

## ARS LAURESHAMENSIS

The *Ars Laureshamensis* is so called because its most important manuscript witness originated at Lorsch<sup>1</sup>. This lengthy *ars grammatica*, possibly the work of a ninth-century Irish *peregrinus* working in a Carolingian milieu<sup>2</sup>, takes the form of a commentary on Donatus's *Ars maior*, in three sections, each of which has a distinct transmission history: first, a brief preface and expansive commentary on Book II, *De partibus orationis*; next, commentary on Book I, beginning with *De voce*; and to conclude, commentary on Book III, beginning with *De barbarismo*<sup>3</sup>. As Vivien Law describes the *Ars Laureshamensis*, it is «text-oriented to a remarkable degree. The focus of attention is not the grammatical doctrine per se, but the way in which Donatus chose to express it»<sup>4</sup>.

Bengt Löfstedt produced a critical edition of the *Ars Laureshamensis* in 1977, based on ten manuscripts<sup>5</sup>. Preserving the order of the text in manuscript A, he prints the preface and commentary on Book II first, followed by Books I and III. Shortly after Löfstedt's edition appeared, Colette Jeudy reported the existence of two further manuscript witnesses (Er

1. The manuscript in question is Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. lat. 1754 (A); cfr. below for further discussion.

2. L. Holtz, *Sur trois commentaires irlandais de l'«Art majeur» de Donat au IX<sup>e</sup> siècle*, «Revue d'histoire des textes» 2 (1972), pp. 45-72: «L'origine irlandaise de ces trois textes [scil. the grammars of Murethach and Sedulius Scottus and the anonymous *Ars Laureshamensis*] est un point indubitable» (p. 45). M. Lapidge and R. Sharpe date the *Ars Laureshamensis* to the ninth century and list it under the heading *Dubia*, which they define as «authors and works of possible or arguable Celtic origin»: M. Lapidge - R. Sharpe, with foreword by P. Mac Cana, *A Bibliography of Celtic-Latin Literature 400-1200*, Dublin 1985, no. 1238, p. 328. V. Law considers the *Ars Laureshamensis* to be the work of an Irish *peregrinus*: cfr. *Grammar and Grammarians in the Early Middle Ages*, London-New York 1997, p. 144.

3. In the discussion below, I follow the established precedent of naming the books of the *Ars Laureshamensis* according to which book of the *Ars maior* they comment on, rather than according to the order in which they appear in the two complete manuscript witnesses (A and Er), in which Book II precedes Books I and III.

4. Law, *Grammar and Grammarians* cit., p. 144.

5. B. Löfstedt (ed.), *Ars Laureshamensis. Expositio in Donatum maiorem*, Turnhout 1977 (CCCM 40A). Holtz had already identified eight of these manuscript witnesses in his article *Sur trois commentaires* cit., which appeared in 1972. Holtz claimed that one further witness to Book III of *Ars Laureshamensis* was preserved in Napoli, Biblioteca Nazionale «Vittorio Emanuele III», IV.A.22, ff. 66r-90r, but Colette Jeudy and Bengt Löfstedt confirm that these folios actually preserve the closely related *Ars Brugensis*: cfr. C. Jeudy - Y.-F. Riou, *Tradition textuelle et commentaire des auteurs classiques latins conservés dans les manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Vaticane [I-III]*, in *La cultura antica nell'occidente latino del VII all'XI secolo*, Spoleto 1975, (Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi Sull'Alto Medioevo, 22), pp. 179-235, at 229; and Löfstedt (ed.), p. XII.

and R)<sup>6</sup>. Among the twelve known manuscripts, only two transmit all three books of the *Ars Laureshamensis*:

- A Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. lat. 1754 (s. X; Lorsch). The *Ars Laureshamensis* commentary on Book II appears first (ff. 1v-34v), followed by Book I (34v-45v) and Book III (45v-59v)<sup>7</sup>.
- Er Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Allgemeinbibliothek (*apud* Universitätsbibliothek), Amplon. 4° 46 (s. XII *in.*; Germany, probably near Lorsch)<sup>8</sup>. As in A, the *Ars Laureshamensis* commentary on Book II appears first (ff. 2r-29v), followed by Book I (29v-37v) and Book III (37v-47v).

According to Jeudy, Er is closely related to A, not only because these two manuscripts are the only ones known to transmit all three books in the same order, but also because in both manuscripts the same anonymous commentary on the *Partitiones* of Priscian appears immediately after the *Ars Laureshamensis*<sup>9</sup>. Löfstedt further claims that because Er is so similar to A and possibly descends directly from A, the omission of Er has little or no impact on the completeness of his critical edition<sup>10</sup>.

Each of the remaining manuscripts transmits only one or two of the three books of the *Ars Laureshamensis*<sup>11</sup>:

- B München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14488 (s. X-XI; possible origin in northern Italy; provenance St. Emmeram, Regensburg). *Ars Laureshamensis* Book II appears on ff. 1v-73v.
- C München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14737 (s. X; unknown origin; provenance St. Emmeram, Regensburg). *Ars Laureshamensis* Book I appears at ff. 92r-114v, followed by Book II at 114v-140v.
- D Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. XIII. 25 (4471) (s. XIII; Italy). This codex preserves *Ars Laureshamensis* Book III at ff. 57r-74r.

6. C. Jeudy, *Donat et commentateurs de Donat à l'abbaye de Ripoll au X<sup>e</sup> siècle (ms. Barcelone, Archivo de la Corona de Aragón, Ripoll 46)*, in *Lettres latines du Moyen Âge et de la Renaissance*, curr. G. Cambier - C. Deroux - J. Préaux, Brussels 1978, pp. 56-75.

7. Holtz, *Sur trois commentaires* cit., p. 55; Löfstedt (ed.), p. xi; B. Bischoff, *Lorsch im Spiegel seiner Handschriften*, München 1974, pp. 118-9.

8. Jeudy, *Donat et commentateurs* cit., p. 73 n. 25; B. Löfstedt, *Zwei weitere Handschriften mit der «Ars Laureshamensis»*, «Latomus», 39 (1980), pp. 418-20, at 418.

9. Jeudy, *Donat et commentateurs* cit., p. 73 n. 25.

10. Löfstedt, *Zwei weitere Handschriften* cit., p. 418; he supports his argument with a list of variant readings where A and Er agree against other manuscript witnesses.

11. This list combines data from Holtz, *Sur trois commentaires* cit., pp. 56-7, and Löfstedt (ed.), but all manuscript sigla follow Löfstedt.

- E Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 11277 (s. XIV; unknown origin). Book III of the *Ars Laureshamensis* appears on ff. 72r-87v.
- F Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, n.a.lat. 1073 (s. XI; unknown origin). Ff. 6v-32v transmit Book I of the *Ars Laureshamensis*<sup>12</sup>.
- H Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, n.a.lat. 909 (s. XV; Italy; provenance Collège des Jésuites d'Agen). A fragment of Book I of the *Ars Laureshamensis* is preserved at ff. 87r-95v<sup>13</sup>.
- J Firenze, Biblioteca Riccardiana 875 (s. XV ex.; Florence). This codex transmits *Ars Laureshamensis* Book I at ff. 77r-90r and Book III at 90r-111v<sup>14</sup>.
- K Gotha, Forschungs- und Landesbibliothek, Mbr. II. 126 (s. XII ex.; Germany?). Book III of *Ars Laureshamensis* appears on ff. 1r-24r<sup>15</sup>.
- P Perugia, Biblioteca Comunale Augusta B 56 (112) (s. XIV). Book III of *Ars Laureshamensis* is preserved on ff. 4r-8v.
- R Barcelona, Arxiu de la Corona d'Aragó, Diversos i Col·leccions, Ripoll 46 (s. X<sup>1</sup>). Ff. 51r-54v preserve the opening sections of Book II of *Ars Laureshamensis*<sup>16</sup>.

Löfstedt's edition foregrounds **A**, with folio numbers from **A** reported in the margins, and readings from other manuscripts reported in the *apparatus criticus*, with an emphasis on the testimony of **B** and **C**. When Löfstedt produced his edition, **A** was the only known witness to all three books of the *Ars Laureshamensis*. However, this was not the only factor in the decision to privilege **A**. Löfstedt argues that **A** preserves the best readings and the fewest superfluous words, and in those instances where Löfstedt prefers variant readings from **B** (for Book II) and **C** (for Books I and III) over the text of **A**, those preferred variants are generally not unique to **B** or **C**<sup>17</sup>.

A *stemma codicum* has not been constructed for the *Ars Laureshamensis*. Löfstedt's opinion is that contamination makes it impossible to discern clearly the lines of descent among the surviving codices. Nonetheless, he outlines groups of closely affiliated manuscripts. **A**'s closest relatives are **D** and **Er**;

12. This is Löfstedt's manuscript **F**, but Holtz assigns it the siglum **J** (*Sur trois commentaires cit.*, p. 55 n. 3).

13. The fragment ends with «non posuerit numerum», corresponding to p. 167, lines 30-1 in Löfstedt's edition. For the manuscript's Italian origin, cfr. C. Jeudy, *L'«Institutio de nomine, pronomine et verbo» de Priscien: manuscrits et commentaires médiévaux*, «Revue d'histoire des textes», 2 (1972), pp. 73-144, at 127-8.

14. This is Löfstedt's manuscript **J**, but Holtz assigns it the siglum **K** (*Sur trois commentaires cit.*, p. 55 n. 3).

15. For a brief discussion of **K** and **P**, cfr. Jeudy-Riou, *Tradition textuelle et commentaire cit.*, p. 228.

16. This fragment of Book II ends with «maximo pumilionum. Sepe idem», corresponding to p. 29, line 93 in Löfstedt's edition, after which multiple gatherings have been lost: cfr. Jeudy, *Donat et commentateurs cit.*, pp. 72-3.

17. Löfstedt (ed.), p. 12.

it is possible that **Er** descends directly from **A**, and although the same cannot be posited of **D**, Löfstedt indicates that they are so similar that **A** and **D** likely descend from a shared hyparchetype<sup>18</sup>. **J** and **P** also follow **A** closely at times. **C** is closely related to the late-medieval witness **E**<sup>19</sup>.

Manuscript **R**, attributed to the early tenth century, is challenging to place on the *Ars Laureshamensis* family tree. Its closest relative is **B**, but in some places, **R** agrees with **A** against **B**, leading to the conclusion that **R** cannot have descended directly from either **A** or **B**. Nor is it certain that **B** is older than **R**. Löfstedt leaves open the question of their relative age but confirms that even if **R** is older, **B** cannot be a direct descendant of **R**; more likely they share a common exemplar<sup>20</sup>.

The *Ars Laureshamensis* is, moreover, a close relative of three contemporary Latin grammars: the *Ars* of Murethach, the *Commentarium in Donati Artem maiorem* by Sedulius Scottus, and the *Ars Brugensis*. None of these four grammars served as a source for any of the others, but all four works borrowed extensively from a lost commentary that seems to have originated in Ireland in the early decades of the ninth century<sup>21</sup>.

Among Carolingian grammars, the *Ars Laureshamensis* has an unusually long transmission history, extending into the fifteenth century, in manuscripts **H** and **J**. In the late twelfth century, Paulus Camaldulensis borrowed material from the *Ars Laureshamensis*; in fact, Paulus's borrowings are so faithful to the *Ars Laureshamensis* that they permit Löfstedt to conclude that Paulus's exemplar was closely related to manuscript **B**<sup>22</sup>. Vito Sivo similarly concludes that either Paulus or an intermediary source was using a redaction of the *Ars Laureshamensis* that was circulating in northern Italy from the tenth century<sup>23</sup>.

LESLIE LOCKETT

18. Löfstedt (ed.), p. 14; Jeudy, *Donat et commentateurs* cit., p. 73 n. 25; Löfstedt, *Zwei weitere Handschriften* cit., p. 418.

19. Löfstedt (ed.), p. 14.

20. Jeudy, *Donat et commentateurs* cit., p. 73; Löfstedt, *Zwei weitere Handschriften* cit., pp. 419-20.

21. For an extended discussion of the interrelationship among these grammars, cfr. Holtz, *Sur trois commentaires* cit.; L. Holtz (ed.), Murethach (Muridac), *In Donati Artem maiorem*, Turnhout 1977 (CCCM 40), pp. LVI-LXI; and Löfstedt (ed.), pp. XII-XIV (with a *stemma* showing the relationship among Murethach, Sedulius, and the *Ars Laureshamensis* at p. XIII). In his edition of Murethach, Holtz explains his attribution of this lost Irish commentary to the period *ca.* 800 - *ca.* 830 (p. LXII). In *Grammar and Grammarians* cit., Law agrees with Holtz's dating at p. 144 but elsewhere assigns this lost commentary to the previous century (p. 59).

22. V. Sivo (ed.), *Il «Donatus» di Paolo Camaldolese*, Spoleto 1990, pp. 26-9 and 166-9; Löfstedt (ed.), p. xv. Here Löfstedt also clarifies that these are the same borrowings that were previously thought to depend on the *Ars* of Murethach.

23. Sivo (ed.), pp. 28-9.