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The following Addenda et Corrigenda, arranged according to the order of the original article (CTC 2.367–72), comprise additional material for the Fortuna, bibliography, and commentaries. The focus is primarily on a) glosses from the oldest tradition of commentary on Martianus, a tradition once attributed to Martin of Laon, and b) an eclectic commentary on De nuptiis found in two Cambridge manuscripts, a commentary known as the Anonymus Cantabrigiensis. New information is provided about the manuscripts, transmission, circulation, scribes, and influence of the oldest gloss tradition, as well as the sources of and exemplar behind the Anonymus Cantabrigiensis in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 153, part II, fols. 70r–85v and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 330, part II, fols. 1r–39v.

**FORTUNA**

p. 367a1. Add:  
Important for the study of Martianus Capella are Luciano Lenaz’s commentary on book II of De nuptiis (1975) and Danuta Shanzer’s on book I (1986). General studies on Martianus and aspects of his work are furnished by William H. Stahl (1971), Fanny Le Moine (1972), Valter Fontanella (1977, 1992), Romeo Schievenin (2009), and Chiara Tommasi Moreschini (2012). For Martianus Capella and the liberal arts tradition, see Sabine Grebe (1999), Muriel Bovey (2003), Shanzer (2005), and Andrew Hicks (2012).

p. 367b1. Add:
To the major contribution of Claudio Leonardi (1959–60) who provided a survey of Martianus manuscripts, we can add the research of Jean-G. Préaux (1978) on the oldest and principal manuscripts of De nuptiis and that of James Willis (1983) and Shanzer (“Felix Capella,” 1986) on the provision of a stemma for the text.

p. 368a. Add:

Since the publication of Lutz’s article in 1971 the traditional dating of Martianus’ work between 410 and 439 has been challenged. For a date in the late fifth century, see Shanzer (1986), and for the late fifth/early sixth century, see Grebe (2000), and Jarmila Bednaříková and Katarina Petrovićová (2010). The traditional dating continues to be accepted (e.g. by Jean-Yves Guillaumin, 2003).

p. 368a19. Add:

For a re-evaluation of the date of the subscription of Securus Melior Felix, see Alan Cameron (1986) who dates the work of Martianus’ first editor to 498 as against the original dating to 534.

p. 368a36–368b39. Add:

Silvestris and the Berlin commentary, and Christopher McDonough’s (2006) edition of Alexander Neckam’s commentary. In addition, Andrew Hicks plans to edit various twelfth-century commentaries. For the twelfth-century commentary tradition, see also Dronke (1974) and Hicks (2012).

p. 369a27. Add:


**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

p. 367a21–369a49. Add:


1. Martinus Laudunensis – Martin of Laon (s. IX)

p. 370a6. Add:

The earliest substantial evidence for the medieval reception of Martianus is the tradition of glosses originally attributed to Dunchad and subsequently to the famous Carolingian scholar Martin of Laon (the attribution of this tradition to Martin of Laon was originally proposed by Jean Préaux, “Le commentaire de Martin de Laon,” whose arguments were re-evaluated by John Contreni in CTC 3.451–52). This tradition, which predates the Carolingian commentaries of John Scottus Eriugena and Remigius of Auxerre, I call the oldest gloss tradition. The first of three major Carolingian efforts to expound Martianus, it influenced the other two and is sometimes found alongside glosses from the Eriugenan and Remigian commentaries. Transmitted anonymously, the format of the oldest gloss tradition was primarily as marginal and interlinear
annotations. The glosses, found mostly in manuscripts dating to the mid- or second half of the ninth century, circulated at a time when *De nuptiis* appears to have been readily available. By contrast, there are indications that Martianus was less well known in the first quarter of the ninth century (Anneli Luhtala, “On Early Medieval Divisions of Knowledge,” 98; Eastwood, *Ordering*, 179–80). Although there are no extant pre-Carolingian manuscripts transmitting the oldest gloss tradition, there is evidence for pre-Carolingian reception and transmission of Martianus, suggesting that the oldest gloss tradition was not generated in a vacuum. For example, not only is *De nuptiis* attested by Fulgentius, Cassiodorus and Gregory of Tours (Antès, “Témoignages précarolingiens,” 289–97), but a number of Carolingian manuscripts reflect the *scriptio continua* of the oldest exemplum (Préaux, “Les manuscrits principaux,” 76–128), and traces of a late antique format are perhaps found in one of the oldest extant Martianus manuscripts (Shanzer, “Felix Capella,” 66).

As for the transmission of the oldest gloss tradition, it was complex. In its current form, it is the product of accretion, mixture, corruption, correction and cross-fertilization (O’Sullivan, *Glossae*, xxv–xxxiv). Manuscripts transmitting the tradition moved around and acquired fresh glosses; multiple scribal hands are attested in the surviving manuscripts, sometimes working in tandem, sometimes drawing on different exemplars; and glosses from different gloss traditions cross-fertilized. The oldest gloss tradition is often transmitted alongside different layers of annotation from other gloss corpora. For instance, one often finds glosses from the oldest gloss tradition in a first layer of annotation side-by-side with contemporary and later accretions. Nevertheless, a discernible corpus of glosses exists, a corpus found in three main families of manuscripts (O’Sullivan, *Glossae*, cx), attesting to a continuous
tradition of glossing Martianus from perhaps as early as the first half of the ninth century (Teeuwen, “Secular Learning,” 39) to the tenth century.

The tradition began in Carolingian centers of intellectual life such as Auxerre, Fleury, Corbie, and Rheims. It was actively copied and distributed in the Loire valley, Central, Northeastern, and Eastern France in the second half of the ninth century, spread eastwards in the late ninth and early tenth centuries to the region Trier–Lorsch–Cologne and found itself in the Low Countries in the tenth and eleventh centuries (O’Sullivan, *Glossae*, cxviii–cxxxix). The spread of the tradition to St. Peter’s abbey in Ghent is demonstrated by the provenance of two of the manuscripts: Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 1987 and Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 88 (Adriaan Verhulst, “L’activité et la calligraphie,” 37–49). In the late tenth century, the tradition reached the abbey of Egmond in Holland. This is attested by a note of ownership in Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 87 stating that the manuscript was donated by Archbishop Egbert of Trier (977–93) to the abbey (Gumbert, “Egberts geschenken aan Egmond,” 25–43). There is some evidence that the tradition was copied further south: the neumes in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud. lat. 118 are identified as Aquitanian (Corbin, “Neumes,” 1–7) and a possession note in Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, IV. G. 68 provides a link with the abbey of St. Gall. Perhaps also the Hildebertus mentioned in Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Vossianus Latinus Folio 48 is the same Hildebertus whose name is recorded in the St. Gall memorial book dated to 818–20 (Teeuwen, “Secular

---

1 The tradition appears to have reached the Westphalian monastery of Liesborn via Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 133 Gud.lat. which transmits glosses similar to those found in Trier, Bibliothek des Bischöflichen Priesterseminars, 100 (though much fewer in number).
Learning,” 36–51). And the tradition found itself on insular soil by the late ninth or early tenth century (O’Sullivan, “Corpus Martianus,” 33–56).

On the basis of the surviving evidence, three major clusters of closely related manuscripts can be identified at (a) Auxerre–Tours–Fleury, (b) Corbie–Rheims and (c) Lorsch–Cologne (O’Sullivan, *Glossae*, cx–cxxix). Corbie appears to have been a relatively important distribution center providing an interesting parallel with the model of textual history for *De nuptiis* as furnished by Préaux, “Les manuscrits principaux,” 97. Manuscripts in the different clusters can be recognized by very similar sets of glosses which share identical wording, spelling, word order, omissions, additions, errors, and corrections. And it is not only the glosses which allow us to identify a specific family, but also the *signes de renvoi*, diagrams, and spelling of the Greek, as well as the textual emendations, variants, corruptions, and misplacements.

The oldest gloss tradition attracted the attention of major Carolingian scholars. John Scottus Eriugena and Remigius of Auxerre drew on it for their commentaries on Martianus. Heiric of Auxerre used the tradition in the third quarter of the ninth century in his copy of the *Liber glossarum* now in London, British Library, Harley 2735. This glossary, arranged alphabetically, contains an abridged version of the *Liber glossarum* together with glosses from the oldest gloss tradition and citations from *De nuptiis* (Ganz, “*Liber Glossarum* avec notes,” 42–43; David Ganz, “Heiric d’Auxerre,” 298). Haimo of Auxerre, the teacher of Heiric, appears also to have drawn on the tradition in his *Commentary on Paul’s Letter to the Galatians* (Eastwood, *Ordering*, 195). In addition, the tradition was used by the compilers of the *Scholica Graecarum glossarum*, who collected glosses on the unusual and rare words in Martianus (Lendinara, “The *Scholica graecarum glossarum* and Martianus Capella,” 301–62). Moreover, the tradition is found as an independent running
commentary in two manuscripts (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 12960 and Orléans, Médiathèque Municipale, 191) and as part of an eclectic commentary in another two (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 153 and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 330). The oldest gloss tradition, then, was a source for one major glossary (the Scholica), furnished additions to another (Liber Glossarum), influenced two Carolingian commentaries on Martianus (those of John Scottus Eriugena and Remigius), was found as a running commentary, and was incorporated into an eclectic commentary. The influence of the oldest gloss tradition is very much in line with the authoritative status of Martianus, reflected, for instance, in the appearance of all nine books of De nuptiis in many manuscripts in the ninth century (Leonardi, Aevum 33, 462–63) and the use of Martianus by scholars such as Hadoard in his classical florilegium (Beeson, “Collectaneum of Hadoard,” 204; Ganz, Corbie, 13–14, 149).

Twenty-four manuscripts transmitting the oldest gloss tradition have been identified. The first was discovered by Lutz and used in her edition (1944): Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 12960. In a series of articles (1953, 1956, 1959), Préaux added seven others: Besançon, Bibliothèque Municipale, 594; Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 87; Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 88; Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Vossianus Latinus Folio 48; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud. lat. 118; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 8670; and Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 1987. In an article (1959) and his census (1959–60), Leonardi identified six further manuscripts: Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, San Marco 190; St. Petersburg, National Library of Russia, Class.lat.F.V.10; Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, IV.G.68; Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 1535; Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 8501; and, with a question mark, Orléans, Médiathèque Municipale, 191. In
1967, Terence Bishop noted that numerous “Dunchad” glosses were found in two Cambridge manuscripts: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 153, part II and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 330, part II. McDonough (1974) demonstrated that Trier, Bibliothek des Bischöflichen Priesterseminars, 100 should be added to the list of manuscripts transmitting “Martin glosses.” Teeuwen (2002) identified five more manuscripts (some of which were listed by Lutz as having “unidentified glosses”): Chartres, Bibliothèque Municipale, 103 (only fragments survive); Cologne, Dombibliothek, 193; Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 36; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 8669, and Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 8671. O’Sullivan added three more (one of which was in Lutz’s list of “unidentified glosses”): Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 153, part I; London, British Library, Harley 2685 and Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 133 Gud.lat.

EDITIONS

p. 370a22. Add:

The first edition was by Cora Lutz (1944) and was based on a single incomplete manuscript witness which transmits glosses as a running commentary to the last section of book 2, all of book 4, and the first third of book 5. The next to edit the tradition was Mariken Teeuwen (2002) who, in her study of the *ars musica* in ninth-century commentaries on *De nuptiis*, edited the annotations on book 9, together with the musical material in books 1–2 based on eight manuscripts transmitting glosses from the oldest gloss tradition. Her printed edition was followed by an online edition based on a single, highly important manuscript witness, namely the Vossianus. A collaborative effort, this online edition was the brainchild of Teeuwen and provided a transcription of glosses on books 1–9 from the oldest gloss tradition as found in Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Voss. Lat. Folio 48.
In 2006, the printed editions of Lutz (1944) and Teeuwen (2002), along with the printed editions of other medieval commentaries and glosses (such as those of Eriugena and the School of Chartres), were reprinted with an Italian translation and supplied with introductions and commentary by Ilaria Ramelli. In 2010, O'Sullivan edited the glosses from the oldest gloss tradition on books 1–2, together with the opening glosses on book 3, based on all known extant manuscripts transmitting glosses from the oldest gloss tradition on books 1–2. Of the twenty manuscripts used, fourteen principal manuscripts were identified and six others, often sparsely glossed or containing a highly eclectic mix, were consulted as a means of comparison and to confirm readings.

**Manuscripts:**

p. 370a31–370b27. Add:


Cambridge, Corpus Christi Coll., 153, s. IX ex and s. X. This manuscript, in two parts, has glosses from the oldest gloss tradition in both sections. Originating in Wales and in England by the mid-tenth century, it has Latin glosses from the oldest gloss tradition in the original or Welsh portion and transmits an eclectic commentary on *De nuptiis* in the second part. The glosses in the original part demonstrate the spread of the oldest gloss tradition to Wales and England, highlighting Welsh-Continental and Welsh-English relations. Moreover, there are a number of striking
similarities between the Latin glosses in Corpus Christi College, 153, part I, and
glosses found in continental manuscripts originating in Fleury–Tours–Auxerre. The
original portion also transmits Welsh glosses and one of the hands writing Latin
glosses appears to have entered some of the vernacular annotations. In addition, the
Latin and Old Welsh glosses were part of the same scholarly exercise. The glosses in
the eclectic commentary draw on the oldest gloss tradition and the Eriugenian corpus
(O’Sullivan, “Corpus Martianus,” 33–56). The manuscript attests to (a) Welsh-
English relations in the ninth and tenth centuries and (b) English-Continental
relations, which were intensified by the spread of the Benedictine reform movement
in English ecclesiastical houses in the second half of the tenth century (Bishop,
“Corpus Martianus Capella,” 257–75; Budny, Insular, 1.109–18; Dumville, “English
Square Minuscule,” 137, 139; Dumville, Liturgy, 116–17; Huws, Medieval Welsh
Manuscripts, 11n, 38n, 121n; James, Descriptive Catalogue 1.344–46; Leonardi,
Aevum 34, 20–21; Lindsay, Early Welsh Script, 19–22; Lutz, CTC 2.371–72; McKee,
Cambridge Juvencus Manuscript, 4–5, 19, 38; O’Sullivan, “Corpus Martianus,” 33–
56; O’Sullivan, Glossae, xli–xlvi; Stokes, “Old-Welsh Glosses,” 385; Teeuwen,
Harmony, 49–51).

Cambridge, Corpus Christi Coll., 330, part II, s. IX ex. This manuscript, in
two parts, transmits an eclectic commentary which is very close to the one found in
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 153. Corpus Christi College, 330, part II reached
England at least as early as the end of the tenth century where it was bound with
Corpus Christi College, 330, part I, a late eleventh- or early twelfth-century
manuscript famous for the autograph glosses by William of Malmesbury (Bishop,
“Corpus Martianus Capella,” 257–75; Budny, Insular 1.737–41; James, Descriptive
Catalogue 2.153–54; Leonardi, Aevum 34, 22–23; Lutz, CTC 2.371–72; O’Sullivan,


Cologne, Dombibl., 193, s. X first half (Jaffé-Wattenbach, Codices, 81; Leonardi, Aevum 34, 60; Préaux, “Les manuscrits principaux,” 79; Bischoff, Katalog, vol. 1, no. 1944; Teeuwen, Harmony, 64, 66, 174, 310, 312; Mayr-Harting, Church and Cosmos, 68–69, 74, 195, 197–217, 220–23, 226–29; O’Sullivan, Glossae, xlvi–l).

Florence, Bibl. Medicea Laurenziana, San Marco 190, s. XI. This manuscript has no glosses on books 1–2 or 9. Examination of the glosses on book III reveals that it transmits annotations from the oldest gloss tradition (Leonardi, Aevum 34, 47–48; Teeuwen, Harmony, 66; O’Sullivan, Glossae, cxxxii). Some of its drawings are similar to those in a fifteenth-century manuscript found in Rome, BNC, S. Pant. 49 (Critelli and Niutta, I manoscritti classici latini, 59–62).


Naples, Bibl. Naz., IV.G.68, s. IX ex and s. X. This manuscript is a miscellany and transmits book IV of *De nuptiis* with some glosses from the oldest gloss tradition (Bergmann and Stricker, *Katalog*, vol. 3, no. 713, 1363–65; Bischoff, *Katalog*, vol. 2, no. 3574; Leonardi, *Aevum* 34, 412–14; Lutz, *Dunchad*, 60–62).


Paris, BNF, lat. 8671, s. IX ex or X in (Bischoff, Katalog, vol. 3, no. 4555; Eastwood, “Plato and Circumsolar Planetary Motion,” 11 n. 14; Leonardi, Aevum 34, 437–38; Mayr-Harting, Church and Cosmos, 198, 214, 216, 221; O’Sullivan, Glossae, lxxxvii–xcii; Préaux, “Les manuscrits principaux,” 79, 125; Teeuwen, Harmony, 86–87, 140–45; Willis, Martianus Capella, xiii).


Vatican City, BAV, Reg. lat. 1535, s. IX second half or third quarter (Bischoff, Katalog, vol. 3, no. 6782; Leonardi, Aevum 34, 469–70; O’Sullivan, Glossae, xciii–xcvi; Préaux, “Deux manuscrits gantois,” 18; Préaux, “Le manuscrit

Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 8501, s. XV. This miscellany has very few glosses from the oldest gloss tradition (Leonardi, Aevum 34, 479–80; O’Sullivan, Glossae, cxxxiii; Teeuwen, Harmony, 35).

St. Petersburg, Nat. Lib. of Russia, Class.lat.F.V.10, s. IXex or Xin (Dobias-Rozdestvenskaia, Histoire, 105; Ganz, Corbie, 154–55; Leonardi, Aevum 34, 69–70; O’Sullivan, Glossae, xcvi–ci; Préaux, “Un nouveau manuscrit,” 223 n. 9; Préaux, “Les manuscrits principaux,” 79, 121; Staerk, Les manuscrits latins, vol. 1, 220–22; vol. 2, pl. LXIX; Teeuwen, Harmony, 66; Willis, Martianus Capella, xiv–xv).


Bibliography:
p. 370b28. Add:

3. Anonymus Cantabrigiensis

p. 371b40. Add:
A sizeable running commentary on *De nuptiis*, known as the *Anonymus Cantabrigiensis*, survives in two manuscripts: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 153, part II (fols. 70r–85v) and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 330, part II (fols. 1r–39v). The commentary in Corpus Christi College, 153, part II, was copied in England, perhaps at St. Augustine’s Abbey, Canterbury, by an English scribe writing holograph Square minuscule of the middle or third quarter of the tenth century. From the pricking and ruling of the two parts of Corpus Christi College, 153, Bishop observed that the second section appears to have been designed from the outset to accompany the original membranes (Bishop, “Corpus Martianus Capella,” 274). Corpus Christi College, 330, part II, is a late ninth-century continental manuscript and seems to have been in England by the late tenth century. Bishop demonstrated that though the glosses in the two manuscripts are very close, Corpus Christi College, 153 is not a copy of Corpus Christi College, 330, but that both instead appear to have shared a common exemplar. He observed that this exemplar was continental, had Insular characteristics and suggested that it was probably from a “north French scriptorium resorted to by Irish scholars.” On the basis of a number of glosses, errors, textual variants, and diagrams, O’Sullivan demonstrated that this exemplar probably originated in a German rather than in a French center, which fits with other evidence

---

2 Two sections of Cambridge, Corpus Christi Coll., 153 have been attributed to the abbey: fols. 19–28 and 69–86. See Dumville, “English Square Minuscule Script,” 136–38. However, Bruce C. Barker-Benfield includes Corpus Christi Coll., 153 in his list of manuscripts for which the attribution to Canterbury is either rejected or remains speculative or unproven (see Barker-Benfield, *St Augustine’s Abbey*, vol. 3, 1822–23).

3 Bishop assigned fols. 69–86 to the “mid-tenth century” and to the “middle of the third quarter of the tenth century,” presumably a printing error for “middle or” (see Bishop, “Corpus Martianus Capella,” 257 and 267; and Dumville, “English Square Minuscule Script,” 137 n. 24).
for well-known Anglo-German relations in the tenth century (O'Sullivan, “Corpus Martianus,” 33–56). Since the eclectic commentary in Corpus Christi College, 330 seems not to have been the source for Corpus Christi College, 153, we can conclude that two copies of the *Anonymus Cantabriensis* had reached England from the Continent by the tenth century, namely, Corpus Christi College, 330, part II, and the exemplar behind the running commentary in Corpus Christi College, 153 and Corpus Christi College, 330.

The *Anonymus Cantabriensis* contains glosses drawn from a variety of different continental traditions of scholarly commentary on Martianus. In a footnote, Bishop outlined the sources of these glosses, stating that they include some glosses from John Scottus Eriugena, numerous glosses from “Dunchad,” many lexicographical glosses, and apparently none from the Remigian tradition. Analysis of the glosses reveals that most correspond with the Eriugenan tradition, but a fair number instead with the oldest gloss tradition and a few with the Remigian tradition. There are striking similarities between the glosses in the *Anonymus Cantabriensis* and the Eriugenan corpus as edited by Édouard Jeaneau from Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. T. 2. (O’Sullivan, “Corpus Martianus,” 33–56).

*Manuscripts:*

p. 372a14. Add:


_Bibliography:_

p. 372a22. Add: