

LESZEK MISIARCZYK
WNHiS UKSW, Warszawa

**THE TEXTS OF ST. JEROME, SEDULIUS SCOTTUS AND
BEDE THE VENERABLE IN PŁOCK AND MOSAN BIBLICAL
MANUSCRIPTS OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY.
AN ATTEMPT AT COMPARISON**

The archive of the diocese of Płock, the successor and inheritor of the medieval cathedral library as well as the archive of the cathedral and collegiate chapter of St. Michael in Płock and the archives of the consistory of Płock and Pułtusk contain numerous valuable handwritings¹. Out of the biblical manuscripts related to Płock, the famous *Złoty Kodeks Pułtuski* [*The Golden Manuscript of Pułtusk*] dating back to the eleventh century, currently maintained at the Princess Czartoryski Museum in Kraków as well as several other manuscripts from the twelfth century have been preserved to modern times. The latter group includes *Biblia Płocka* [*Bible of Płock*], *Ewangeliarz Księżnej Anastazji* [*Evangelary of Princess Anastasia*], *Perykopy Ewangeliczne* [*Evangelic Pericopes*], which contain fragments of gospel designed for celebrating liturgy on various days of the liturgical year as well as *Ewangelia Marka* [*The Gospel according to St. Mark*] with glossaries by Walahfrid Strabo and Anselm of Laon². As far as the existing studies are concerned, it has been suspected that all these manuscripts were brought to Płock during the governance of Bishop Alexander of Malonne (1129-1156) of the Meuse Riverland or Bishop Werner (1156-1170) or were created in a local scriptorium in the latter half of the twelfth century³. Undeniably during the governance of Bishop Alexander of Malonne, the ecclesiastical circles in Płock were experiencing terrific renaissance. While Alexander of Malonne remained in charge, Płock not only received biblical manuscripts or liturgical books, but some of them were probably locally copied for use in the cathedral and the newly established castle churches⁴. We know that it was Bishop Alexander who in 1144 consecrated the stone Romanesque cathedral erected upon his authority, located on the

¹ Cfr. M. Bershon, *Księgozbiór katedralny plocki*, Warszawa 1899; A. Vetulani, *Średniowieczne rękopisy Płockiej Biblioteki Katedralnej*, „Roczniki Biblioteczne”, 7/1963, issue3-4, p. 329; R. Knapiński, *Nieznaną odyseję plockich zabytków*, „Roczniki Humanistyczne”, 41/1993, issue4, pp. 41–59; W. Graczyk, *Biblioteka katedralna Płocka od średniowiecza do nowożytności*, in: Idem (editor), *Biblioteka Wyższego Seminarium Duchownego w Płocku*, Płock 2003, pp. 7-71; W. Graczyk-J.M. Marszalska, *Księgi rękopiśmienne i stare druki w zbiorach Biblioteki Wyższego Seminarium Duchownego w Płocku. Z dziejów kultury bibliotek kościelnych w dawnych wiekach*, Kraków 2010, pp. 25-36.

² Cfr. D. Majewski, *Zasób Archiwum Diecezjalnego w Płocku*, in: *Biblioteka Wyższego Seminarium Duchownego w Płocku*, pp. 155-170.

³ Cfr. W. Graczyk – J.M. Marszalska, op. cit., p. 88.

⁴ Cfr. Cz. Deptuła, *Krąg kościelny plocki w połowie XII wieku*, „Roczniki Humanistyczne”, 8/1960, issue2, pp. 5-122; Idem, *Aleksander z Malonne*, in: *Encyklopedia Katolicka*, vol. 1, Lublin 1973, col. 340; J. Drzymała,

Tumskie Hill in Płock, and commissioned the famous cathedral door cast from bronze in Magdeburg⁵. Although art historians have long been interested in the biblical manuscripts of Płock and have analysed their casings and ornamentation, there are no comparative studies examining the differences between the contents of the biblical scripts from Płock and the Meuse Riverlands. R. Knapiński⁶ conducted a comprehensive analysis of the ornamentation of the famous *Bible of Płock*, the silver cover of the *Evangelary of Princess Anastasia* became the subject matter of numerous studies and works⁷ and the miniatures in *Evangelic Pericopes* were analysed by P. Skubiszewski⁸. In this paper I would like to make a comparison between the biblical manuscripts of Płock and the Meuse Riverland manuscripts in hope that such a comparative analysis will provide us with additional arguments concerning the confirmation of the Mosan origin of the manuscripts or will enable us to debunk this theory. Perhaps such a comparative analysis will allow us to produce arguments for the existence of a scriptorium in Płock during the period of governance of Bishop Alexander as this issue is hotly debated by scholars. Of course we will be able to draw the final conclusions only after comparing the entirety of the biblical script preserved in the manuscripts from Płock with the contents of the Mosan manuscripts and it is prudent to hold the belief that such studies will be continued. This study has been carried out with a rather modest goal in mind. In this paper I wish to compare the contents of the letter of St. Jerome addressed to Pope Damasius and his introduction to four Gospels as well as the introductions by Sedulius Scottus and Bede the Venerable to the respective parts of the script preserved in the *Bible of Płock*, the *Evangelary of Princess Anastasia* and the *Gospel according to St. Mark* with the two Mosan manuscripts maintained at the University Library Archive in Liège: *Ewangeliarz Averboda [Evangelary of Averbode]* and the so called *Biblia Universa. Evangelic Pericopes* will be disregarded as this manuscript does not contain the entirety of texts but only selected evangelic pericopes for the liturgical year.

Before we proceed to the comparative analysis of the indicated texts we shall briefly recall the most important conclusions drawn from the existing studies concerning the subject matter. It is assumed that the *Bible of Płock* was created in the second quarter of the century in one of the Mosan scriptoria in Leodium, Gembloux or in the very Malonne⁹.

Działalność fundacyjna biskupa Aleksandra z Malonne, „Nasze Historie”, 3/1998, pp. 37-69; M. Gębarowicz, *Aleksander (departed in 1156) Bishop of Płock*, PSB vol. 1 (1935) vol. 65-66.

⁵ Cfr. R. Knapiński, *Credo Apostolorum w romańskich Drzwiach Płockich*, Płock 1992; Idem, *Porta Fidei – Brama wiary. Romańskie Drzwi Płockie w Nowogrodzie Wielkim*, Płock 2012; Idem, *Uniwersalny charakter sztuki polskiej na przykładzie diecezji płockiej w czasach biskupa Aleksandra z Malonne (1129-1156)*, in: *Fundamenty średniowiecznej Europy*, editor Ż. Sztylec, D. Zagórski, A. Radziwiński, R. Biskup, Pelplin 2013, pp. 285-296.

⁶ Cfr. R. Knapiński, *Iluminacje romańskiej Biblii Płockiej*, Lublin 1993.

⁷ Cfr. T. Mroczo, *Czerwińsk romański*, Warszawa 1972, pp. 47-52; Idem, *Polska sztuka przedromańska i romańska*, Warszawa 1988, p. 55nn; B. Paszkiewicz, *O matce Lestka Bolesławica i początkach mniactwa mazowieckiego*, „Przegląd Historyczny”, 92/2001, pp. 1-14; K. Askanaz, *O niektórych zabytkach rzemiosła artystycznego epoki romańskiej w Płocku*, „Notatki Płockie”, 13/1968, pp. 28-33; Idem, *Srebrna okładka Ewangeliarza księżnej Anastazji*, „Notatki Płockie”, 34/1989, pp. 7-18.

⁸ Cfr. P. Skubiszewski, *La décoration des manuscrits Płock 140 et Gniezno 110 Saint-Laurent de Liège et la Pologne*, in: *Clio et son Regard. Mélanges offerts à Jacques Stiennon à l'occasion de ses vingt-cinq ans d'enseignement à l'Université de Liège*, editor R. Lejeune – J. Deckers, Liège 1982, pp. 615-637.

⁹ Cfr. Wł. Semkowicz, *Paleografia łacińska*, Kraków 2011, pp. 293-295; St. Sawicka, *Les Principaux manuscrits à peintures de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Varsovie, du Château Royal e des Bibliothèques: Des Zamoyski à Varsovie, du Séminaire de Płock ed du Chapitre de Gniezno*, „Bulletin de a Société Francias de reproduction des Manu-

Since the *Bible* mentions two instances of miracles which occurred in the cathedral in Płock in 1148¹⁰ it is assumed that the Bible had been already present in Płock prior to this date or, possibly, as early as during the consecration of the new cathedral in 1144. According to certain researchers, those records, as well as the annotation concerning custodian Azon and scholar Zacharias, indicate that a scriptorium and a cathedral school existed at that time in Płock. Thus it is suspected that the *Bible* was created in Płock in a local scriptorium or at least was illuminated there by the Benedictines who had come to Płock from the areas surrounding the Meuse River¹¹. The opponents of such a hypothesis emphasise that the notes were made in a rather primitive handwriting and the sheet on which they were inscribed was added later and thus it cannot be considered the evidence of the existence of a professional scriptorium in Płock at that time and that the *Bible* would have been brought from abroad, most probably from the area of the Meuse Riverland, and the manuscript would only have been illuminated locally and certain additions would have been made¹². R. Knapieński, who was the only researcher to analyse *the Bible* from both the codicological point of view and in respect of the ornamentation, drew another conclusion: the *Bible* contains two types of miniature paintings, the professional miniature paintings created in the Meuse River region and the rather simple additions created locally in Płock. In his opinion the entirety of the biblical text, the large part of initials and some of the miniature paintings had been created before the manuscript was brought to Płock whereas in Płock the remaining pages were illuminated and the famous annotations concerning the miracles, the description of the Good Friday cathedral liturgy and the commentary by Augustine were added and certain miniature paintings were made in a small, local scriptorium¹³. Such a hypothesis assumes that some scriptorium existed in Płock by the middle of the twelfth century although not as professional as those in the west of Europe at that time. Notwithstanding that, the subject matter of the existence of a scriptorium in Płock remains open.

Some researchers connect the *Evangelary of Princess Anastasia* with the person of Bishop Alexander¹⁴ whereas others suspect that it was brought to Płock by Bishop Werner

screts à Peintures", 19/1938, p. 234n; R. Knapieński, *Biblia Płocka. Wiedza o rękopisie w świetle dotychczasowych badań*, „Studia Płockie”, 18/1990, pp. 237-255; Idem, *Iluminacje romańskiej Biblii Płockiej*, Lublin 1993, p. 26.

¹⁰ Cfr. Z. Kozłowska-Budkowa, *Płockie zapiski z 1148 r.*, „Roczniki Humanistyczne”, 44/1930, pp. 341-348; D. Brzeziński-B. Leszkiewicz, *Zapiski liturgiczne w kodeksie Biblii Płockiej z TWELFTH wieku. Studium źródłoznawcze i edycja tekstu*, Płock 2005, as they themselves indicate on page 6 they have included the edition by Z. Kozłowska-Budkowa without reading the text anew. For the new reading of the text and their new translation to Polish language see: L. Misiarczyk, *Zapiski o cudach z 1148 roku w Biblii Płockiej*, ABMK 104 (2015) pp. 189-201.

¹¹ Cfr. F. Kopera, *Dzieje malarstwa w Polsce. Średniowieczne malarstwo w Polsce*, vol. 1, Kraków 1925, p. 18; M.żBershon, *Księgozbiór katedralny płocki*, Warszawa 1899; A. Vetulani, *Średniowieczne rękopisy Płockiej Biblioteki Katedralnej*, „Roczniki Biblioteczne”, 7/1963, issue 3-4, p. 329; W. Góralski, *Kapituła katedralna w Płocku XII-XVI w. Z dziejów organizacji prawnej kapitul polskich*, Płock 1979.

¹² Cfr. Z. Kozłowska-Budkowa, *Płockie zapiski z 1148 r.*, „Roczniki Humanistyczne”, 44/1930, pp. 341-348; St. Sawicka, *Les Principaux manuscrits à peintures de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Varsovie, du Château Royal e des Bibliothèques: Des Zamoyski à Varsovie, du Séminaire de Płock ed du Chapitre de Gniezno*, „Bulletin de a Société Francias de reproduction des Manuscrits à Peintures”, 19/1938, p. 234n., M. Morełowski, *Związki artystyczne i kulturalne pomiędzy Polską a krajami położonymi nad Mozą i Sekwaną*, Wrocław 1963; Wł. Semkowicz, *Paleografia lacińska*, p. 293-295; M. Waliński, *Wyposażenie artystyczne dworu i kościoła*, in: Idem (editor), *Sztuka polska przedromańska i romańska do schyłku XII wieku*, vol. 1, Warszawa 1971, pp. 249-303.

¹³ Cfr. R. Knapieński, *Biblia Płocka. Wiedza o rękopisie w świetle dotychczasowych badań*, „Studia Płockie”, 18/1990, pp. 237-255; Idem, *Iluminacje romańskiej Biblii Płockiej*, Lublin 1993, p. 203-211.

¹⁴ Cfr. Wł. Semkowicz, op. cit., p. 294.

during his 1161 journey to the court of Friedrich I Barbarossa¹⁵. According to Długosz, Anastasia was supposed to be the daughter of Wsiewłod, Prince of Nowogród, also known under her Slavonic name Wierzchosława, who was married to Bolesław Kędzierzawy and died in 1158 (and most certainly sometime after 1148) and the *Evangelary* was to be a votive offering presented in the intention of her salvation to the monastery of Regular Canons in Czerwińsk. The third manuscript is *The Gospel according to St. Mark* with a commentary. A. Birkenmajer dates the covers of this manuscript to approx. 1150 and Nowowiejski and Vetulani agree with his judgement. Although it is assumed that the manuscript comes from the first half of the twelfth century from the area of the northern France¹⁶, such conjectures are not supported by any concrete and credible palaeographic or codicological research which is absolutely essential because the lettering of the Gospel text is not the Carolingian minuscule characteristic for the first half of the twelfth century but rather the uncial script which would indicate that the manuscript originates from the end of the twelfth or the beginning of the thirteenth century. The issue of the origins of the manuscript remains unresolved. Thus we can observe that the conclusions drawn during the study of the biblical manuscripts from Płock were not preceded by detailed codicological or palaeographic analyses but were simply based on the general historical knowledge. Various researchers propagate and repeat the general conclusions proposed by others and do not contribute to the discussion. The twelfth century biblical manuscripts from Płock still await such a thorough analysis without which it will be impossible to make progress with the research.¹⁷

Speaking of the manuscripts from the Meuse River region – the *Evangelary of Averbode*, filed under number 363 in the collection of manuscripts of the University Library in Liège, measuring 277 mm by 192 mm, was written in the Romanesque minuscule and is dated to years 1150-1175. It was created and maintained in the Premonstratensians Abbey in Averbode established in approx. 1130 and still exists until today¹⁸. In turn the so called *Biblia Universa*, existing as two volumes filed under numbers 224 and 225, is suspected to have been created in the Abbey of St. Trudonis as clearly indicated by the fifteenth century record: *Iste liber pertinet venerabili monasterio Sancti Trudonis*. The first volume contains the books of the Old Testament from the Book of Genesis up to the Book of Minor Prophets and is supposed to have been created in 1120 whereas the second volume includes the remaining books of the Old Testament and the entirety of the New Testament and was written down in 1167. We are able to precisely date the *Biblia Universa* as the manuscripts include a historical note containing the exact dating of the book. On the verso of the first page of the first volume we can read: *Scriptus est hic liber sub Rudolpho abbate sub annum MCXVIII ut ex fine colligitur* and the verso of the first page of the second volume contains the following inscription: *Scriptus sub Rodulpho abbate ut ex fine tomi praecedentis colligitur, sub anno MCXVIII*. The manuscript measures 405 mm by 327 mm and was written down by a skilled copyist in the Romanesque

¹⁵ Cfr. T. Mroczo, *Czerwińsk romański*, pp. 47-52.

¹⁶ Cfr. W. Graczyk-J.M. Marszalska, *Księgi rękopiśmienne i stare druki w zbiorach Biblioteki Wyższego Seminarium Duchownego w Płocku. Z dziejów kultury bibliotek kościelnych w dawnych wiekach*, p. 84.

¹⁷ Cfr. A. Birkenmajer, *Die nächsten Aufgaben bei der Erforschung der Frühgeschichte des gepressten Ldereinbandes im Christlichen Europa*, „Jahrbuch der Einbandkunst“, 1/1927, p. 13n; A.J. Nowowiejski, *Płock. Monografia historyczna*, Płock 1930, p. 450; A. Vetulani, *Średniowieczne rękopisy płockiej biblioteki katedralnej*, p. 415.

¹⁸ Cfr. W. Petke, *Provenienz und Datierung des Evangeliers von Averbode*, *Scriptorium* 33 (1979) pp. 206-218.

minuscule script. Both volumes contain the miniature paintings characteristic for the twelfth century art from the Meuse River region.¹⁹

The arrangement of the introductions by St. Jerome, Sedulius Scottus and Bede the Venerable is very similar in all the discussed manuscripts, although the manuscripts from Plock are lacking to include certain texts. The *Evangelary of Averbode* is the most complete and contains the following titles: *Beatissimo pape Damaso Iheronim[us]*, *Prologus quattuor ev[an]geliorum*, *Eusebi[us] Carpiano Fr[at]ri in D[omi]no Sal[ute]*, *Iheronimus Damaso pap[a]e*, *Incipit Argument[um] s[e]c[un]d[u]m Mathe[um]*, *Explicit Argumentum*, *Incipit Breviarium Eiusde[m]*, followed by the *Canons of Eusebius and the script of the Gospel according to St. Matthew*, *Explicit liber s[an]c[t]i evangelii s[e]c[un]d[u]m Mathe[um]*, *Incipit Prolog[us] in Marco*, *Explicit argumentum*, *Incipit breviari[um]*, the *script of the Gospel according to St. Mark*, *Explicit ev[an]geli[um] secundum Marcum*, no title available, *Explicit argumentu[m] secundum Lucam*, *Incipit capitula*, the *script of the Gospel according to St. Luke*, *Explicit Evangelium secundum Lucam*, *Incipit Prolog[us] s[e]c[un]d[u]m Iohannem*, *Explicit Prolog[us] s[e]c[un]d[u]m Iohannem*, *Incipit Breviarium s[e]c[un]d[u]m Iohannem*, the *script of the Gospel according to St. John*.

In the *Biblia Universa* we can find the following titles: *Explicit prefatio hieronimi pr[es]b[ite]ri in ev[an]g[e]l[i]o incipit prim[um]*, which contains the text of the letter from Eusebius to Karpianus, *prefatio ii* which corresponds to *Beatissimo pape Damaso Iheronim[us]*, text in the *Evangelary of Averbode* and *Incipit P[re]phatio S[an]c[t]i Iheronimi Pr[es]b[ite]ri i In Libro Quattuor Evvangelior[um]*. *beatissimo papa damaso* from the *Bible of Plock*, item *argumentum* is equated with the *Prologus quattuor ev[an]geliorum* whereas *P[re]phatio ev[an]g[e]l[i]i s[e]c[un]d[u]m mathev[m]* is the text identified by *Argument[um] s[e]c[un]d[u]m Mathe[um]*, *explicit pr[ae]fationes*, that is anticipated in other sources, the entirety of the *Canons of Eusebius* and the *table of contents* are missing but the work includes a different text describing the *St. Trudonis Monastery* followed by the *script of Gospel according to St. Matthew*, *Incipit Prolog[us] s[e]c[un]d[u]m Marcum*, *epliciti prefatio*, *incipiunt capitula*, *eplicivnt capitula*, the *Gospel according to St. Mark*, *Explicit ev[an]geli[um] secundum Marcum*, *incipit Prolog[us] in ev[an]g[e]l[i]o s[e]c[un]d[u]m lucam*, *explicit prologus*, *sequuntur capitula*, *explicitvnt capitula*, the *Gospel according to St. Luke* *Explicit Evangelium secundum Lucam*, *p[re]f[ati]o ev[an]g[e]l[i]i s[e]c[un]d[u]m iohannem*, *explicit praefatio*, *incipiunt capitula ev[an]g[e]l[i]i s[e]c[un]d[u]m iohannem*, *explicitvnt capitula*, the *Gospel according to St. John*.

The *Bible of Plock* includes only the following titles: *Incipit P[re]phatio S[an]c[t]i Iheronimi Pr[es]b[ite]ri In Libro Quattuor Evvangelior[um]*. *beatissimo papa damaso*, the contents of which exactly correspond with the letter of St. Jerome titled *Beatissimo pape Damaso Iheronim[us]*, *explicit p[re]phatio*, *incipit prolog[us] in iiiior evvangeliorum* exactly as in the *Evangelary of Averbode* whereas the *letter of Eusebius to Karpian* and the third letter by St. Jerome are missing; they are followed by *explicit prolog[us]*, *incipit argument[um] s[e]c[un]d[u]m Mathe[um]*, *Explic[it] Argum[en]tv[m]*, *Incipit Breviarium*

¹⁹ Cf. J. Stiennon, *Documents inédits sur l'organisation domaniale de l'abbaye de Saint-Trond au XIIe siècle*, Bulletin de la Commission royale d'histoire, 114 (1949) pp. 172-173; Idem, *Du lectionnaire de Saint-Trond aux Evangiles d'Averbode: contribution à l'étude de la miniature Mosane au XIIe siècle*, in: *Scriptorium*, Gand 1953, pp. 42-43; M.R. Lapière, *La lettre ornée dans les manuscrits Mosans d'origine bénédictine (XIe-XIIE siècles)*, Liège 1981, pp. 202-204, pp. 206-215.

Ei[us]de[m], The Canons of Eusebius and the script of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, *Explic[it] Ev[an]g[e]liu[m] s[ecundum] Math[eu]m, Incip[it] Prolog[us] In Ev[an]g[e]lio S[ecundum] Marcu[m], Explic[it] Prolog[us], incipiunt cap[i]t[ul]a, expliciunt cap[i]t[ul]a*, the script of the Gospel according to St. Mark, *Incipit Prolog[us] s[ancti] ev[an]g[e]lii s[ecundum] lucam, explicit p[ro]logus, incipiunt cap[i]t[ul]a*, the script of the Gospel according to St. Luke, *Incip[it] p[re]p[h]ati[o] in ev[an]g[e]lio s[ecundum] iohanne[m]*, the script of the Gospel according to St. John.

The *Evangelary of Princess Anastasia* includes *Incip[it] P[re]p[h]atio S[an]c[t]i Iheronimi P[re]s[b]iteri In Libro Quattuor Evvangelior[um] Beatissimo pape Damaso Iheronim[us], explicit p[re]p[h]atio, incipit prologvs*, just as in the case of the *Bible of Plock*, the *Letter of Eusebius to Karpian* and the third text of St. Jerome are missing; they are followed by *explic[it] p[ro]log[us], Incipit argumentum* without the annotation indicating St. Matthew, *Explicit argumentum, Incipiunt capitula*, and the Canons of Eusebius and the script of Gospel according to St. Matthew up to chapter 18, verse 9. The remaining part of the Gospel according to St. Matthew is missing just like the introduction to and the script of the Gospel according to St. Mark and the introduction to the Gospel according to St. Luke; the Gospel according to St. Luke has been preserved partially, from chapter 7, verse 34 onwards. Whereas page 95 of the manuscript has the same contents as the *Bible of Plock*: the introduction to the Gospel according to St. John and the *capitula*, also missing the title, followed by the script of the Gospel according to St. John.

On the other hand the Gospel according to St. Mark does not include the title in the beginning or in the end of the introduction. Comparing all the titles we can clearly observe that they were treated rather freely by copyists who used *prefatio, prologus* and *argumentum*, as well as *breviarium* and *capitula* interchangeably. The manuscripts from the Meuse River area, the *Evangelary of Averbode* in particular, are of better quality, also in terms of aesthetics, and contain more cohesive transcription: where the term *prologus* was used in the title of the introduction, the same term was also used in the conclusion. It may indicate that the manuscripts from Plock were created in a less refined, local scriptorium although they were written down by the copyists from the Meuse River region.

The texts contained in the *Evangelary of Averbode* were used for the purpose of the comparison as it is the most complete source and the differences in the remaining manuscripts were indicated in references.

BEATISSIMO PAPE DAMASO IHERONIM[US]²⁰

NOVUM OPUS facere me cogis ex vetere ut post exemplaria scripturar[um] toto orbe disp[er]sa quasi quidam arbiter sedeam et quia inter se uariant qu[a]e sint illa qu[a]e cum greca consenciant²¹ veritate decernam. Pius labor s[ed] periculosa p[re]su[m]ptio²² iudicare de c[a]

²⁰ *The Bible of Plock* (hereinafter BP) has an expanded title: INCIPIT P[RE]P[H]ATI[O] S[ANCTI] IHERONIMI P[RE]S[B]ITERI IN LIBRO QUATUOR EV[AN]G[E]L[I]ORU[M]. BEATISSIMO PAPA DAMASO IHERONIM[US]; *The Evangelary of Princess Anastasia* (hereinafter EA) has the same title as *The Bible of Plock*: INCIPIT P[RE]P[H]ATI[O] S[ANCTI] IHERONIMI P[RE]S[B]ITERI IN LIBRO IIII-OR EV[AN]G[E]L[I]ORU[M]. BEATISSIMO PAPA DAMASO IHERONIM[US]; *Biblia Universa* (hereinafter BU) is titled: PREFATIO II.

²¹ EA, BP and BU consentiant.

²² BP consumptio. An explicit mistake of a copyist.

eteris ipsum ab om[n]ib[us] iudicandum senis mutare linguam et conescente[m]²³ mundu[m] ad inicia²⁴ retrahere²⁵ paruulor[um]. Quis eni[m] doctus partier uel indoctus cu[m] in manus²⁶ uolume assumpserit²⁷ et a²⁸ saliu[m] qua[m] semel inibit uiderit discrepare q[uo]d lectitat non statim erumpat in uocem me falsariu[m]²⁹ me clamans³⁰ esse sacrilegum qui audea[m] aliquid in ueterib[us] libris addere, mutare, corrigere? Aduersus quam inuidiam duplex causa me consolatur: q[uo]d et tu q[ui] sum[us]³¹ sacerdos es fieri³² iubes et uerum non esse q[uo]d uariat etia[m] maledicor[um] testimonio comp[ro]bat[ur]. Si enim latinis exemplarib[us] fides est adhibenda, respondeant quib[us]³³ tot s[un]t exemplaria pene quot codices³⁴. Sin aute[m] ueritas est querenda de plurib[us] cur non ad grecam originem reuertentes ea qu[a] e uel a uiciosis³⁵ interp[re]tib[us] male edita uel a p[re]su[m]ptorib[us] inperitis³⁶ emendata p[er]uersius uel a librariis dormitantib[us] aut addita sunt aut mutata corrigimus?³⁷ Neq[ue] uero ego de uetere disputo testa[m]ento quod a septuaginta³⁸ seniorib[us] in grecam linguam uersum tercio³⁹ gradu ad nos usq[ue] p[er]uenit. Non⁴⁰ quero q[ui]d aquila q[ui]d sýmmachus sapiant, quare theodocion⁴¹ inter nouos et ueteros medius incedat; sit illa uera interp[re]tatio qua[m] ap[osto]li p[ro]bauer[un]t. De nouo nunc loquor testamento, q[uo]d grecum esse non dubium est, excepto ap[osto]lo matheo qui prim[us] in iudea euangelium xpi hebraicis litteris edidit. Hoc certe⁴² cum in n[ost]ro sermone discordat et diu[er]sos⁴³ riuulorum tramites ducit uno, de fonte querendum⁴⁴ est. Pretermitto eos codices quos a luciano et esýcio⁴⁵ nuncupatos paucor[um] hominu[m] asserit peruersa contentio, quib[us] utiq[ue] nec in uetere⁴⁶

²³ EA and BP canescentem iam.

²⁴ BU and BP initia.

²⁵ BP trahere.

²⁶ EA and BP manu sua.

²⁷ BP adumpserit.

²⁸ BP *om.*

²⁹ BP fallarium. An explicit mistake of a scribe who had mistaken the *s* letter with *i*.

³⁰ EA and BP clamitans.

³¹ BU and BP summus.

³² EA and BP si fieri.

³³ EA and BP + enim.

³⁴ BP tot sunt pene exemplaria quot codices.

³⁵ BU and BP uitiosis.

³⁶ EA and BP imperitis.

³⁷ EA and BP only have emendata corrigimus. A part of the text contained in the Evangeliary of Averbode and BU is missing: *peruersius uel a librariis dormitantibus aut addita sunt aut mutata*

³⁸ BU has LXX.

³⁹ BU tertio.

⁴⁰ BU Nam.

⁴¹ BU and BP Theodotion.

⁴² EA and BP certe + quod.

⁴³ EA in diuersos; BU uarios.

⁴⁴ BU querendus.

⁴⁵ BU [a]jesichio.

⁴⁶ BU and BP ueteri.

instrumento⁴⁷ post septuaginta⁴⁸ interp[re]tes emendare qui⁴⁹ licuit nec in nouo p[ro]fuit emendasse cum multar[um] gentium⁵⁰ linguis sc[ri]ptura ante translata doceat falsa esse qu[a]e⁵¹ addita sunt. Igit[ur] h[ab]ec⁵² p[re]sens p[re]fatiuncula⁵³ pollicet[ur] quattuor tantu[m] [a] eu[an]g[e]listas quor[um] ordo iste est mattheus marcus lucas iohannes, codicum grecor[um] emendata⁵⁴ collatione⁵⁵ s[ed]⁵⁶ ueterum qu[a]e ne multu[m]⁵⁷ a lectionis latin[a]e consuetudine discreparent, ita calamo imperauim[us]⁵⁸ ut his tantu[m] qu[a]e sensum uidebant[ur] mutare correctis, reliqua manere paterem[ur] ut fuerant. Canones quoq[ue] quos eusebius cesariensis eps⁵⁹ alexandrin[us] secutus ammoniu[m] in decem numeros ordinauit, sicut in greco habentur expressim[us], quo si quis de curiosis uoluerit nosse qu[a]e in eu[an]g[e]l[is] uel eadem uel uicina uel sola sint, eor[um] distinctione⁶⁰ cognoscat. Magnus siquidem⁶¹ hic in n[ost]ris codicib[us] error inoleuit, dum q[uo]d in eade[m] re alius eu[an]g[e]lista plus dixit, in alio quia minus putauerin[t]⁶² addiderun[t]; uel dum⁶³ eundem sensum alius aliter expressit, ille qui unum e quattuor p[ri]mum legerat, ad eius exempl[um] ceteros quoq[ue] estimauerit emendandos. Vnde accidit ut apud nos mixta sint om[n]ia, et in marco plura luc[a]e atq[ue] mathei, rursum in matheo iohannis et marci, et in c[eteris] reliquor[um] qu[a]e in aliis p[ro]pria sunt inueniant[ur]. Cum itaq[ue] canones legeris qui subiecti sunt, confusionis errore sublato et similia omniu[m] scies et singulis sua qu[ae]q[ue] resititues. In canone p[ri]mo concordant quattuor, math[eu]s marcus lucas ioh[anne]s; in s[ecun]do tres, math[eu]s marcus lucas, in tercio⁶⁴ tres, math[eu]s lucas ioh[anne]s, in quarto⁶⁵ tres, mathe[us] marcus ioh[anne]s, in q[ui]nto duo, math[eu]s lucas, in sexto duo, math[eu]s marcus, in septimo duo, math[eu]s ioh[anne]s, in octauo duo, lucas marcus; in nono duo, lucas ioh[anne]s; in decimo p[ro]pria usq[ue] usq[ue], qu[a]e n[on] habent[ur] in aliis, ediderunt. Singulis uero [a]eu[an]g[e]l[is] ab uno incipiens usq[ue] ad fine[m] libror[um] dispar numerus increscit. Hic nigro colore p[re]scriptus sub se habet alium⁶⁶ ex mineo⁶⁷ numeru[m] discolorem, qui ad decem usq[ue] p[ro]cedens indicat, p[ri]or numerus in quo sit canone required[us]. Cum ig[itu]r

⁴⁷ A mistake of a copyist. EA includes the correct phrase *testamento*; BU and BP instrumento.

⁴⁸ BU and BP have LXX.

⁴⁹ EA and BP quid.

⁵⁰ BU and BP gentium.

⁵¹ BP quod.

⁵² BP hoc.

⁵³ BP prefaciuncula.

⁵⁴ EA emendata codicum grecorum; BP codicum grecorum emendata.

⁵⁵ BU conlatione.

⁵⁶ BU and BP sed et.

⁵⁷ EA multarum.

⁵⁸ BP temperauimus.

⁵⁹ BU eps.

⁶⁰ EA distincione eorum; BP eorum distincione.

⁶¹ EA quidem.

⁶² BP putauerunt.

⁶³ EA, BP and BU cum.

⁶⁴ BU tertio.

⁶⁵ BP in quatuor. A mistake of a scribe.

⁶⁶ EA altum.

⁶⁷ BU and BP ex minio.

ap[er]to codice uerbi gr[ati]a illud siue illud capitulu[m] scire uolueris cui[us] canonis sit, statim ex subiecto numero doceberis et recurrens ad p[ri]ncipia in quib[us] canonu[m] est ditincta congeries, eodemq[ue] statim canone ex titulo frontis inuento, illum quem querebas numeru[m] eiusdem [a]eu[an]g[e]list[ae] qui et ipse ex insc[ri]ptione signatur inuenies, atq[ue] e uicino c[a]eteror[um] tramitib[us] inspectis, quos numeros e regione habeant adnotabis; et cum scieris, recurris⁶⁸ ad uolumina singular[um] et sine mora, rep[er]itis numeris quos ante signaueras, repperies et loca in quib[us] uel eadem uel uicina dixerunt.

Opto ut in xpo ualeas et memineris mei, p[a]p[a] b[ea]tissime⁶⁹.

EXPLICIT PR[E]PHATIO.

PROLOGUS QUATUOR EV[AN]G[E]LIOR[UM]⁷⁰

PLURES fuisse qui [a]euangelia sc[ri]pserunt et Lucas [a]eu[an]gelista testat[or]⁷¹ dicens: *q[ua]onia[m] quide[m] multi conati sunt ordinare narration[m] reru[m] qu[ae] in nobis complet[ae]⁷² sunt sicut tradider[un]t nobis q[ui] ab inicio⁷³ ipsi uider[un]t sermone[m] et ministrauer[un]t ei et p[er]seuerantia usq[ue] ad p[re]sens temp[us] monimenta⁷⁴ declarant, qu[ae] a diuersis auctorib[us] edita diuersam heresum⁷⁵ fuere p[ri]ncipia ut est illud iuxta egýptios et thomam et mathiam⁷⁶ et bartholome[um] dudecim⁷⁷ quoqu[ae] ap[os]to[lorum] et basýlidis⁷⁸ atq[uae] appellis⁷⁹ ac reliquor[um]⁸⁰ quos enumerare longissim[um] est cu[m] hoc tantu[m] in p[re]sentiar[um] necesse sit dicere, extitisse quosda[m] qui sine sp[iritu] et gra[tia] dei conati sunt magis ordinare narration[m] qua[m] hýstori[a]⁸¹ texere veritate[m]. Quib[us] iure potest illud p[ro]pheticum coaptari. *Ve qui p[ro]phetant de corde suo: qui ambulant post sp[iritu]m suu[m], qui dicunt: dicit d[omi]n[us]; et d[omi]n[us] non misit eos* (Ez 13,3). De quib[us] et⁸² saluator in [a]eu[an]gelio ioh[ann]is loquit[ur]: *Om[nes] qui ante me⁸³ uener[un]t fures fuerunt⁸⁴ et latrones* (J 10,8). Qui uener[un]t, non qui missi sunt. Ipse*

⁶⁸ BP recurrens.

⁶⁹ In *The Evangeluary of Averbode* the additions are written in smaller characters. In the remaining scripts the text is written in regular characters.

⁷⁰ The text is a fragment of *Commentariorum in Evangelium Matthei*; BU has a different title here: ITEM ARGUMENTUM IIII and the text is found after the following: BP – INCIP[IT] PROLOG[US] IN IIII-OR EVVANGELIORUM; EA – INCIPIT PROLOGUS.

⁷¹ EA testatur Lucas euangelista; BP Lucas euangelista testatur.

⁷² BP completa.

⁷³ EA, BP and BU initio.

⁷⁴ BU monumenta; EA and BP monimenta.

⁷⁵ EA aduersarum heresum; BP aduersarium heresum.

⁷⁶ EA and BP mathýam.

⁷⁷ EA TWELFTHcim.

⁷⁸ BU and BP basilidis.

⁷⁹ EA and BP apelles; BU apellidis.

⁸⁰ EA ac reliquorum *om.*

⁸¹ EA ýstoriae; BP hýstoriae.

⁸² BP *om.*

⁸³ BP *om.*

⁸⁴ BP fures fuerunt *om.*

eni[m] ait: *Ueniebant et ego non mittebam*⁸⁵ *eos* (Ir 14,14). In⁸⁶ uenientib[us] p[rae]sumptio temeritatis in⁸⁷ missis obsequiu[m] serutituis est. [A]eccl[esi]a autem qu[a]e supra petram d[omi]ni uoce fundata est, qua[m] introdux[it] rex in cubiculu[m] suu[m] et ad qua[m] p[er] foramen descensio[n]is occulte misit manu[m] sua[m]. Similis dammul[a]e⁸⁸ hýnnuloq[ue]⁸⁹ ceruor[um] quattuor⁹⁰ flumina paradýsi⁹¹ instar eructuans quattuor⁹² angulos et anulos habet p[er] quos quasi archa⁹³ testam[en]ti et custos legis d[omi]ni lignis mobilib[us] uehitur.

Primus omniu[m] matheus est publican[us] cogonomento leui, qui [a]euangelium in iudea hebreo sermone edidit ob eor[um] uel maxime causam qui in ihm crediderant ex iudeis et nequaqu[uam] legis umbra succedente⁹⁴ [a]euangelíi ueritate[m] seruabant. S[e]c[un]d[u]s marcus interpres ap[osto]li petri et alexandrine[a]e [a]ecclesi[a]e p[ri]mus ep[iscopu]s⁹⁵ qui d[omi]n[u]m quide[m]⁹⁶ saluatorem ipse n[on] uidit s[ed] ea qu[a]e magistru[m] audierat p[rae]dicante[m] iuxta fide[m] magis gestor[um] narrauit qua[m] ordinem. Tercius⁹⁷ Lucas medicus natione sýrus antiocensis⁹⁸ cui[us] laus in [a]eu[an]gelio qui et ipse discip[u]l[u]s ap[osto]li pauli in achai[a]e bitini[a]e[que] uolumen c[on]didit queda[m] altius repetens et ut ipse in p[re]hmio¹⁰⁰ confitet[ur] audita magis qua[m] uisa describens. Vultimus ioh[anne]s ap[osto]l[u]s et [a]eu[an]g[e]lista que[m] ihs¹⁰¹ amaui plurimu[m] q[ui] sup[er] pectus d[omi]ni recumbens purissima doctrinar[um] fluenta potauit et qui solus de cruce meruit audire: *ecce mater tua* (J 19,27). Is cum esset in asia¹⁰² et iam¹⁰³ tunc hereticor[um]¹⁰⁴ semina pullularent cerenthi hebionis¹⁰⁵ et c[a]eterror[um] qui negant xpm in carne uenisse quos et ipse in [a]ep[istu]la sua antichristos¹⁰⁶ uocat et ap[osto]l[u]s paulus frequent[er] p[er] cutit coactus est ab om[n]ib[us] pene tunc asi[a]e¹⁰⁷ ep[iscop]is et multar[um] [a]eccles[ia]ru[m] legationib[us] de¹⁰⁸ diuinitate saluatoris altius scribere et ad ipsum ut ita dicam dei

⁸⁵ BP dimittebam.

⁸⁶ EA *om*; BP *ma In*.

⁸⁷ EA i BP *om*.

⁸⁸ BP dammul[a]e.

⁸⁹ BU hinnuloque; BP hymnuloque.

⁹⁰ EA IIIIor.

⁹¹ BU paradisi.

⁹² EA IIIIor.

⁹³ EA i BU archa.

⁹⁴ BP suscedente.

⁹⁵ BP epc.

⁹⁶ EA *om*.

⁹⁷ EA i BU tertius; BP tercius.

⁹⁸ EA antýochensis; BP antýocensis.

⁹⁹ EA býtimiae quae; BP bithini[a]e qui.

¹⁰⁰ BU praemio; BP premio.

¹⁰¹ BP ihc.

¹⁰² EA asýa.

¹⁰³ EA i BP *etiam* instead of *et iam*.

¹⁰⁴ BU hereticorum tunc.

¹⁰⁵ EA cerinthi ebionis; BP cerinthý ebionis; BU cherinti et ebionis.

¹⁰⁶ EA antixpistos; BP antýxpistos.

¹⁰⁷ EA asýe.

¹⁰⁸ EA and BP *om*.

uerbu[m] non tam audaci qua[m] felici temeritate p[ro]rump[er]e. ut [a]eccl[esi]astica narrat historia¹⁰⁹ cum a fr[at]rib[us] cogeret[ur] ut scriberet, ita facturu[m]¹¹⁰ respondisse, si indicto ieiunio incommune om[n]e[s] d[eu]m precarentur¹¹¹. Quo expleto reuelatione saturatus in illud p[re]hmiu[m]¹¹² c[a]elo ueniens eructauit: *In p[ri]ncipio erat uerbum et uerbum erat apud d[eu]m et d[e]us erat uerbum, hoc erat in p[ri]ncipio ap[ud] d[eu]m*. H[ae]c ig[itur] quattuor [a]eu[an]g[e]lia multo ante p[re]dicta ezechielis¹¹³ quoq[ue] uolumen p[ro]bat, in quo p[ri]ma uisio ita contextit[ur]: et in medio sicut similitudo quattuor¹¹⁴ animaliu[m] et uult[us] eor[um] facies hominis et facies leonis et facies uituli et facies aquil[a]e. Prima hominis facies matheu[m] significat q[ui] quasi de homine exorsus est scribere: *liber generationis ih[esu] x[pi]*¹¹⁵, *filii dauid, filii Abraham*. S[ecun]da marcum in quo uox leonis in heremo rugientis audit[ur]: *uox clamantis in deserto, parate uiam d[omi]ni*¹¹⁶ *rectas facite seminas*¹¹⁷ *ei[us]*. Tercia¹¹⁸ uituli qu[a]e [a]eu[an]g[e]listam lucam a¹¹⁹ zacharia sacerdote su[m]psisse initium¹²⁰ prefiguratur. Quarta ioh[ann]em [a]eu[an]g[e]listam qui asu[m]ptis¹²¹ pennis aquil[a]e et ad altiora festinans de uerbo d[e]i disputat. C[etera] qu[a]e sequunt[ur]¹²² in eundem sensum p[ro]ficiunt. Crura eor[um] recta et pennati pedes et quocu[m]q[ue] sp[iritu] ibat, ibant et¹²³ n[on] reuertebant[ur] et dorsa eor[um] plena oculis et scintill[a]e ac lampades in medio discurrentes et rota in rotam et in singulis quattuor¹²⁴ fecies. Vnde et apocalypsis¹²⁵ ioh[ann]is post ex positione[m] uiginti quattuor¹²⁶ senior[um] qui tenentes cýtharas et fialas¹²⁷ et adorant agnum dei introducit fulgura et tonitura et septe[m] sp[iritu] discurrentes¹²⁸ et mare uitreum et quatuor¹²⁹ animalia plena oculis dicens: *Animal p[ri]mum simile leoni et s[ecun]d[u]m simile uitulo et terciu[m]*¹³⁰ *simile homini*¹³¹ *et quartu[m] simile aquil[a]e uolanti*. Et post paululum: *Plena, inquit, erant oculis et requiem n[on] hababant die ac nocte dicentia: s[an]c[t]us, s[an]c[t]us, s[an]c[t]us d[omi]n[u]s d[e]us om[n]ip[oten]s qui erat et qui est et qui*

¹⁰⁹ EA, BP and BU hystoria.

¹¹⁰ EA and BP + se.

¹¹¹ EA, BP and BU deprecarentur.

¹¹² BP and BU premium.

¹¹³ BU hezechielis.

¹¹⁴ EA IIIIor; BP quatuor.

¹¹⁵ BP ihu xpi.

¹¹⁶ BU domino.

¹¹⁷ BU and BP semitas.

¹¹⁸ EA and BU tertia; BP tercia.

¹¹⁹ EA and BP om.

¹²⁰ EA, BP and BU initium.

¹²¹ BU assumpsit; BP assumptis.

¹²² BU and BP secuntur.

¹²³ EA + cum.

¹²⁴ EA IIIIor; BP quatuor.

¹²⁵ EA apokalipsis; BP apocalipsis.

¹²⁶ EA has XTWELFTHIor; BU has XTWELFTHIL.

¹²⁷ EA and BP phýalas.

¹²⁸ EA and BU discurrentes.

¹²⁹ EA IIIIor.

¹³⁰ BU tertium.

¹³¹ BU hominis.

uenturus est (Ap 4,7-8). Quib[us] cunctis p[er]spicue ostenditur quattuor¹³² tantu[m] debere¹³³ [a]e[u]a[n]g[e]lia suscipi¹³⁴ et om[ne]s apocriporum¹³⁵ nenias¹³⁶ mortuis magis hereticis qua[m] [a]eccl[esi]asticis uiuis¹³⁷ canendas¹³⁸.

IHERONYM[US] DAMASO PAP[AE]¹³⁹. The text is missing from *The Bible of Płock* and *The Evangeliary of Princess Anastasia*.

INCIPIT ARGUMENTU[M] S[E]C[UN]D[U]M MATHEU[M]¹⁴⁰

MATHEUS ex iudea sicut in ordine prim[us] ponit[ur] ita [a]e[u]a[n]g[e]liu[m] in iudea prim[us] scripsit¹⁴¹. Cui[us] uocatio ad d[omi]n[u]m ex publican[is] actib[us] fuit. Duor[um] in generatione xpi p[ri]ncipia p[re]sumens, unius cuius p[ri]ma circu[m]cisio in carne¹⁴², alterius cui[us] s[e]c[un]d[u]m cor electio fuit ex utrisq[ue] ei[us]¹⁴³ patrib[us]¹⁴⁴ xpc sicq[ue] quarter¹⁴⁵ denario numero trisformiter posito p[ri]ncipium a credendi fide in electionis temp[us] porrigens et ex¹⁴⁶ electione¹⁴⁷ usq[ue]¹⁴⁸ in transmigrationis diem dirigens atq[ue] t[ra]nsmigratio[n]is die usq[ue] in¹⁴⁹ xpm definiens¹⁵⁰, decursam aduentus domini ostendit generatione[m]. Et¹⁵¹ numero satisfaciens¹⁵² et tempori et se q[uo]d esset ostenderet et dei in se opus¹⁵³ monstrans, etia[m]¹⁵⁴ in his quor[um] genus posuit xpi operantis a p[ri]ncipio testimoniu[m] non negaret. Quar[um] omniu[m] reru[m] temp[us], ordo numer[us] disposito uel ratio q[uo]d fidei necessariu[m] est, d[omi]n[u]s xpc est qui factus est ex muliere factus sub lege, natus ex virgine, passus in carne, om[n]ia in cruce fixit¹⁵⁵ ut triumphans ea in semetipso,

¹³² EA IIIor; BP quattuor.

¹³³ EA and BP debere tantum.

¹³⁴ EA suscipiet.

¹³⁵ BU and BP apochriporum.

¹³⁶ EA and BP neruas.

¹³⁷ BU *uiris* corrected in the same handwriting to *uiuis*; EA and BP uiis.

¹³⁸ EA and BP add EXPLIC[IT] PROLOG[US].

¹³⁹ BU has a different title: ITEM PRAEFATIO EIUSDE[M] III.

¹⁴⁰ BP includes the title – INCIPIT ARGUMENTU[M] S[E]C[UN]D[U]M MATHEU[M]; EA – INCIP[IT] ARGUMENT[UM]; BU has the title PREFATIO EV[AN]G[E]LII S[E]C[UN]D[U]M MATHEVU[M].

¹⁴¹ EA i BP *maja Matheus sicut in ordine primus ponitur euangelium in iudea primus scripsit*.

¹⁴² EA, BP and BU *carnis*.

¹⁴³ BU, EA and BP *om*.

¹⁴⁴ EA and BP in *patribus*.

¹⁴⁵ EA, BP and BU *quaternario*.

¹⁴⁶ BP *om*.

¹⁴⁷ BP *electio*.

¹⁴⁸ EA, BP and BU *om*. BP et *electio in transmigrationis usque ad xpm definiens*.

¹⁴⁹ BU *ad*.

¹⁵⁰ BU *deffiniens*.

¹⁵¹ BU and BP *ut et*.

¹⁵² BU *satisfaceret*; EA and BP *satisfaciens*.

¹⁵³ EA *dei opus in se*; BP *dei in se opus*.

¹⁵⁴ EA *et*.

¹⁵⁵ EA and BP *fecit*.

resurgens in corpore et patris¹⁵⁶ nomen in patrib[us] filio et filií¹⁵⁷ nom[en] patri restituens in filií¹⁵⁸, sine principio, sine fine, ostendens unum se cu[m] patrem esse, quia unus est¹⁵⁹. In quo [a]eu[an]gelio utile est¹⁶⁰ desiderantib[us] d[ominu]m sic p[ri]ma uel media¹⁶¹ uel¹⁶² p[er]fecta cognoscere ut et uocatione[m]¹⁶³ ap[osto]li et opus [a]eu[an]gelí et dilectione[m] dei in carne nascentis p[ro] uniuersa legentes intelligant atq[ue] id¹⁶⁴ in eo in quo app[re]hensi sunt et app[re]hendere expetunt, recognoscant. Nobis eni[m] hoc in¹⁶⁵ studio argum[en]ti fuit et fidem fact[a]e rei traderE et operantis d[omin]i intelligendam diligenter esse¹⁶⁶ dispositone[m] querentib[us] non tacere.

EXPLICIT ARGUMENTUM¹⁶⁷

INCIPIT PROLOG[US] IN MARCO¹⁶⁸

MARCUS EVANgelista d[ei]¹⁶⁹ et petri in baptisate filius atq[ue] in diuino sermone discipulus, sacerodcium¹⁷⁰ in ih[er]usal[e]m¹⁷¹ agens, s[e]c[un]d[u]m carnem leuita, conuersus ad fidem xpi¹⁷², [a]eu[an]g[e]l[iu]m in italia sc[ri]psit, ostendens in eo quid et generi suo deberet et xpo. Nam iniciu[m]¹⁷³ principis¹⁷⁴ in uoce p[ro]phetic[a]e exclamationis instituens ordinem leuitic[a]e electionis ostendit ut p[re]dicans¹⁷⁵ p[re] destinatum¹⁷⁶ iohanne[m] filiu[m] zachari[ae]¹⁷⁷ in uoce angeli annunciantis¹⁷⁸ emissum¹⁷⁹ non solum uerbum caro¹⁸⁰ factum

¹⁵⁶ BP patri.

¹⁵⁷ EA filio.

¹⁵⁸ EA and BP filiis. A mistake of a scribe.

¹⁵⁹ BU *om.*

¹⁶⁰ EA and BP *om.*

¹⁶¹ EA and BP mediaces.

¹⁶² BP *om.*

¹⁶³ BU uocatione.

¹⁶⁴ BU and BP *om.*

¹⁶⁵ BP *om.*

¹⁶⁶ EA, BP and BU *om.*

¹⁶⁷ EA and BP: EXPLICIT ARGUMENTUM; BU has the phrase: EXPLICIVNT PREFATIONES.

¹⁶⁸ BU includes the phrase: INCIPIT PROLOG[US] S[E]C[UN]D[U]M MARUM; BP includes the title: INCIPIT PROLOG[US] IN EV[AN]GELIO S[ECUN]DU[M] MARCV[M]; EA does not include the Gospel according to St. Mark.

¹⁶⁹ BP + elect[us].

¹⁷⁰ Gospel according to St. Mark (hereinafter EM), BP and BU sacerdotium.

¹⁷¹ BU *om.*

¹⁷² EM ad fidem xpi conuersus.

¹⁷³ EM, BP and BU initium; BP initium + euangelii.

¹⁷⁴ EM, BP and BU principii.

¹⁷⁵ BP + ioh[anne]m.

¹⁷⁶ BU and BP predestinatum.

¹⁷⁷ BP predicans ioh[anne]m predestinatum filium zachari[ae].

¹⁷⁸ BU adnuntiantis.

¹⁷⁹ EM emissum anuntiantis.

¹⁸⁰ BP carnem.

s[ed] corpus d[omi]ni in omnia¹⁸¹ per uerbum diuin[a]e uocis animatum inicio¹⁸² [a]eu[an]g[e]lic[ae] p[re]dicationis ostenderet ut qui h[a]ec legens sciret cui initium¹⁸³ carnis in d[omi]no et ihu¹⁸⁴ aduenientis habitaculum caro deberet¹⁸⁵ agnoscere, atq[ue] in se uerbum uocis quod in consonantib[us]¹⁸⁶ p[er]diderat inueniret. Deniq[ue] et¹⁸⁷ p[er]fecti [a]eu[an]g[e]l[ic]i intrasset opus¹⁸⁸ a baptismo domini p[re]dicare d[ominu]m inchoans¹⁸⁹, non laborauit natiuitate[m] carnis quia in priorib[us] uiderat dicere s[ed] totus¹⁹⁰ in exprimens¹⁹¹ expositionem deserti ieiunium numeri, temptation[m] diaboli congregatione[m] bestiaru[m] et ministeri[um] p[ro]tulit angelor[um] ut¹⁹² instituens nos ad intelligendu[m] singula in breuis¹⁹³ conpingens¹⁹⁴ nec auctoritate[m] fact[a]e¹⁹⁵ rei demerit¹⁹⁶ et p[ro]ficiendi operis¹⁹⁷ plenitudine[m] non negaret. Deniq[ue] amputasse¹⁹⁸ sibi post fidem pollicem dicit[ur]¹⁹⁹ ut sacerdocio²⁰⁰ reprob[us] haberet[ur]. S[ed] tantu[m] consensuens²⁰¹ fidei p[re]destinata potuit electio ut nec sic op[er]e²⁰² uerbi p[er]deret q[uo]d pri[us] meruerat in genere. Nam alexandri[a]e epc²⁰³ fuit cuius p[er] singula opus scire et [a]eu[an]g[e]l[ic]i in se dicta disponere et disciplinam in se legis agnoscere²⁰⁴ et diuina[m] in carne²⁰⁵ d[omi]ni²⁰⁶ intelligere natura[m] qu[a]e in nos primu[m] require²⁰⁷, de hinc inquisita uolumus agnosci habentes mercede[m] exhortationis q[ue]m qui plantat et qui rigat unum sunt, qui au[tem] incrementum prestat deus EST.

¹⁸¹ BP *om* in omnia.

¹⁸² EM, BP and BU initio.

¹⁸³ EM, BP and BU initium.

¹⁸⁴ BP in ihu.

¹⁸⁵ BP *debere*.

¹⁸⁶ BP *consumationibus*.

¹⁸⁷ EM *cum* zamiast *et*; BU i BP *om*.

¹⁸⁸ EM, BP and BU opus intrasset.

¹⁸⁹ EM incipiens.

¹⁹⁰ EM totius.

¹⁹¹ BU and BP in primis.

¹⁹² BU *om*.

¹⁹³ BP singula[m] breui.

¹⁹⁴ BU conpingens.

¹⁹⁵ EM *facte*.

¹⁹⁶ BU and BP *demeret*.

¹⁹⁷ BU *proficiendo operi*; BP *proficiendo operis*.

¹⁹⁸ BP *anputas se*.

¹⁹⁹ BP *diceret*.

²⁰⁰ EM, BP and BU *sacerdotio*.

²⁰¹ EM, BP and BU *consentiens*.

²⁰² EM and BP in opere.

²⁰³ BU and BP *eps*.

²⁰⁴ BU + *est*.

²⁰⁵ BP *carnem*.

²⁰⁶ BU and BP *om*.

²⁰⁷ EM *requiri oportet*; BP *oportet requiri*; BU *requirere*.

EXPLICIT ARGUMENTUM²⁰⁸No title²⁰⁹

LUCA SÝRUS antiocensis²¹⁰, arte medicus, discipul[us] ap[osto]lor[um], post²¹¹ paulum secutus usq[ue] ad confessionem²¹² eius seruiens d[omin]o sine crimine. Nam neq[ue] uxorem umqua[m] habens neq[ue] filios, septuaginta et quattuor²¹³ annor[um] obiit in bithinia²¹⁴ plenus sp[irit]u s[an]c[t]o. Qui cum iam scripta essent [a]eu[an]g[e]lia per matheum quidem in iudea, p[er] marcu[m] aute[m] in italia, s[an]c[t]o²¹⁵ instigante sp[irit]u in achai[a]²¹⁶ partib[us] hoc sc[ri]psit [a]eu[an]g[e]liu[m] significans etia[m] ipse in principio ante alia e[ss]e descripta. Cui extra ea qu[a]e ordo [a]eu[an]g[e]lic[a]e dispositionis²¹⁷ exposcit, ea maxime necessitas laboris fuit ut primu[m] grecis fidelib[us] om[n]i p[ro]phetatione uenturi²¹⁸ in carne[m] d[omi]ni²¹⁹ xpi manifesta²²⁰ humanitas ne iudaicis²²¹ fabulis attentis²²² in solo legis desiderio tenerent[ur] ne uel²²³ hereticis fabulis et stultis sollicitationib[us] seducti excederent a ueritate elaboraret. De hinc²²⁴ ut in principio [a]eu[an]g[e]lii ioh[ann]is natiuitate presu[m]pta cui [a]eu[an]g[e]l[iu]m scriberet et in quo electus scriberet indicaret contestans in se complete²²⁵ e[ss]e qu[a]e essent ab aliis inchoata. Cui ideo²²⁶ post baptismum filiis dei a p[er]fectione generationis in xpo implet[a]²²⁷ repetend[a]e a p[ri]ncipio natiuitatis human[a]e potestas p[ro]missa est ut req[ui]rentib[us] demonstraret in quo app[re]hendens²²⁸ erat p[er] nathan filium introitum recurrentis in d[ominu]m²²⁹ generationis²³⁰ ammisso²³¹ indisp[ar]abilis dei p[re]dicans in

²⁰⁸ BU includes the phrase: EXPLICIT PREFATIO; BP – EXPLIC[IT] PTOLOG[US].

²⁰⁹ BU has the title: INCIPIT PROLOGUS IN EV[AN]G[E]L[I]O S[E]C[UN]D[U]M LVCAM; BP – INCIPIT PROLOG[US] S[ANCTI] EV[AN]GELII S[ECUNDUM] LUCAM.

²¹⁰ BU natione antiocensis; BP Lucas fuit sýrus antchiocensis.

²¹¹ BP postea.

²¹² BP passionem.

²¹³ BP LXX IIII.

²¹⁴ BP bethania.

²¹⁵ BP + autem.

²¹⁶ BU achagiae; BP agaie.

²¹⁷ BP disputacionis. A mistake of a scribe.

²¹⁸ BP p[ro]phetacioni uentur[a]e.

²¹⁹ BP *om*.

²²⁰ BU manifestata.

²²¹ BP hereticis.

²²² BU adtenti.

²²³ BP omits *attenti in solo legis desiderio tenerent[ur] ne uel* phrase.

²²⁴ BU manifestata.

²²⁵ BU and BP completa.

²²⁶ BP ergo.

²²⁷ BP + et.

²²⁸ BP adprehendens.

²²⁹ BP deum.

²³⁰ BP repeats *generacionis* twice. Amistake of a copyist.

²³¹ BU and BP admissio.

hominib[us] xpm suu[m] p[er]fecti opus hominis redire in se²³² p[er] filium faceret qui p[er] dauid patre[m] uenientib[us] iter p[re]dicabat²³³ in xpo. Cui luc[ae] non immerito²³⁴ etia[m] scribendor[um] apostolicor[um] actuum²³⁵ potestas in mýsterio²³⁶ datur ut deo in d[eu]m pleno et filio p[re]dicationis²³⁷ extincto oratione ab ap[osto]lis facta forte d[omi]ni electionis²³⁸ numerus co[m]pleretur. Sicq[ue] Paulus consummation[m] ap[osto]licis actib[us] daret que[m] diu stimulum recalitrante[m]²³⁹ d[omi]n[u]s elegisset. Quod et legentib[us] ac requirentibus d[ominu]m²⁴⁰ et si p[er] singula expediri a nobis²⁴¹ utile fuerat sciens tamq[uam]²⁴² q[uo]d operantem agricolam oporteat de fructib[us] suis edere uitauimus publicam curiositate[m] ne non tam uolentib[us] d[ominu]m²⁴³ uideremur quam fastidientibus PRODESSE²⁴⁴.

EXPLICIT ARGUMENTU[M] SECUNDUM LUCAM²⁴⁵

INCIPIT PROLOGUS SEC[UN]D[U]M IOHANNEM²⁴⁶

HIC EST IOH[ANNE]S [a]eu[an]g[e]lista unus ex discipulis dei²⁴⁷ qui uirgo electus est a deo²⁴⁸, que[m] de nuptiis uolentem nubere uocauit deus²⁴⁹. Cui²⁵⁰ uirginitatis²⁵¹ in hoc duplex testimonium in [a]eu[an]g[e]lio datur²⁵² quod a pr[a]e c[a]eteris dilectus a d[omin]o dicit[ur] et huic matre[m] suam de cruce²⁵³ co[m]mendauit d[omi]n[u]s ut uirgo uirgine[m]²⁵⁴ seruaret. Deniq[ue] manifestans in [a]eu[an]g[e]lio quod erat ipse incorruptibilis uerbi opus inchoans solus uerbum carne[m]²⁵⁵ factu[m] esse nec lumen a tenebris comp[re]hensu[m]²⁵⁶ fuisse

²³² BP insuper.

²³³ BU and BP prebebat.

²³⁴ BU immerito.

²³⁵ BP auctuu[m].

²³⁶ BP misterio.

²³⁷ BU preditionis.

²³⁸ BP *om.*

²³⁹ BP calcinantem.

²⁴⁰ BP de[um].

²⁴¹ BP a nobis expediri.

²⁴² BU tamen.

²⁴³ BP deu[m].

²⁴⁴ BU and BP prodidisse.

²⁴⁵ BU and BP include the phrase: EXPLICIT P[RO]LOGUS.

²⁴⁶ BP has the title: INCIPIT P[RE]P[RO]PH[ET]IA IN EV[AN]GELIO S[ECUNDUM] IOHANNEM; No title of any kind in EA; BU includes the phrase: P[RE]F[AT]IO EV[AN]G[E]LII S[ECUNDUM] IOHANNEM.

²⁴⁷ EA and BP domini.

²⁴⁸ BU and BP a Deo est.

²⁴⁹ EA and BP dominus.

²⁵⁰ BU and BP cuius.

²⁵¹ BP uirginitati.

²⁵² BP dat[ur] in euang[e]lio.

²⁵³ EA ***iens de cruce; BU and BP pendens in cruce.

²⁵⁴ EA and BP uirginem uirgo.

²⁵⁵ EA, BP and BU caro.

²⁵⁶ BU conprehensum.

testat[ur]. Primu[m] signu[m] ponens q[uo]d in nuptiis fecit d[omi]n[u]s ut²⁵⁷ ostendens q[uo]d erat ipse²⁵⁸ legentib[us] demonstraret quod ubi d[omi]n[u]s inuitatus deficere nuptiar[um]²⁵⁹ uinu[m] debeat ut et²⁶⁰ ueterib[us] immutatis noua²⁶¹ om[n]ia qu[a]e a xpo instituunt[ur] appareant. Hoc aute[m] [a]eu[an]g[e]l[iu]m scripsit in asia postea qua[m]²⁶² in pathmos insula apocalýpsin²⁶³ scripserat ut cui in p[ri]ncipio canonis incorruptibile p[ri]ncipium in genesi etia[m] incorruptibilis finis p[er] uirginem in apocalýpsi²⁶⁴ redderet[ur] dicente xpo: ego sum A et W. Et hic est ioh[anni]s qui sciens sup[er]uenisse diem recessus sui conuocatis discipulis suis in epheso p[er] multa signor[um] experimenta promens xpm descendens in defossum sepulture[a]e su[a]e locu[m] facta oratione²⁶⁵ positus est ad patres suos tam ex traneus²⁶⁶ a dolore mortis qua[m] a corruptione carnis inuenit[ur] alienus. Tamen post om[n]is²⁶⁷ [a] eu[an]g[e]l[iu]m scripsit et hoc uirgini debebat[ur]²⁶⁸. Quor[um] tam[en] uel scriptor[um] temp[or]e dispositio uel libror[um] ordinatione ideo p[er] singula nobis²⁶⁹ non exponit[ur] ut scienti²⁷⁰ desiderio collocetur²⁷¹ et qu[a]erentib[us] fructus laboris et deo magisterií doctrina seruetur. AMEN²⁷².

EXPLICIT PROLOGUS S[E]C[UN]D[U]M IOHANNEM. ²⁷³

Before I present several conclusions which come to mind after comparing the discussed texts let us consider a more general remark concerning the authorship of those texts. The first three texts, *Beatissimo pape Damaso (Novum opus)*, *Prologus quatuor euangeliorum (Plures fuisse)* and *Iheronimus Damaso pape (Sciendum etiam)*, which are missing from *The Bible of Plock* and *The Evangeliary of Princess Anastasia* were authored by St. Jerome. Whereas the introductions to the synoptic Gospels: *Argumentum secundum Matheum*, *Prologus in Marco* and *Prologus sancti Evangelii secundum Lucam* were neither written by St. Jerome as it is often mistakenly propagated by researchers nor are they the so called *Dialogi Monarchiańskie [The Monarchianic Dialogues]*, as such a title also circulates among scholars, but instead they were written by Sedulius Scottus, an Irish monk and a poet who lived and worked in the Leodium school in the ninth century²⁷⁴, while the introduction to the Gospel

²⁵⁷ BP om.

²⁵⁸ EA, BP and BU ipse erat.

²⁵⁹ BP nupciarum.

²⁶⁰ BP has *ac* instead of *ut et*.

²⁶¹ BP nouo.

²⁶² BU postquam.

²⁶³ EA apokalipsin; BP apocalipsim.

²⁶⁴ EA apokalipsi; BP apocalipsi; BU apocalýpsin.

²⁶⁵ BP oracione.

²⁶⁶ EA, BP and BU extraneus.

²⁶⁷ BP om[n]es.

²⁶⁸ BP debetur.

²⁶⁹ EA, BP and BU a nobis.

²⁷⁰ BP sciendi.

²⁷¹ EA collocata; BU and BP conlocato.

²⁷² EA, BP and BU om.

²⁷³ BP has the following ending: EXPLIC[IT] P[RE]PHATIO; BU – EXPLICIT PRAEFATIO.

²⁷⁴ Cfr. *Patrologia Latina* (hereinafter PL) 103, 273-274: *Argumentum in Mattheum*; PL 103, 279-280: *Argumentum in Marcum*; PL 103, 285-286: *Argumentum secundum Lucam. Expositiuncula*.

according to St. John *Prephatio in Evangelium secundum Iohannem* was written by Bede the Venerable. This ascertainment is very important as all of those texts are frequently and incorrectly attributed to St. Jerome. Insofar as the texts of St. Jerome were rather commonly used in the medieval biblical manuscripts across the entirety of Europe at that time, the fact that the introductions to the synoptic Gospels were written by Sedulius Scottus and are contained in both the *Bible of Płock* and, partially, in the *Evangelary of Princess Anastasia* is a very strong argument supporting the idea of the twelfth century biblical manuscripts from Płock originating from Leodium. Obviously this does not necessarily mean that they were created in the Meuse River region and were brought to Płock as it is equally possible that they were transcribed locally by the copyists from Leodium. Furthermore, we can observe that the manner of transcription in the manuscripts from Płock and Leodium was the same, possibly due to the pronunciation of the name of Jerome: *Iheronimus*. The comparative analysis of the texts explicitly leads us to several important conclusions. Firstly, the *Bible of Płock* and the *Evangelary of Princess Anastasia* are more similar to the version of the text preserved in the *Biblia Universa*, the manuscript from the *sancti Trudonis* monastery, than to the *Evangelary of Averbode*. Those differences are not major but the same differentiation elements are repeated in those three manuscripts. Thus we should search for the origins of the twelfth century biblical manuscripts of Płock in the Benedictine monasteries of Leodium, possibly in the very *sancti Trudonis* monastery located in the vicinity of Liège. Secondly, the manuscript from Płock containing the Gospel according to St. Mark frequently, although not always, follows the version of the text preserved in the *Bible of Płock* and the *Biblia Universa*. Therefore, it is prudent to hope that any further comparative research, particularly the research concerning the biblical script itself, will allow us to confirm this relationship and will help us to determine whether the manuscript was created in the area of the Meuse River or if it is a transcript of the *Bible of Płock* created locally. Thirdly, and it is an exceptionally interesting conclusion, the *Evangelary of Princess Anastasia*, discounting the minor changes made by a copyist such as changing – *tium* to *cium* or altering individual letters, closely follows the *Bible of Płock*. However, the fact that both manuscripts omit the same phrase: *peruersius uel a librariis dormitantibus aut addita sunt aut mutata* in the text of the first script of Jerome remains the strongest argument. It is difficult to speak of a coincidence and the above fact appears to indicate that the *Evangelary of Princess Anastasia* was created on the basis of the *Bible of Płock*. If the *Bible* had been already present in Płock before 1148, as the records of miracles from 1148 appear to confirm, it is highly plausible that the *Evangelary of Princess Anastasia* would have been a copy of the script created in a local scriptorium in Płock and funded by Bolesław Kędzierzawy as a votive offering presented with the intention of salvation of the soul of his deceased wife. Thus the manuscript would have been created in Płock after her death dated to 1158, during the period of Bishop Werner, and would not have been, as it is suspected, brought by Werner during his journey to Aachen. Whereas the script of Sedulius Scottus preserved in *Comentaria* to the Gospel according to St. Mark deviates from both the *Bible of Płock* and the *Evangelary of Duches Anastasia*, as it comes from a later period and most probably from a different location.²⁷⁵

The conclusions presented hereinabove are, for obvious reasons, only the preliminary conjectures as the compared texts are rather short and we will be able to present more

²⁷⁵ Cfr. *Patrologia Latina* 92,633-636: *In Iohannis Evangelium Expositio*.

comprehensive and substantial conclusions only after the comparative analysis of the entirety of the script of all four Gospels.

The Scripts of St. Jerome, Sedulius Scottus and Beda Venerable in Plock and Mosan Biblical Manuscripts of the twelfth century. An attempt at comparison

Summary

This paper concerns the comparison of three twelfth-century biblical manuscripts from Plock, namely the so-called *The Bible of Plock* and *The Evangeliary of Princess Anastasia* with two Mosan biblical manuscripts: *The Evangeliary of Averbode* and the *Biblia Universa* transcribed in the same period. The first three texts: *Beatissimo Papae Damaso (Novum opus)*, *Prologus quatuor evangeliorum (Plures fuisse)* and *Iheronimus Damaso Pape (Sciendum etiam)* – the last one is not included in the *Bible of Plock* – and *Evangeliary of Princess Anastasia* are of St. Jerome. In contrast, the introductions to the Synoptic Gospels: *Argumentum secundum Matheum*, *Prologus in Marco* and *Prologus sancti Evangelii secundum Lucam* are not the texts of St. Jerome, as is sometimes mistakenly repeated by different scholars, but were written by Sedulius Scottus, an Irish monk and a poet who lived and worked in a school in Leodium in the ninth century, whereas the introduction to the Gospel according to St. John: *Prephatio in Evangelium secundum Iohannem* was written by Bede the Venerable. While the texts of Jerome were quite commonly used in medieval biblical manuscripts, the fact that the introductions to the Synoptic Gospels are written by Sedulius Scottus and are present in both *The Bible of Plock* as well as partially in *The Evangeliary of Princess Anastasia* is a very strong argument for the Mosan origin of the twelfth century biblical manuscripts of Plock. The comparative analysis of the texts themselves clearly leads to several important conclusions. First, the *Bible of Plock* and *Evangeliary of Princess Anastasia* are closer to the version of the text preserved in the *Biblia Universa*, a codex written in the monastery of Sancti Trudonis, than to the *Evangeliary of Averbode*. It follows that the sources for the biblical manuscripts of Plock from the twelfth century should be searched at Mosan Benedictine monasteries, perhaps in the very monastery Sancti Trudonis near Liège. Second, the *Gospel according to St. Mark* generally follows the version of the text preserved in the *Biblia Universa* and the *Bible of Plock* but not all the time. It should therefore be hoped that the further comparative studies, especially of the version of the biblical text, will confirm this relationship and will help to determine whether the codex was written in the Meuse River region or is it a copy of the *Bible of Plock* made on the spot. Thirdly, and this is an extremely interesting proposal, the *Evangeliary of Princess Anastasia*, not counting minor changes made by a copyist like converting – *tium* to – *cium*, is very much dependent on the *Bible of Plock*. If, as it is confirmed by records of the miracles, the Bible was already in Plock in 1148 or before that date, it is very likely that the *Evangeliary of Princess Anastasia*, would be a copy of the text made on the spot in a local Plock scriptorium as a foundation of Boleslaw Kedzierzawy and a votive offering for the salvation of his deceased wife Anastasia. The codex would therefore arise after her death, dating back to the year 1158 in Plock in the time of Bishop Werner and would not have been brought by him following his trip to Aachen.

These conclusions, for obvious reasons, are only preliminary, as comparison of the texts is not fully detailed and more comprehensive conclusions will be presented only after benchmarking a version of the biblical text of the four Gospels.

Keywords: biblical codex, medieval Plock, Mosan manuscripts

About the author: Fr. assistant professor Leszek Misiarczyk, prof. UKSW. Works at the Faculty of Historical and Social Sciences.