde fossae aut valles possunt repleri ab agregando. Agger proprie (165)	unde fosse aut valles possint recreari. Aggerem proprie (214)	unde fossae aut valles possint recreari. Aggerem proprie	unde fossae aut valles possint recreari. Aggerem propriae (234v)	unde fosse aut valles possunt repleri. Aggerem proprie (247)

Etym. 16.10.1 (II.55)

St. Gallen 236 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 232 (series C)	St. Gallen 233	St. Gallen 235	Wolfenbüttel Weiss. 64	St. Gallen 237
quam que ÷ fulvae sunt: (al. flavescunt <i>add. sup. lin.</i>) Illas enim (158)	quam quae fulvae sunt. Illas enim (241r)	quam quae fulvae sunt. Illas enim (187)	–	quam que flavae sunt. Illas enim (169)	quam quae flavae sunt. Illas enim (256r)	quam quae flavescunt. Illas enim (259)

L. St. Gallen 235 shows corrections from series A and B

Etym. 12.7.19 (II.11)¹³

St. Gallen 236 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 232 (series C)	St. Gallen 233	St. Gallen 235	Wolfen- büttel Weiss. 64	St. Gallen 237
Nautae vero sibi hunc bonam progno- siam facere dicunt (57)	Nautae vero sibi hunc ÷ bonum pro signo: (al. bonam prog- nosiam <i>add.</i> <i>sup. lin.</i>) facere dicunt (196r)	Naute vero sibi hunc bonam progno- siam facere dicunt (71)	Nauta vero sibi hunc bona prog- nosim facere dicunt (122)	Nauta vero sibi hunc bona pro signo (progno- sim <i>a.c.</i>) facere dicunt (50)	Nautae vero sibi hanc bona prog- nosim facere dicunt (188r)	Naute vero hanc bonam progro- siam facere dicunt (202)

Etym. 14.3.2 (II.20)¹⁴

St. Gallen 236 (series A)	Zofingen Pa 32 (series B)	St. Gallen 232 (series C)	St. Gallen 233	St. Gallen 235	Wolfen- büttel Weiss. 64	St. Gallen 237
ex Greco in Lat- inum vertitur ortus deli- ciarum: porro Ebraice Eden (89)	ex Greco in Lati- num ver- titur ortus ÷ deli- ciarum: porro Ebraice Eden (211r)	ex Greco in Lati- num verti- tur ortus: porro Ebrai- cae Eden (109)	ex Greco in Lati- num verti- tur ortus: porro Ebrai- cae Eden (158)	ex Greco in Lati- num ver- titur ortus (delicia- rum <i>add.</i> <i>sup. lin.</i>): porro Ae- braicae Eden (93)	ex Grego in Lati- num verti- tur ortus: porro Hebraice Eden (205v)	ex Creco in Lati- num ver- titur ortus (<i>p.c.</i>): porro Hebraice Eden (219)

¹³ The correction from *prognosim* to *pro signo* in St. Gallen 235 seems to have been carried out on the basis of Zofingen Pa 32.

¹⁴ The addition *deliciarum* in St. Gallen 235 seems to come either from St. Gallen 236 or Zofingen Pa 32.