

Manuscripts of Ivo's Correspondence

[Adapted from C.J. Rolker, 'Canon law and the letters of Ivo of Chartres', Cambridge PhD thesis 2006, Appendix A; Appendix B edits twelve letters from eight of the manuscripts listed below. See further his *Canon law and the letters of Ivo of Chartres* (2010), esp. 127-32, 303-38]

The letters of Ivo survive in a remarkable number of widely diffused copies. A provisional list of 127 known mss (of which three are lost) containing a significant number of the letters is attached. It is too soon to attempt a detailed account of the transmission. What follows is a preliminary discussion of the classification of the surviving copies, based on detailed study of some forty manuscripts. I have concentrated on those collections of Ivo's letters which were compiled in his lifetime or not much later from Chartrain sources; later derivative forms have largely been ignored.

The standard model of the manuscript tradition is still that developed by Jean Leclercq in the context of his partial edition.¹ While his editorial principles have been severely criticised,² his account of the manuscript tradition has been widely accepted.³ However, working in war-time Paris, Leclercq had only limited access to the manuscripts, and his achievements must be seen in the light of these circumstances. He knew of some fifty copies but seems to have worked only with a selection of the manuscripts now in the Bibliothèque Nationale. His comments on non-Parisian manuscripts are not always reliable and suggest only indirect

¹ J. Leclercq, 'La collection des lettres d'Yves de Chartres', *RB* 56 (1946), 108-25 and 'Introduction', in idem (ed.), *Yves de Chartres, Correspondance* (Paris, 1949), vii-xxxix, here at xxv-xxxiii.

² See the reviews by J.M. de Smet, *RB* (1950), 261-6 and C. Dereine, *Scriptorium* 4 (1950), 317-9.

³ See the more recent accounts by L. Guizard, 'Note sur trois manuscrits des lettres d'Yves de Chartres conservés à la bibliothèque de l'Université de Montpellier', in C.-E. Perrin (ed.), *Mélanges d'histoire du moyen âge dédiés à la mémoire de Louis Halphen* (Paris, 1951), 307-12, R. Sprandel, *Ivo von Chartres und seine Stellung in der Kirchengeschichte* (Stuttgart, 1962), 14-5, B.C. Brasington, 'Some new perspectives on the letters of Ivo of Chartres', *Manuscripta* 37 (1993), 168-78 and X. Hermand, 'Note sur deux manuscrits de la correspondance d'Yves de Chartres provenant de l'abbaye de Floreffe (Namur, fonds de la ville, manuscrits 91 et 118)', *Scriptorium* 51 (1997), 329-36. Only Brasington has seen a substantial number of mss.

knowledge.⁴ In fact, a significant number even of Paris manuscripts seems to have escaped Leclercq, while two Paris manuscripts he refers to do not contain Ivo's correspondence.⁵ The comments on manuscripts he presumably had seen suggest that he did not have the opportunity for detailed examination of the text.⁶ A comparison of his edition with the manuscripts he used also suggests that he worked in some haste.⁷ In addition, Leclercq's account of the Paris manuscripts has a number of

⁴ The mss lists in Leclercq, 'Lettres d'Yves', 111-2 and idem, 'Introduction', xxvi, n. 1 are not identical. In total, Leclercq mentions 50 mss, 27 of which are kept in the BN (including two erroneous references for which see the next note). Of the other mss, **Cj** and **Ka** had already been destroyed when Leclercq published his work. Leclercq's description of **Cj** as a 'type II' ms contradicts the description by Merlet in his translation of Ivo's letters from this very ms (see below). The Florence 'Santa Croce' copy is an apparent error for the Heiligenkreuz ms (which Leclercq lists). **Md** is not, as Leclercq claimed, a 'type II' ms (cf. Guizard, 'Trois manuscrits', 309, n. 1). The shelfmark of the Bodleian ms is Oxford, Laud. misc. 226 (not 266), and according to Leclercq's own criteria it is a 'type I' rather than 'type II' ms. The Bamberg ms does not contain the collection but only one letter (ep. 60). Brussels, BR 1400 does not contain any of Ivo's correspondence. The reference to 'Berlin, Phil. 2892' (Leclercq, 'Introduction', xxvi, n. 1) should perhaps be to Paris, BN lat. 2892. Vat. lat. 147 is neither a 'type I' ms nor does it end with ep. 102 as Leclercq claimed ('Lettres d'Yves', 111). Finally, the reference to 'Vat. Reg. 70' (ibid., 112 and 117) should in fact be to Vat. Reg. 79.

⁵ Leclercq, 'Lettres d'Yves', 111-2 lists BN lat. 2884 and 5501 as copies of Ivo's letters, but in fact the former is a copy of Anselm's letters and the latter contains Anastasius Bibliothecarius, *Historia ecclesiastica*. Leclercq was not aware of Paris, Mazarine 2010 and BN lat. 15165, 16250, 16713, nor did he mention the shorter and/or fragmentary collections in BN lat. 14146, 14193, 16699 and 18219 (with 18248).

⁶ Leclercq (ibid., 111) claimed that BN lat. 2481, 2483 and 5501 lacked epp. 1-2bis, but these letters are in fact present in the first two mss, and the third is not a copy of Ivo. BN lat. 2486 cannot, as Leclercq claimed, be the exemplar of BN lat. 2894, and his comments on the supposed links between BN lat. 2884/2890 and 2887/2889 respectively are also misleading. Leclercq claimed that BN lat. 2888 and 2489 depend on the same exemplar but lists the former ms only as containing the *Prologus* after ep. 103. In general, Leclercq does not give detailed descriptions of the mss. In BN nouv. acq. lat. 3041, for example, the scribe did not omit the missing passages around epp. 103-13; rather, the folios between fols. 80-1 were neatly cut out; the medieval numeration confirms that the missing letters were there originally. In addition, contrary to what Leclercq claimed, the ms is incomplete; it conflates epp. 164/166 and epp. 198/199 (omitting ep. 165 and most of ep. 198) and is physically incomplete at the end, breaking off in ep. 247.

⁷ In his edition of ep. 36, for example, Leclercq does not report several variants shared by two of his three mss (and often many other mss). A number of minor variants in **PmPr** Leclercq does not report at all: quantum] quanto (line 5 in his edition), est paradisus] paradisus est (line 53), uiteram] uitaremus (line 63); the latter reading is in fact found in all three mss Leclercq employed (**PmPrPz**). One variant Leclercq reports for **Pr** is also found in **Pm** (and in fact in most mss): dixit] dicit (line 45). Most strikingly, however, Leclercq fails to report a large gap found in many mss including two of his base mss: qui, ut audiuius, quietam possessionem clericorum approbant, monachorum] *om.* **PmPr** (lines 29-31). Leclercq in his main text also omits the 'et cui(us) estis' (line 73), though it is found all three mss he employed (as in most mss). For 'detrahimur' (line 64) he reports the 'variant' reading 'detrahimur' in **PmPr**; but in fact, these two (and all other mss I have seen, including **Pz**) have 'detrahimus'. For the 'et suprema deiection' phrase at the end (lines 71-2), Leclercq relates: 'suprema *corr. ex. superba* **PrPz**; et suprema] *om.* **Pm**', but in fact all three mss

typographical errors and other slips which make it at times difficult to follow the argument.⁸ Printing errors and inconsistencies also mar Leclercq's account of his 'type I' and 'II'.⁹ In assessing his model, it is important to recognise that it is based on a relatively small sample of the extant manuscripts; his work suggests that he made a close and detailed study of perhaps half those now preserved in Paris, and of none elsewhere.

Let us now turn to the model itself.¹⁰ Following a suggestion by André Wilmart, Leclercq distinguished two versions which he called 'primitif' or 'primaire' (= 'type I') and 'secondaire' (= 'type II'), assuming that the latter depended on the first. Leclercq went on to argue that virtually all known copies depended in some way on the 'type I' collection,¹¹ be it directly or indirectly via the 'type II' tradition.

have 'superba', and only in **Pr** a modern hand has changed this to 'suprema'. Leclercq's apparatus is not only incomplete; what he reports as the consensus of **PmPrPz** and hence the 'type I' tradition is in fact often an idiosyncratic variant of **Pz** only or even an invention of Leclercq, e.g. the 'paradisus est' (line 53), 'uitarem' and 'detrahimur' (lines 63-4), 'suprema' (lines 71-2) and the omission of 'et cui(us) estis' (line 73). Some of these features are certainly found in mss (some indeed in many mss), but not in the three mss from which Leclercq printed.

⁸ Leclercq's reference to BN lat. 2884 ('Lettres d'Yves', 112) should be to BN lat. 2484. According to Leclercq (ibid., 111), BN lat. 4221 and 5501 contain the *Prologus* after ep. 54; however, BN lat. 4221 has only a short *Prologus* excerpt after ep. 54 and BN lat. 5501 is not a copy of Ivo at all; the ms Leclercq had in mind was presumably BN lat. 5505, where the same *Prologus* excerpt is found after ep. 54. BN lat. 2887 and 2889 are profoundly different in content, arrangement and textual variants; they cannot, as Leclercq, 'Lettres d'Yves', 112 claimed, depend on the same exemplar; it is not clear to me which mss Leclercq intended here. Lastly, BN lat. 18586 ends with ep. 67 (not ep. 69). For **PhPmPrPz** (= BN lat. 2488, 2892, 2892A and 10341) see the next note.

⁹ Both in Leclercq, 'Lettres d'Yves', 111-2 and idem, 'Introduction', xxvii-xxviii, the accounts of 'type I' and 'II' have minor inaccuracies; one should read '133, 132, 135, 134' (not '133, 134, 132, 135') and '136-87, 189, 188, 190-3' (not '136-93') in the case of 'type I'. Leclercq further suggests at 'Lettres d'Yves', 111-2, 'Introduction', xxvii-xxviii' that the repetition of ep. 215 is a distinctive feature of the 'type I' mss and that 'type II' omit the series of epp. 213-5 ('Lettres d'Yves', 111-2, 'Introduction', xxvii-xxviii), while claiming at 'Lettres d'Yves', 112, 'Introduction', xxviii that 'type II' mss repeat ep. 215 just as the 'type I' mss do. Only the latter observation is true. In addition, none of the three mss **PmPrPz** which according to Leclercq (ibid.) contain 'exactement' this sequence actually does so. **Pm** conflates epp. 198/199, **Pr** lacks some twenty letters in the original order most (but not all) of which were added in the appendix (fols. 99r-111r; by several hands), and **Pz** has two additions (epp. 271 and 284). Furthermore, **Ph** is listed among the 'type I' mss although it does not meet the criteria Leclercq listed for this group; the long form of ep. 219 (fols. 79r-81v) in fact suggests a relation to 'type II'. Mss **Cj** and **Oc**, on the contrary, belong to the 'type I' tradition rather than to the 'type II' mss as Leclercq claimed.

¹⁰ For the following see Leclercq, 'Lettres d'Yves', 110-3 and idem, 'Introduction', xxvi-xxix.

¹¹ The only exception Leclercq mentions is Reg. lat. 79 (quoted as '70' in 'Lettres d'Yves', 112 and 117).

By implication, he denied the existence of earlier collections. Finally, Leclercq claimed that Ivo himself had compiled ‘type I’, while ‘type II’ was compiled soon after his death. However, as will be discussed below, there is good evidence that the ‘type I’ tradition originated only after Ivo’s death, while other, independent collections were already circulating in his lifetime. Yet Leclercq was certainly right to identify the ‘type I/II’ manuscripts as two important branches of the tradition, and we will therefore begin with the examination of these manuscripts.

A.1 ‘Type I’ and ‘II’

The ‘type I’ and ‘II’ manuscripts are relatively common, especially among the Paris copies. They contain largely the same letters but have a slightly different arrangement in the last third of the collection; they contain almost all letters known to have survived, some charters and a small number of other documents, namely three pieces of Urban II concerning Ivo’s election (epp. 1-2bis) and the reply to a letter Ivo had written to Lyon (ep. 237). The arrangement of the original ‘type I’ is the following:¹²

Epp. 1-2bis, 4-37, 40, 38-9, 41-60, 62, 61, 63, 65-7, 64, 68-83, 85, 84, 86-103, *Prologus*, 104-22, 124-5, 123, 126-31, 133, 132, 135, 134, 136-87, 189, 188, 190-3, 195, 194, 196-200, 202, 201, 203-9, 212, 211, 282, 213-5, 219, 210, 216-8, 220-7, 283, 228-35, 187, 236-62, 264-5, 215, 266-70.

No extant manuscript preserves this order perfectly, but a large number of manuscripts fit this tradition closely.¹³ Although many ‘type I’ manuscripts also contain ep. 271 at the end, it seems that this was an addition to the original form.¹⁴

¹² Corrected from *ibid.*, 111.

¹³ There are at least thirty mss extant which contain at least a substantial part of ‘type I’ (**CaDaEbHcHdLlLoMaNbOcOdPaPbPcPePgPkPmPoPrPsPzQgQkQlRcVkVnWi**); this list does not include derivative collections, shorter fragmentary mss and lost copies like *Cj*.

¹⁴ Ep. 271 is absent from numerous ‘type I’ mss (**AeDaHcHdLoOcRbRcVnWi**) and a ‘type I’ derivative extant in several mss (**HbMhMkPwPyWcWd**). In (at least) three ‘type I’ mss which extend to ep. 271, the capitulatio ends with ep. 270 (**PaPeQg**).

‘Type II’ manuscripts, which are less common but still numerous,¹⁵ go back to a collection containing a very similar set of letters:¹⁶

Epp. 1-2bis, 4-37, 40, 38-9, 41-53, 55-60, 62, 61, 63, 65-7, 64, 68-83, 85, 84, 86-103, *Prologus*, 104-22, 124-5, 123, 126-31, 133, 132, 135, 134, 136-87, 189, 188, 190-1, 193, 195, 194, 196-200, 202, 201, 203-9, 212, 192, 211, 282, 219, 210, 216-8, 220-2, 227, 283, 228-35, 224-5, 278-9, 213-5, 223, 280, 236, 238-62, 264-5, 215, 266-70, 272-6.

Both collections are very similar, even more so than Leclercq suggested. Contrary to what Leclercq claimed,¹⁷ both traditions contain ep. 215 twice, once addressed to Thomas of York and once addressed to his successor Thurstan.¹⁸ His suggestion that only ‘type II’ manuscripts have a capitulatio is also misleading.¹⁹ To ep. 282 at least, the two recensions are largely identical. The only difference is that ‘type II’ drops ep. 54 (apparently accidentally) and places ep. 192 after ep. 212. From this point the versions begin to diverge. Some letters are found in ‘type I’ only (the repeated ep. 187, ep. 226 and ep. 237), some in ‘type II’ only (epp. 272-6 and 278-80), and some letters are placed differently in the two collections (epp. 213-5, 223-5). In ‘type II’ there is a series of the replaced letters and three of the new letters after ep. 235 (epp. 224-5, 278-9, 213-5, 223, 280); the remaining letters not found in ‘type I’ are added at the end (epp. 272-6). This structural argument suggests that ‘type II’ derives ultimately from something very close to ‘type I’. However, since ‘type II’ has more

¹⁵ Twelve mss (*AeBhBjMbPjPnPqPtPvQaQdRb*). An Oxford ms (*Oc*) and the lost Chartres ms (*Cj*), which Leclercq both claimed to belong to the ‘type II’ tradition, are in fact ‘type I’ mss.

¹⁶ Corrected from Leclercq, ‘Lettres d’Yves’, 112 (= idem, ‘Introduction’, xxviii).

¹⁷ Leclercq, ‘Lettres d’Yves’, 111-2 (= idem, ‘Introduction’, xxviii).

¹⁸ It is not clear whether one of the addresses is corrupted. Both are credible in principle, as Ivo enjoyed good relations with both Thomas II and Thurstan. See D. Nicholl, *Thurstan* (York, 1964), 43 for Thurstan and Ivo, and in general J.E. Burton, ‘Introduction’, in eadem (ed.), *York 1070 - 1154* (Oxford, 1988), xix-li and L.K. Barker, ‘Ivo of Chartres and the Anglo-Norman cultural tradition’, *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 13 (1991), 15-33.

¹⁹ ‘Type I’ mss with capitulatio: *HcHdLoPaPeQgQl*.

complete versions of letters 198 and 219, this source was not any extant form of ‘type I’.²⁰

Manuscripts belonging to the ‘type I/II’ tradition rarely represent either type perfectly. Many manuscripts are incomplete, rearranged or added to from other sources; cross-contamination between the two traditions is also relatively common.²¹ In addition, there are subgroups within each tradition. An important subgroup of ‘type I’ manuscripts, for example, seems to depend on a model in which letters 198 and 199 were conflated.²² Several manuscripts of this subgroup also share gaps, e.g. in letters 16, 36 and 189.²³ Some but not all of these errors were corrected in late manuscripts of this group.²⁴ It is this defective subgroup from which Leclercq chose two of his three base manuscripts.²⁵ Another large subgroup of the ‘type I’ tradition is marked by an excerpt from the *Prologus* being inserted after ep. 54.²⁶ In a smaller group of manuscripts which seems to depend on the ‘type I/II’ tradition the letters were rearranged by recipients.²⁷ This group of related manuscripts may be part of a

²⁰ The last sentence of ep. 198 (PL 162, 206) is absent in all ‘type I’ mss I have seen (cf. Juret’s comment, repr. in PL 162, 206). In ‘type II’, ep. 219 has a longer beginning; ‘type I’ and the printed editions all have the short version (PL 162, 222-5); Merlet, translating the letters from a ‘type I’ ms (*Cj*), also has the short version.

²¹ For example, epp. 272-6 are added to ‘type I’ mss (*PbPePg*) and ‘type II’ copies sometimes contain ep. 54 at the end (*Pt*). Copies of both traditions are also augmented with letters originally not found in either ‘type I’ or ‘II’ like ep. 287 (e.g. in *AeDaHcHdMbLoPtQdWi*).

²² The known mss are *PaPcPePmPrQlWi* plus perhaps *PbPg*. In *PaPePmPrQlWi*, the address of ep. 198 is followed by the body of ep. 199; the letters were presumably conflated because both are addressed to (different) men called Gislebert. *Pc* is incomplete (ending with ep. 181) but clearly depends on a ms very similar to *Pr*, with which it shares gaps and variants in all letters it contains. On *PbPg* see the next notes.

²³ *PbPcPePmPrQl* all skip a line in ep. 36 (lines 18-9 in my edition; see above, note 7; this error is also found in *PfPlQk*, presumably independently); *PbPePgPrQl* also share omissions in ep. 189; *PrQl* and *Pe a.c.* further share a gap in ep. 16.

²⁴ In *Pe*, most of the missing ep. 198 and the address of ep. 199 are added in the margin, the ep. 16 gap was corrected and (later) epp. 271-7 were added at the end. All these modifications are also found in *PbPg* which may depend on *Pe*.

²⁵ BN lat. 2892 (*Pr*) and 2887A (*Pm*) are Leclercq’s mss *B* and *C*, respectively.

²⁶ *HbMhMkPwPyWcWd*; cf. Brasington, ‘Letters of Ivo’, 169-70. I have not yet seen *Mf* which seems to be linked to *MhMk*. The mss of this group also share other features, e.g. a short form of ep. 63. Contrary to what Leclercq suggested, no known ms has a complete *Prologus* after ep. 54.

²⁷ *PdPpQe*; the mss also share certain variant readings.

larger set of manuscripts which share an idiosyncratic arrangement of certain letters.²⁸

Nonetheless, it is clear that all these manuscripts ultimately depend on a common source. How did this collection behind ‘type I/II’ evolve? Although it forms a large corpus by any standard, it is highly selective. As it seems, only letters of theological, moral, legal or political interest were collected; no letters written before 1090 were included at all.²⁹ Some letters were presumably available to the compilers but thought too mundane to be preserved.³⁰ Two other letters also omitted in ‘type I/II’, though preserved elsewhere, repeat letters which were included in ‘type I’, and one may suspect that the compilers avoided repetition.³¹ The range of material and the inserted charters suggest a compilation in Chartres, perhaps by Ivo’s pupils. Leclercq proposed that Ivo himself compiled the collection, assuming that the most recent letters in ‘type I’ were written in 1114, and that Ivo died in 1116.³² However, both assumptions are wrong. Ivo died on 23 December 1115,³³ and several letters in the ‘type I’ manuscripts must have been written in his last year. Letter 250, for example, was presumably written in late 1114. In this letter to Paschal II, Ivo defends the

²⁸ **BfGaKaLdLk** all place epp. 156, 16, 161 (in this order) at the beginning before letters to Urban II. In **PdPp** (but not **Qe**), this series is found in mid-collection before Ivo’s letters to Urban II. In **Pm** (otherwise a ‘type I’ ms) ep. 156 was inserted before ep. 16 for no apparent reason. The published descriptions suggest that **BfGaKaLdLk** (especially the lost **Ka**) are related to **PdPpQe**, but I was not able to examine this apparently derivative mss group in detail.

²⁹ The two letters from before 1090 are Juret’s ep. 287 and the first letter ed. Schmitt.

³⁰ Cf. the two letters ed. Merlet as an example of more conventional Ivonian letters of a kind excluded from the main collection.

³¹ See below note 41.

³² Leclercq, ‘Lettres d’Yves’, 109, n. 2 (Ivo †1116) and 112-3: ‘Que le recueil ait existé comme tel de vivant d’Yves, nous n’en avons aucune preuve. [...] Il paraît cependant vraisemblable qu’un premier recueil ait été constitué par Yves lui-même dans les dernières années de son épiscopat: la dernière en date des lettres du type primitif est de 1114. [...] Yves de Chartres [...] avait déjà publié trois collections de textes canoniques; elles avaient obtenu grand succès: on s’explique aisément qu’il y ait ajouté une autre collection répondant au même besoin. [...] Très peu de temps après la mort d’Yves, le recueil fut complété et organisé, ce qui donna naissance au type II.’ This is repeated in Leclercq, ‘Introduction’, xxix-xxx. Sprandel corrected Leclercq’s chronological errors but followed his idea that Ivo compiled the letter collection himself; however, his only argument is the fact that Ivo’s last will mentions a certain ‘epistolarium’; yet there is nothing to suggest that this was the exemplar of his letters (against Sprandel, *Ivo von Chartres*, 15).

³³ R.L. Poole, ‘The masters of the schools at Paris and Chartres in John of Salisbury’s time’, *English Historical Review*, 35 (1920), 321-42, 324 and Sprandel, *Ivo von Chartres*, 115.

election of Ralph d'Escures as archbishop of Canterbury, which the pope reluctantly accepted for the first time in a letter written on 30 March 1115.³⁴ Ralph sent envoys to Rome only in late 1114, and they may have taken the letter with them in November or December 1114.³⁵ Letter 253, where Ivo mentions the council at Beauvais which had taken place in late 1114, almost certainly was written in 1115.³⁶ A number of letters, including a series of letters to Cono of Praeneste, can be dated to 1114x1115 only, but it seems implausible that all were written in 1114.³⁷ If the sequence of the letters is arranged in even approximately as precise a chronological order as Leclercq assumed, it would be plausible to date at least twenty letters found in 'type I' manuscripts to 1115.³⁸ In fact, at least one can positively be assigned to Ivo's last six months. Letter 265 was written during the 'dies caniculares' (July/August) and refers to a papal document from October 1114; it must therefore have been written in Ivo's last summer.³⁹ This renders a compilation of 'type I' by Ivo himself very improbable. The same arguments hold for 'type II' which contains several letters written in 1115.⁴⁰ Two can be dated to Ivo's last months. The first is ep. 265 already mentioned above; the second is ep. 273 which mentions the excommunication of the Norman bishops by the papal legate Cono in July 1115.⁴¹

³⁴ Ep. 250 (PL 162, 255-7); Paschal's grudging letter is JL 6450. On Ralph see most recently M. Brett and J.A. Gribbin, 'Introduction', in *idem* (eds.), *Canterbury, 1070-1136* (Oxford and New York, 2004), xxii-lxxxiv, here at xxxix-xlvi.

³⁵ Cf. Eadmer, *Historia novorum* (RS 81, 226-9) on the journey.

³⁶ Ep. 253 (PL 162, 258-9); cf. R. Somerville, 'The council of Beauvais, 1114', *Traditio*, 24 (1968), 493-503 on Beauvais.

³⁷ See Sprandel, *Ivo von Chartres*, 194-6 on epp. 239, 260, 266-8, 270-1 and the letter in RHF 15, 177. On Cono see T. Schieffer, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich vom Verträge von Meerssen (870) bis zum Schisma von 1130* (Berlin, 1935), 199-202.

³⁸ Cf. Leclercq, 'Lettres d'Yves', 114 (= *idem*, 'Introduction', xxx). By these standards, the last twenty-one letters in 'type I' (epp. 250-62, 264-5, 215, 266-70) were presumably all written in 1115. Ep. 271, which Leclercq thought to belong to the original 'type I' collection as well, is the latest datable letter of Ivo; it was written after ep. 265 (see next note).

³⁹ Ep. 265 (PL 162, 269-70). The document is a confirmation by Paschal II from 28 October 1114; see Sprandel, *Ivo von Chartres*, 114, 195 and 205. In this letter to King Philip, Ivo also mentioned that he would turn to the pope, and this letter is extant as ep. 271 (PL 162, 274-5), a letter found in many but not all 'type I' mss.

⁴⁰ According to Leclercq's standards, one should date the last twenty-five letters in 'type II' (epp. 250-62, 264-5, 215, 267-70, 272-6) to 1115.

⁴¹ Ep. 273 (PL 162, 276).

The higher proportion of late letters in ‘type II’ supports a later date for its composition.

So both ‘type I’ and ‘II’ were presumably compiled only after Ivo’s death. However, both collections in all likelihood originated at Chartres, and therefore go back to Ivo, if only indirectly. We know that Ivo kept copies of his letters and that he allowed some of his letters to circulate in his lifetime.⁴² Ivo sometimes reused his own drafts,⁴³ and in one letter he reports rereading an earlier one.⁴⁴ What was the relation between these copies evidently kept at Chartres and the ‘type I/II’ collection? In this context, the main evidence comes from the sequence of the letters. In general, ‘type I/II’ is chronologically arranged. However, scholars are divided about how far one can trust the apparent order; for most letters, internal evidence for their dating is lacking. Leclercq assumed that one could confidently date such letters by their place in the collection, not least because he thought ‘type I’ to be very close to Ivo’s register.⁴⁵ Sprandel challenged Leclercq’s optimism. He rightly pointed out several letters which are definitely not in chronological sequence.⁴⁶ However, he may have gone too far. One should notice that several letters which are manifestly misplaced in the editions are in fact absent from ‘type I/II’ manuscripts.⁴⁷ For some letters, the

⁴² See the introduction to chapter four **of my thesis**.

⁴³ Ivo repeats most of ep. 72 in ep. 80 and ep. 255 served as a model for ep. Add. III (see below); ep. 211 to Reims and the letter to Cono of Preneste (RHF 15, 177) are almost identical, too.

⁴⁴ Ep. 66 (PL 162, 85), referring to ep. 60.

⁴⁵ Leclercq, ‘Lettres d’Yves’, 114: ‘Aussi, pour les lettres qu’on ne peut dater d’après aucun indice, la place dans la série indique-t-elle la position chronologique approximative.’

⁴⁶ Sprandel, *Ivo von Chartres*, 184-96.

⁴⁷ Epp. 277, 281 and 287. Sprandel does not distinguish between the mss and the editions.

dating is less certain than Sprandel thought.⁴⁸ In one case, Sprandel's date is clearly wrong and the date implied by the apparent order of the collection is probably right.⁴⁹

However, at least nine letters remain which are not in chronological sequence in 'type I/II'. It is surely significant that these letters are distributed unevenly in the collections. In the common part to ep. 282, only two letters, less than one per cent, are moderately out of sequence.⁵⁰ In contrast, seven letters, or almost ten per cent of the remaining collection, are clearly not in chronological sequence, often written several years earlier than the surrounding letters.⁵¹ In addition, three more letters in the second part which defy precise dating must be out of sequence either in 'type I' or in 'type II'.⁵² While the shared first part is therefore largely in chronological sequence, this order is manifestly disturbed in the second part in both collections. One explanation could be that the first part comes from a distinct source. While 'type I' and 'II' in their present form cannot have been compiled before late 1115, the 'core' to letter 282 may well pre-date both collections, with the most recent material being from ca. 1109. If so, its chronological order may support the idea that it stems indeed from a register-like collection of letters compiled by Ivo and his secretaries. The other letters from ca. 1109 to 1115 presumably also go back to such copies, but when 'type I' and 'II' were compiled, they seem not to have existed in a similarly

⁴⁸ Ep. 9 may have been written 1092x1093 before Anselm's consecration; it is not clear who the abbot of Bec mentioned here was. The dating of ep. 16 remains largely speculative; the king's marriage mentioned may well be the same epp. 14-5 deal with. Epp. 110-4 may all have been written in 1103 in the sequence they are found in 'type I/II'. Sprandel, *Ivo von Chartres*, 184-91 suggests 1094/05 for epp. 9 and 16, 1104 for ep. 110, and 1102/03 for epp. 112 and 114. These dates are entirely possible but one cannot exclude the dates suggested by the letters' place in the collection.

⁴⁹ Ep. 46 was most probably written in 1096, and certainly not ca. 1098, as Sprandel assumed (see chapter five). The letters before and after it in 'type I/II' are from 1096, too.

⁵⁰ Epp. 106 and 147. Ep. 106 to Henry I is from the beginning of his reign, but the surrounding letter before are from 1102. Ep. 147 is placed after a series of letters from 1104 but seems to predate a privilege which was issued in 1103 (cf. Sprandel, *Ivo von Chartres*, 192). Both letters are therefore a few months earlier than their place in the collection would suggest.

⁵¹ Epp. 223, 234-5, 243, 245, 254, 276. Epp. 234-5 were written 1104/05 but are found among letters all written 1111/12; ep. 243 was written 1111, but placed among letters that can be dated 1113x1115; ep. 245 was written 1103/04 but is found at the very end of the collection (Sprandel, *Ivo von Chartres*, 184-96).

⁵² Ep. 192 is placed before a set of letters from 1109-11 (ep. 193, 195, 194, 196-200, 202, 201, 203-9, 212) in 'type I' but after these letters in 'type II'. Epp. 224-5 are placed before epp. 227, 283, 228-35 in 'type I' but after it in 'type II'; the sequence contains letters from 1111 (epp. 227, 233) and ca. 1104 (epp. 234-5).

well-ordered form. After Ivo's death, the early letters were thus pre-ordered and pre-selected, while for the letters of the last six or seven years, both the selection and the arrangement of these letters were left to the compilers. This would explain both the almost undisturbed chronological order of the first part of the collections and variants and disorder in the last part. It may further account for the fact that the selection of letters from 1090 to ca. 1109 is essentially fixed. Most letters Ivo wrote as bishop of Chartres must have been written in these two decades, which covers almost all the great conflicts Ivo was involved in. Yet the *extravagantes* surviving only outside the 'type I/II' tradition are predominantly from the time before or after this period.⁵³ This may suggest that the reworking of his register also involved the destruction of those letters not included in the version that now survives as the shared part of the 'type I/II' traditions. If the letters from 1090 to ca. 1109 (and these only) were taken from such a source, the question presents itself whether this collection may not have circulated independently. However, while there are manuscripts which only contain part of 'type I/II', they all seem to be fragmentary collections or to have been copied from a fragmentary exemplar. On the other hand, there is good evidence that other collections of the letters already circulated during Ivo's lifetime, and these collections we have to turn to now.

A.2 The Jesus Collection

The first of these collection I will refer to as the 'Jesus collection', since the best (and perhaps the earliest) representative is now at Jesus College, Cambridge (**Cd**). Three other copies are known; one is preserved in Berlin (**Bb**), another one in Erlangen (**Ea**), and one has survived only in fragments now preserved in London and Paris (**Lh/Qh**). In addition to these four manuscripts, three Paris manuscripts preserve a later version of the same series (**PfPIPu**); two further manuscripts influenced by the Jesus group will be discussed later on (**LjWa**).

⁵³

There are seventeen *extravagantes* (including ep. 271). Three pieces (ep. 287, Schmitt III, and ep. 3) predate his pontificate; five letters are clearly late (ep. 271, Schmitt II and the letters edited in RHF 15, nos. 126, 128 and 162).

As already indicated, the four main manuscripts are dispersed across Europe. Compared to the printed editions the arrangement of letters in the ‘Jesus group’ appears chaotic. In addition, all four manuscripts are defective to some degree. The Berlin manuscript contains not only a copy of the Jesus collection but also other collections of Ivo’s letters; the Cambridge manuscript is misbound, added to and incomplete, the Erlangen copy is also incomplete at the end, and the last has only survived in fragments which have not hitherto been recognised as parts of the same manuscript. This all may explain why the manuscripts have not been addressed as a group before. Yet the shared characteristics are manifest. First of all, the letters in the Jesus collection were all written before ca. 1105. Sometimes the manuscripts also contain more recent letters, but fortunately internal evidence allows one to distinguish clearly between an older core (the Jesus collection proper) and more recent additions. Further, the Jesus collection is marked by distinctively abbreviated forms of letters 16, 27 and 134.⁵⁴ Frequently, there are distinct variant readings, and two manuscripts also share a set of letters from and to Anselm of Canterbury.⁵⁵ The distinct arrangement of the letters and the peculiar material found in the manuscripts of the Jesus group demand a common source containing the shared material of *BbCdEaLhQh*, a source which was also behind *PfPIPu* and *LjWa*. However, it is not easy to see where the collection originally ended. Three of the four manuscripts (*BbCdLh*) have the letters to ep. 32 in common; two add ep. 95 and the Anselmiana (*BbCd*); only one also has epp. 102 and 287 at the end (*Bb*), though ep. 287 is also found in *Cd* and *Lh*, if not at the end. If the letters after ep. 32 are additions, these were presumably made early; they do not contain material later than the rest of the collection, the additions are not very extensive, and most of the letters are found in at least two of the four manuscripts discussed here. The presence of ep. 95, the Anselmiana and epp. 102 and 287 (in this very sequence) in *PI* also suggests that

⁵⁴ Epp. 16* (*BbCdEaPfPIQh*), 27* (*CdEaPfPIQh*) and 134* (*BbCdLhPfPIPP*).

⁵⁵ The letters in *BbCdPIPu* (referred to as ‘Anselmiana’ in the following) are *EA* 218, *EA* 222 (= *JL* 5908), *EA* 280, *EA* 281 (= *JL* 5928) and *EA* 284; the same series is also found in *Qe*, and all but the first are also found in *LjWa* (see below). The Anselm letters were all written ca. 1102 (see below).

these pieces were part of the original collection or added to it very early. The Jesus collection therefore originally may have looked as follows (short versions are marked by an asterisk):

*Prologus**, epp. 12*, 25, 8, 16*, 27*, 35-6, 47, 60*, 63, 68, 71, 73-4, 77, 80, 82-3, 105, 85, 99, 122, 125, 155-6, 161-2, 123, 134*, 148, 19, 22, 24, 30*, 3, 40, 7, 10, 9, 13-5, 17, 37, 26*, 34, 29*, 32, 95, 102, 287; Anselmiana.

Internal evidence suggests that it was compiled in Ivo's lifetime as none of the letters in the original collection was written after ca. 1105.⁵⁶ The Anselmiana, dated around 1102, seem to have been an integral part of the collection.⁵⁷ It would be hard to explain why the compiler should have limited himself to letters written before ca. 1105 if much more had been available to him. Both the textual quality of the letters contained and the early date of some of the manuscripts further support the view that *BbCdEaLhQh* represent an early tradition. There can be no doubt that the collection had an independent circulation; four extant manuscripts of the collection proper plus six more which are influenced by it in fact suggest some influence. The question remains where it was compiled. Given the wide range of recipients of the letters contained, the collection cannot stem from any recipient's archives; nor is there any regional bias visible. Only the Anselm material may suggest an Anglo-Norman background. In any case, the compiler must have had access to Chartrain material. This is also suggested by the fact that the later 'vulgate' collections, which were compiled at Chartres, contain almost all the letters transmitted in the 'Jesus' tradition.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ The latest letter which can be dated with some confidence on internal evidence is ep. 134 (written 1103 or 1104); epp. 148, 155-6 and 161-2 seem all have been written 1103x1105 according to their place in 'type I/II'.

⁵⁷ On the dating of the letters, see Schmitt's notes in his edition. *EA* 218 may have been written in late 1101 or early 1102, the other letters can be dated confidently to 1102.

⁵⁸ Epp. 287 and 3 are not found in 'type I/II'.

A.3 The Rochester Group

Another group of three manuscripts preserves another distinct collection that may have circulated in Ivo's lifetime. Again, the manuscripts are dispersed over Europe and have so far not been recognised as a group. I refer to their supposed common source as the 'Rochester collection', as the earliest manuscript can first be traced at Rochester in 1124.⁵⁹ This collection survives more or less in its original form in the Rochester manuscript now at London (**Ln**), a Vatican (**Vm**) and a Cambridge manuscript (**Cc**); two other manuscripts influenced by the same source will be discussed later (**LjWa**). Only the Rochester manuscript contains the complete collection; **Cc** and **Vm** have shorter versions. All three manuscripts also contain later additions. Yet parallels between **CcLnVm** strongly suggest that they have a common source which contained at least the series beginning with letter four, containing Ivo's *Prologus* before ep. 105 and ending with an abbreviated version of his tract on the coronation of Louis VI (ep. 189*). The remaining letters, although some are found in two manuscripts (epp. 73-4, 287, 3, 47, 77, 250* in **LnVm**), are additions. While the first part is made up of letters from ca. 1090 to 1108 largely in chronological order, the last letters not only disturb this order but also contain letters both from before 1090 (ep. 287) and after 1108 (ep. 250); while the first part seems to draw on a source similar to the later 'type I/II' tradition, two of the added letters are not found there (epp. 287 and 3). I therefore assume that the Rochester collection originally only contained the following letters:

Epp. 4-5, 8, 10, 12, 16, 27, 35-7, 41, 20-1, 24-6, 29-30, 32, 40, 44, 49, 58-60, 63, 66-72, 99, *Prologus*, 105-7, 83, 85-6, 88, 90, 91*, 108, 111, 116, 118,

⁵⁹ London, BL Royal 6.B.vi (**Ln**). The ms is in the catalogue of St Andrew, Rochester, in the *Textus Roffensis*, written before 1124 (Rochester, Cathedral Library A.3.5, now Strood, Medway Archives and Local Studies Centre, DRc/ R 1, fol. 227r). The ms itself has a St Andrew ex-libris (**Ln**, fol. 1r). The catalogue was edited by R.P. Coates, 'Catalogue of the library of the priory of St. Andrew, Rochester, from the Textus Roffensis', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 6 (1864/65), 120-8. For a full description of the *Textus Roffensis*, see P.H. Sawyer, '[Introduction]', in idem (ed.), *Textus Roffensis* (Copenhagen, 1957/62), i, 11-21 & ii, 11-9.

121-2, 125, 123, 131-2, 134, 140, 143, 150, 152, 155-7, 160-3, 165, 167, 170-2, 176-7, 179, 183, 185-7, 189*.

Before we analyse this collection further, let us briefly turn to two other manuscripts which draw on the Rochester collection. One each is now preserved in London (**Lj**) and Vienna (**Wa**); they both contain a peculiar set of Ivo's letters in no apparent order and a short version of Anselm's *De concordia* after the Ivonian material.⁶⁰ The first part and the end are almost identical (short versions are again marked by an asterisk):

LjWa: Epp. 8, 12, 16, 35, 24-5, 59-60; 4-5, 10, 27, 36-7, 41, 26, 29, 32, 40, 44, 49, 58, 63, 66; 20-1, 43, 6, 47; 68, 71, 73, 99, 122, 125, 155-6, 161; 74, 165, 170*, 77, 22; 80, 82-3, 105, 85, 162, 123, 134*, 148, 19, 30*, 3, 7, 9, 13-5, 17, 34, 95, 287; 86, 163, 42, 33, 38, 46, 48, 50-1, 53-7, 62, 61, 65, 67, [...], Anselmiana, Anselm's *De concordia*.

The sequence seems chaotic at first, but the collections discussed so far help to elucidate the collection. While the source of the first eight letters is less clear, the series from ep. 4 to ep. 66 is clearly taken from the Rochester tradition. After four letters (epp. 20-1, 43, 6), there is a series of letters which corresponds exactly to the Jesus collection discussed above (ep. 47 to ep. 161), and after a short break, there is an even longer parallel to the Jesus collection (ep. 80 to ep. 287), including two characteristic short versions (epp. 30* and 134*). In addition, the short form of ep. 170 found in **LjWa** is also found in manuscripts which were discussed above as drawing on the Jesus collection (**PfPIPu**). Finally, the Anselm of Canterbury letters are almost the same as in the Jesus collection.⁶¹ This all leaves little doubt that **LjWa** depend on a combination of the Rochester and the Jesus collection.

⁶⁰ Cf. F.S. Schmitt, 'Eine frühe Rezension des Werkes *De concordia* des hl. Anselm von Canterbury', *RB*, 48 (1936), 41-70 on *De concordia* in **MjWa** (and other mss not related to Ivo); **Lj** should be added to the list of Anselm mss. **Mj** is otherwise not related to **LjWa**.

⁶¹ **LjWa** contain *EA* 222, *EA* 280, *EA* 281, *EA* 284, *EA* 97. All but the last are also part of the Jesus collection (see above); *EA* 97 belongs to the following *De concordia*.

This brings us back to the genesis of the Rochester collection, which has some parallels to the Jesus collection. Both contain only early letters, both partly contain the same letters,⁶² and both traditions were later combined. However, the two collections seem to have evolved independently of each other. Unlike the Jesus collection, the Rochester collection is simply a selection of the letters to ca. 1108 and does not rearrange the letters topically. The Anselm letters which travel with the Jesus group are not found in manuscripts of the Rochester collection proper.⁶³ Crucially, the Rochester collection contains many letters which are later than those in the Jesus collection; the most recent piece is ep. 189, a letter-tract Ivo wrote shortly after the coronation of Louis VI in August 1108. However, ep. 189 cannot be used to determine the *terminus ad quem* of the Rochester collection with the same confidence that the most recent letters in the Jesus collection can be employed to date this collection. The reason for this is that the version of ep. 189 in the Rochester collection is incomplete, breaking off in mid-sentence.⁶⁴ Although the grammar is not disturbed, the resulting short version lacks the most important sections of ep. 189, and there is reason to suspect that this short version is derived from a physically incomplete copy. If this is the case, the exemplar behind the Rochester collection may well have contained letters written after 1108. It is therefore possible that the Rochester collection originated after ‘type I/II’. On the other hand, there is independent evidence that the Rochester collection circulated fairly early. The extant copies are relatively early and include the earliest surviving datable manuscripts of Ivo’s letters; the collection influenced other collections apparently from an early date on; and finally, as discussed above, there is evidence that around 1109 Ivo and his secretaries were reworking the copies they kept of Ivo’s letters. If the Rochester collection originated around this time, it may credibly be linked to the editorial

⁶² See Appendix C.2.

⁶³ One late ms (*Cc*) also contains Anselm letters, but they do not come from the Jesus collection; there is nothing to suggest that the Rochester collection contained Anselm letters. Ivo’s letters are often transmitted with other letters, most commonly with those written by Anselm, Lanfranc, Fulbert, Hildebert of Lavardin and Hugh of Lyon.

⁶⁴ Cf. Appendix B.9, line 33.

activity at Chartres around 1109. This would also suit what we can infer about the apparent source of the Rochester collection. Manifestly, this source was similar to ‘type I/II’: all letters in the Rochester collection are found here in almost the same order, and even the *Prologus* is inserted where one would expect it from ‘type I/II’.

To sum up: Leclercq was right to identify his types ‘I’ and ‘II’ as widespread forms of Ivo’s letters, but wrong to suppose that Ivo compiled ‘type I’ and that ‘type II’ derived directly from ‘type I’ as found in the extant manuscripts. To some extent they represent independent handlings of the shared material, soon after Ivo’s death. Further, there is at least one collection of the letters which is not derived from type I/II’, but seem to have been made in Chartres ca. 1105 and circulated during Ivo’s lifetime. A second collection may have been compiled ca. 1109, also at Chartres. So far as these four forms overlap they provide a relatively secure basis for establishing the text of the letters. This conclusion is unlikely to be overthrown by subsequent work, though it may well be that other groupings have yet to be defined, and certainly there is room for much further precision on the detail of the transmission and the mutual cross-contamination of the different traditions.

A.4 Manuscripts of Ivo’s Letters: A Provisional Census

The following list records manuscripts of Ivo’s letters which have come to my attention. It is unlikely to be complete. I have deliberately excluded manuscripts containing less than ten letters, but included lost manuscripts, if the content can be inferred from detailed descriptions. Lost manuscripts are marked by a dagger (†). Short versions of single letters are marked by an asterisk (*), major variants by an ‘x’. For the sake of brevity, the descriptions are very basic and normally taken from the catalogues. Where no other reference is given, the descriptions are my own.

Admont, Stiftsbibliothek 257, fos 121v-219v (see too the file Panend.doc). A set of 202 numbered letters, of which the last is JE 3258. Contains 1-2B, 4-37, 39,40,38, 41-54 (followed by an unnumbered insertion, *Quodcumque imperator per epistolam – divine? Hec hactenus*, from the end of the Prologue, 55-60, 62, 61,63-4, 68-83, 287, 85, 84, 86-

106, 108-115, 118-129, 131, 133, 143-4, 148-51, 153-57, 160-2, 166, 168-71, 176, 179, 182-7, 189, 188, 191-2, 197, 200, 204-6, 208-9, 213-5, 219, 210, 231-2, 236-7, 218, 220-222, 225-6, 229-230, 234, 240-2, 245-7, 251-2, 256, 259, 261-2, 265-8, 270. Compare **Kc** below.

Alençon, BM 19 (**Aa**); saec. xii, ex St Evroul; 79 letters.⁶⁵

Antwerpen, Museum Plantin-Moretus lat. 157 (**Ab**); saec. xvi; 76 letters.⁶⁶

Auxerre, BM 69 (66) (**Ac**); ex chapter of Sens; incomplete at beginning and end. First complete letter ep. 16, last is ep. 214.

BM 125 (112) (**Ad**); ex Jouy-en-Brie, ex chapter of Sens. Two Urban letters, then 94 letters, beginning with ep. 4, ending with ep. 277.

Avranches, BM 243 (**Ae**); saec. xii, ex Mont St Michel; 'type I' to ep. 270.⁶⁷

Berlin, SPKB Phil. 1694 (**Bb/Bc/Bd**); saec. xii/xiii, ex Metz; contains the Rochester collection and two other collections of letters of Ivo. Fols. 5r-26r (**Bb**): *Prologus**, epp. 12, 25, 8, 16*, 35-6, 47, 60, 63, 68, 156, 71, 73-4, 77, 80, 83, 105, 85, 99, 122, 125, 155, 161-2, 123, 134*, 148, 19, 22, 24, 30, 3, 40, 7, 9, 13-5, 17, 37, 26, 34, 29, 32, 95, 102, 287, followed by Anselmiana (= EA 218, 222, 280, 281, 284; also found in **CdPIPuQe**, cf. **LjWa**) and further other correspondence; fols. 53r-66v (**Bc**): epp. 224, 231, 213, 255, 191, Schmitt III, 230, 6, 18, 20, 49, 170, 64, 90*, 96*, 119-20, 131, 135, 82, 178, 183, 185-6, 188, 222, 171, 197, 203, 205-6, 212, 81, 220-1, 228-9, 232-3, 16x, 10, 27*, 41, 63*; fols. 134v-138v (**Bd**): epp. 44, 57, 61, 63*, 66, 69-70, followed by letters of Hugh Metel.

lat. theol. qu. 119 (**Be**); saec. xii², ex Maria Laach; 172 letters, beginning with ep. 104, ending with ep. 259; contains a grant for St Medard (also found in **Pu**).⁶⁸

lat. theol. qu. 169 (**Bf**); saec. xii², ex Trier (?); 61 letters arranged by recipient.⁶⁹

Bern, Burgerbibliothek 225 (**Bg**); saec. xii; 16 letters.⁷⁰

470 (**Bh**); saec. xii/xiii; 'type II' with some omissions according to Leclercq.⁷¹

⁶⁵ The ms does not, as J.F. Schulte, 'Iter Gallicum', *SB Wien*, 59/4 (1868), 355-496, 451 suggested, contain a *Panormia*. For the link to St Evroul, cf. G. Nortier, *Les bibliothèques médiévales des abbayes Bénédictines de Normandie* (Paris, 1971), 120.

⁶⁶ J. Denuncé, *Musaeum Plantin-Moretus: catalogue des manuscrits* (Antwerp, 1927), 121-2.

⁶⁷ Against Leclercq, 'Lettres d'Yves', 112. Cf. also Nortier, *Bibliothèques médiévales*, 88.

⁶⁸ Rose, no. 917 (vol. ii/3, 1119-20). The ms was used by Sackur (MGH. Libelli de lite ii, 642).

⁶⁹ G. Achten, *Die theologischen lateinischen Handschriften in Quarto der Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz Berlin* (2 vols., Wiesbaden, 1984), i, 99.

⁷⁰ H. Hagen, *Catalogus codicum Bernensium* (Bern, 1875), 275.

- Boulogne-sur-Mer, BM 81 (**Bj**); saec. xii², ex St Bertin; 182 letters, beginning with ep. 4, ending with ep. 287 (not in table).
- Bruxelles, BR 1401 (**Bk**); saec. xiii, ex Bollandists; 53 letters, partly arranged by recipients; related to **Bf** and **Pp**.⁷²
- BR 1402 (**Bl**); saec. xiii, ex Alne; 110 letters, largely arranged by recipient; parallels especially to **Bf** and **Pp**.⁷³
- Cambrai, BM 554 (512) (**Ca**); ex Ourscamp (?); 276 letters, beginning with ep. 1, ending with ep. 271.⁷⁴
- Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 299 (**Cc**); saec. xiii, ex London Dominicans; contains epp. 4-5, 8, 10, 12, 16, 27, 35, 36*, 41*, 20-1, 24-6, 29-30, 32, 40, 44, 49, 58-60, 63, 66-70; 6-7, 9, 11, 13-5, 17-9, 22-3, 28, 31, 33-4, 38-9, 42-3, 45*, 46-8, 50-6, 62, 61, 65, 64, 71-83, 85, 84, 86-97, 220, 57, 1.
- Jesus College Q.G.5 (**Cd**); saec. xii¹; contains epp. 26*, 34, 29*, 95, Anselmiana (also found in **BbPIPuQe**, cf. **LjWa**), 'Sermo Augustini', ep. 236; epp. 12*, 25, 8, 16*, 27*, 35-6, 47, 60*, 63, 68, 71, 73-4, 77, 80, 82-3, 105, 85, 99, 122, 125, 155-6, 161-2, 123, 134*, 148, 19, 22, 24, 30*, 3, 40, 7, 10, 9, 13-5, 17, 37, 215, 287*. The manuscript is misbound.
- Pembroke College 69 (II) (**Ce**); saec. xiii, ex Bury.⁷⁵
- Châlons-en-Champagne, BM 72 (80) (**Cg**); ex S. Pierre de Châlons; begins with ep. 4, ends with ep. 95.⁷⁶
- Charleville, BM 53 (**Ch**); saec. xiii¹, ex Signy; 276 letters.⁷⁷
- †Chartres, BM 1029 (**Cj**); saec. xii, ex Chartres chapter; a 'type I' ms with additions: epp. [1-2bis], 4-37, 40, 38-9, 41-60, 62, 61, 63, 65-7, 64, 68-83, 85, 84, 86-103, [Prologus], 104-22, 124-5, 123, 126-31, 133, 132, 135, 134, 136-87, [189], 188, 190-3, 195, 194, 196-7,

⁷¹ Leclercq, 'Lettres d'Yves', 112.

⁷² Leclercq, 'Lettres d'Yves', 112: type 'II' with omissions and inversions. Cf. *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique* (13 vols., Brussels, 1901-48), ii, 328.

⁷³ *ibid.*

⁷⁴ V. Wolf von Glanvell, 'Einleitung', in *idem* (ed.), *Die Kanonessammlung des Kardinals Deusdedit* (Paderborn, 1905), ix-liv, xxxv-xxxvii.

⁷⁵ M.R. James, *A descriptive catalogue of the manuscripts in the library of Pembroke College* (Cambridge, 1905), 61. The collection contains numerous fragments, sometimes run together, and very few letters are even nearly complete.

⁷⁶ Leclercq, 'Lettres d'Yves', 116.

⁷⁷ *Catalogue générale* v (1879), 570.

- 198*, 199-200, 202, 201, 203-9, 212, 211, [282], 213-5, 219, 210, 216-8, 220-7, [283], 228-35, [187], 236, 238-65, [215], 266-76, Add. I. Destroyed in 1944.⁷⁸
- Clermont-Ferrand, BM 163 (144) (**Ck**); saec. xiii; 211 letters.⁷⁹
- Dublin, Trinity College 184 (**Da**); saec. xii², from Gloucester; ‘type I’ with variants. Begins with ep. 1, ends with epp. 270 and 287.⁸⁰ Related to **Hc**.
- Erlangen, UB 226 (**Ea**); saec. xii², ex Heilbronn; contains Ivo’s sermones and the Jesus collection: *Prologus**, epp. 12*, 25, 8, 16, 27*, 35-6, 47, 60*, 63, 68, 71, 73-4, 77, 80, 82-3, 105*.
- Escorial, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo ç.II.3 (**Eb**); saec. xvi, ex Agustín; apparently an incomplete ‘type I’, containing epp. 7-271.⁸¹
- d.III.22 (**Ec**); saec. xiii, ex St Stephen, Fossa nuova (OSB). Begins ep. 1, ends with ep. 122.⁸²
- Gießen, UB 163.4 (**Ga**); saec. xiv; 88 letters, ordered largely by recipient; beginning with ep. 2, ending with ep. 32.⁸³ Depends on a model similar to **Lk**.
- s’Gravenhage, Museum Meermanno-Westreenianum 10.B.19 (**Gb**); saec. xiii, French.⁸⁴
- Hannover, Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek I.246 (**Ha**); saec. xii; idiosyncratic arrangement, begins with ep. 1, breaks off incomplete with ep. 244*.⁸⁵
- Heiligenkreuz, Stiftsbibliothek 188 (**Hb**); saec. xii²; 191 letters, has *Prologus* excerpt after ep. 54 (cf. **MhMkPwPyWcWd**).⁸⁶
- Hereford, Cathedral Library P.I.15 (**Hc**); saec. xii; a ‘type I’ with minor variants; has epp. 1-2bis, 4-37, 40, 38-9, 41-60, 62, 61, 63, 65-7, 64, 68-83, 85, 84, 86-122, 124-5, 123, 126-31, 133, 132, 135, 134, 136-89, 188, 190-3, 195, 194, 196-7, 198*, 199-200, 202, 201,

⁷⁸ The content can be inferred from the notes in L. Merlet, *Lettres de saint Yves évêque de Chartres traduites et annotées* (Chartres, 1885), who used **Cj** as his base ms. Leclercq, ‘Lettres d’Yves’, 115 wrongly claimed **Cj** to be a ‘type II’ ms.

⁷⁹ *Catalogue générale* xiv (1890), 60.

⁸⁰ M.L. Colker, *Trinity College Library Dublin: descriptive catalogue of the mediaeval and Renaissance Latin manuscripts* (2 vols., Aldershot, 1991), i, 345-50.

⁸¹ G. Antolín, *Catálogo de los códices latinos de la Real Biblioteca del Escorial* (5 vols., Madrid, 1910-28), i, 215-6.

⁸² *ibid.*, 499-502.

⁸³ J.V. Adrian, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Academiae Gissensis* (Frankfurt, 1840), 45 and F.W. Otto, *Commentarii critici in codices Bibliothecae Academiae Gissensis graecos et latinos philologicos et medii aevi historicos ac geographicos* (Gießen, 1842), 52-4.

⁸⁴ P.J.H. Vermeeren and A.F. Dekker, *Inventaris van de Handschriften van het Museum Meermanno-Westreenianum* (s’Gravenhage, 1960), 19-20.

⁸⁵ H. Härtel and F. Ekowski, *Handschriften der Niedersächsischen Landesbibliothek Hannover* (2 vols., Wiesbaden, 1982/89), ii, 92-3.

⁸⁶ Brasington, ‘Letters of Ivo’, 169.

203-9, 212, 211, 282, 213-5, 219, 216-8, 220-6, 284, 227, 283, 228-62, 264-70, 287;
related to **Da**.

P.II.15 (**Hd**); saec. xii¹, ex Cirencester; essentially a 'type I' divided in eleven *distinctiones*;
related to **Lo**.

†Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek Rastatt 24 (**Ka**); saec. xii; 80 letters, largely arranged by
recipients. Very similar to BN lat. 16250 (**Qe**); possibly related to **GaLoPdPp**. Lost
during the Second World War.⁸⁷

København, Kongelige Bibliotek Gl. kgl. S. 1357 4° (**Kc**); saec. xii, ex Cismar (OC). Contains 1-2B,
4-37, 39, 40, 38, 41-60, 62, 61, 63, 67, 64-6, 68-83, 85, 84, 86-106, 108-115, 118-
122, 124-5, 123, 126-8, 129*, 131, 133, 143-4, 148-51, 153-7, 160-2, 166, 168-71,
176, 179, 182-7, 189, 188, 191-2, 197, 200, 204-6, 208-9, 282, 213-5, 219, 210,
231-2, 236-7, 218, 220-2, 225-6, 229-30, 234, 240-2, 245-8, 251-2, 256, 259, 261-2,
265--8, 270. In short, what looks like Type I, much disarranged and abbreviated in
the later sections. The text is distinctly approximate. After the explicit the recto of
fo. 84 has one unidentified canon from Pan. 3.1, and then 3.5-9 more or less
complete. Fo. 85v has a drawing of Ivo as a bishop enthroned.⁸⁸

Köln, Historische Archive W* 130 (**Kd**); saec. xii; 32 letters.⁸⁹

Le Mans, BM 8 (**La**); saec. xiii, ex Charterhouse 'Domus Parci'.⁹⁰

Leiden, BPL 191E (**Lb**); saec. xii, ex 'Herswithenhusen'.⁹¹

BPL 1925 (**Lc**); saec. xii/xiii, ex Pethau.⁹²

Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek 201 2° (**Ld**); saec. xiii, ex Altzelle; 37 letters, partly arranged by
recipients.⁹³

Lincoln, Cathedral Library 233 (**Le**); saec. xiiⁱⁿ; 58 letters and *Prologus*.⁹⁴

Linz, Studienbibliothek 295 (**Lf**); saec. xiii, ex Baumgartenberg.⁹⁵

⁸⁷

A. Holder, *Die Durlacher und Rastatter Handschriften* (Die Handschriften der
Großherzoglich Badischen Hof- und Landesbibliothek in Karlsruhe 3, Karlsruhe, 1895), 107-16.

⁸⁸

E. Jørgensen, *Catalogus codicum latinorum medii aevi Bibliothecae Regiae
Hafniensis* (Copenhagen, 1926), 49, supplemented by information from Martin Brett.

⁸⁹

J. Vennebusch, *Die theologischen Handschriften des Stadtarchivs Köln* (Cologne,
1989), 42.

⁹⁰

Catalogue générale xx (1893), 22-3.

⁹¹

Codices bibliothecae publicae latini (Bibliotheca Universitatis Leidensis. Codices
manuscripti 3, Leiden, 1912), 98.

⁹²

ibid., 187.

⁹³

R. Helssig, *Die theologischen Handschriften* (Katalog der lateinischen und
deutschen Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek zu Leipzig 1, Leipzig, 1935), 282.

⁹⁴

R.M. Thomson, *Catalogue of the manuscripts of Lincoln Cathedral Chapter Library*
(Cambridge, 1989), 193.

Lisbon, Biblioteca Nacional Fundo Alcobaça CCXV/146 (**Lg**); saec. xii; 272 letters and sermons arranged by recipient and theme.⁹⁵

London, BL Add. 10973 (**Lh**); saec. xii; fragment of the Jesus collection: epp. 71ex, 73, 74, 77, 80, 82-3, 105, 85, 99, 122, 125, 123, 155-6, 162, 134*, 148, 287, 19, 22, 24, 30*, 3, 40, 7, 10, 9, 13-5, 17, 18*/36*/37, 26, 34, 29*, 32*. The first part of this manuscript is now found in fragments in Paris, BN lat. 18219 (**Qh**) and 18248.

Add. 18333 (**Lj**); saec. xii, ex St Mary, Victring; has epp. 8, 12, 16, 35, 24-5, 59-60, 4-5, 10, 27, 36, 37*, 41*, 26, 29, 32, 40, 44, 49, 58, 63, 66, 20-1, 43, 6, 47, 68*, 71, 73, 99, 122, 125, 155-6, 161, 74, 165, 170*, 77, 22, 80, 82-3, 105, 85, 162, 123, 134*, 148, 19, 30*, 3, 7, 9, 13-5, 17, 34, 95, 287, 86, 163, 42, 33, 38, 46, 48, 50-1, 53-7, 62, 61, 65, 67, 64, 69-70, 72, 89-91, 93, 96, 101, 100, 104, 107, 111-2, 114-5, 118, 116, 119-121, 126-30, 132, 135-6, 138-9, 141-7, 151, 153, 174-80, 182-3, 185-7, 189, 188, 190, 222, 108, 172, 171, 220-1, 228-9, 232-4, 224, 214, 231, 268, 256, 239, 278, 215, 213, 255, 274, 191, 193, 195, 194, 196-7, 200, 202-7, 212, Schmitt II, 133, 157, 140, 150, 152, 160, 81, 98, 88, 137, 149, Schmitt III, 154, 159, 164, 102, 192, 230, 241, 245, 106, 246, 250, 184, 273, 269, 266, Anselmiana (also found in **Wa**, cf. **BbCdPIPuQe**), Anselm, *De concordia* (also found in **MjWa**). Draws on both the Jesus and the Rochester collection. Related to **Wa**.

Cotton Claudius A.vi (**Lk**); saec. xii; has 253 letters in two collections. The first, ordered by recipient, contains epp. 2, 156, 16, 161, 1, 12, 25, 43, 46, 48, 65, 67; 81, 88-9, 92, 94-5, 103-5, 108-10, 117, 135; 84, 87, 93*, 133, 54-5, 59-61, 63, 66, 68-70; 71, 72*, 73-4, 77-8, 80, 82-3, 85, 90, 96, 99, 101-2, 106, 111, 40, 10, 24, 236*, 287, 148, 162, 155, 47, 13, 15, 8, 16*, 27*, 35-6, 122, 125, 124, 134*, 22, 3, 7, 17, 26, 34, 19, 32; the other collection supplies almost all missing letters in the order of 'type I', and the *Prologus* at the end. Related to **Ga** and **Va**.

Harley 229 (**Li**); saec. xii; an incomplete 'type I' manuscript, containing epp. 1-103 and breaking off in the *Prologus*. May be related to **Pz**.

Royal 6.B.vi (**Ln**); saec. xii^{1/4}, ex Rochester; contains the Rochester collection: epp. 4-5, 8, 10, 12, 16, 27, 35-7, 41, 20-1, 24-6, 29-30, 32, 40, 44, 49, 58, 59-60, 63, 66-72, 99, *Prologus*, 105-7, 83, 85-6, 88, 90, 91*, 108, 111, 116, 118, 121-2, 125, 123, 131-2, 134, 140, 143, 150, 152, 155-7, 160-3, 165, 167, 170-2, 176-7, 179, 183-7, 189*, 73-4, 287, 19*, 7, 4, 17, 3, 47, 77, 250.

⁹⁵ MBK Österreich, v, 17; cf. K. Schiffmann, *Die Handschriften der Öffentlichen Studienbibliothek in Linz* (Linz, 1935).

⁹⁶ T.L. Amos, *The Fundo Alcobaça of the Biblioteca Nacional, Lisbon* (3 vols., Collegeville, Minn., 1988), i, 186-7.

Royal 11.A.x (**Lo**); saec. xii², ex Lanthony (?); 264 letters in eleven *distinctiones*. The order is by and large that of 'type I', with ep. 287 added at the end. Related to **Hd**.

Royal 13.A.xviii (**Lp**); saec. xv; 171 letters with *Prologus* after ep. 103.⁹⁷

Mantova, Bibl. comunale 32 (A. II. 1); ex Polirone; saec. xii; 70 letters, with some insertions.⁹⁸

Montpellier, BM 75 (**Ma**); saec. xiii; 276 letters; 'type I' ending with ep. 271.⁹⁹

BM 231 (**Mb**); saec. xii^{med}, ex Clairvaux; 'type II', ends with ep. 287.¹⁰⁰

BM 542 (**Md**); saec. xii^{med}, ex Oratory of Troyes; has epp. 1-108 as 'type I', then distinct sequence.¹⁰¹

Moscow, Lomonosov State University, Documentary Collection of Gustav Schmidt, Fond 40, inv. 1, no. 3, s. xii or s. xiii, 6 fol. fragm.¹⁰²

München, BSB clm 111 (**Me**); saec. xvi; 263 letters.¹⁰³

clm 14408 (**Mf**); ex St Emmeran; 200 letters; adds John VIII, JE 3258 at the end (also found in **MfMkWd**).¹⁰⁴

clm 17208 (**Mh**); saec. xii^{med}, ex Schäftlarn; has 200 letters, *Prologus* excerpt after ep. 54 (cf. **HbMkPwPyWcWd**) and JE 3258 at the end (cf. **MfMkWd**).

clm 22291 (**Mj**); saec. xiii, ex Windberg; has 204 letters and a version of Anselm's *De concordia* (also found in **LjWa**).

clm 23606 (**Mk**); saec. xii, ex Ranshofen; has 200 letters, *Prologus* excerpt after ep. 54 (cf. **HbMhPwPyWcWd**) and JE 3258 at the end (cf. **MfMhWd**).

Namur, Bibliothèque de la ville 91 (**Na**); divided into three *distinctiones*, each with *capitulatio*, and re-organised.¹⁰⁵

118 (**Nb**), 'type I' with omissions and inversions according to Leclercq.¹⁰⁶

⁹⁷

G.F. Warner and J.P. Gilson, *Catalogue of Western manuscripts in the Old Royal and King's collections* (4 vols., London, 1921), ii, 85.

⁹⁸

Corrado Corradini *et al.*, *Catalogo dei manoscritti Polironiani* (Storia di San Benedetto Polirone III. 1, Bologna, 1998), 9-11.

⁹⁹

Guizard, 'Trois manuscrits', 308.

¹⁰⁰

ibid., 308-9.

¹⁰¹

ibid., 309.

¹⁰²

Formerly at Halberstadt, contains all or parts of epp. 1-2, 17-18, 20, 24, 27-36. E.R. Skwajrs, and N. Ganina, *Deutsche mittelalterliche Handschriften- und Druckfragmente in der 'Dokumentensammlung Gustav Schmidt' der Lomonossov Universität Moskau. Katalog, Beiträge und Studien* [in Russian], Moscow 2008, 35-6, no. 3 with plate 27, which suggests s. xii rather than the s. xiii of the Catalogue.

¹⁰³

C. Halm *et al.*, *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis* (5 in 7 vols., Munich, 1868-81), i/1, 29.

¹⁰⁴

ibid., ii/2, 168.

¹⁰⁵

Leclercq, 'Lettres d'Yves', 115; cf. Hermand, 'Note sur deux manuscrits'.

¹⁰⁶

Leclercq, 'Lettres d'Yves', 111; cf. Hermand, 'Note sur deux manuscrits'.

Orléans, BM 222, pp. 79-104 (**Oa**); saec. xii, ex Fleury; appendix to *Panormia* containing some hundred letters or extracts from letters 4-134.¹⁰⁷

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 526 (**Oc**); saec. xii²; incomplete 'type I', beginning with ep. 104, ending with ep. 270.

Laud misc. 226 (**Od**); saec. xii; complete 'type I', ending with ep. 271.

Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine 2010 (1126) (**Pa**); saec. xii, ex Oratoire; 'type I', physically incomplete at the beginning: epp. 8, 7, 9-37, 40, 38-9, 41-60, 62, 61, 63, 65-7, 64, 68-83, 85, 84, 86-103, *Prologus*, 104-22, 124-5, 123, 126-31, 133, 132, 135, 134, 136-87, 189, 188, 190-3, 195, 194, 196-7, 198*, 200, 202, 201, 203-9, 212, 211, 282, 213-5, 219, 210, 216, 218, 220-6, 284, 227, 283, 228-35, 187, 236-62, 264-5, 215, 266-71.

Paris, BN lat. 2481 (**Pb**); saec. xii, from St-Jean-en-Vallée; 'type I' with additions: epp. 1-2bis, 4-37, 40, 38-9, 41-60, 62, 61, 63, 65-7, 64, 68-83, 85, 84, 86-103, *Prologus*, 104-22, 124-5, 123, 126-31, 133, 132, 135, 134, 136-87, 189, 188, 190-3, 195, 194, 196-7, 198*, 199, 200, 202, 201, 203-9, 212, 211, 282, 213-5, 219, 210, 216-8, 220-7, 283, 228-35, 187, 236-62, 264-5, 215, 266-77; a letter of Bernard of Clairvaux (also found in **Pg**); may depend on a model similar to **Pe**.

2483 (**Pc**); saec. xii; incomplete 'type I': epp. 1-2bis, 4-37, 40, 38-9, 41-60, 62, 61, 63, 65-7, 64, 68-78, 80, 82-3, 85-6, 90-1, 96-103, *Prologus*, 104-22, 124-5, 123, 126-31, 133, 132, 135, 134, 136-81. Depends on model close to **Pr**.

2484 (**Pd**); ex Charles d'Orléans; partly arranged by recipient: epp. 2, 1, 2bis, 12, 25, 43, 46, 48, 65, 67; 88-9, 92, 94-5, 103-5, 108-10, 117, 135, 81; 84, 93, 133; 54, 59, 60-1, 66, 68, 24; 125, 90, 111, 113, 115, 119, 134*; 8*, 50*, 35; 85, 102; 56, 14-5, 22, 28, 144; 106, 118, 71, 72*/80, 73-7; 91, 116; 79, 82-4, 86-7; 156, 16, 161, 63, 70, 96-7, 114*, 98-101, 107, 122-3, 49, 51-3, 58, 62, 5-7, 10, 78, 44*, 287, 13, 17-21, 23, 26-7, 30-2, 34, 36-7, 40, 38-9, 41-2, 47, 64, 120, 128, 112, 121, 129, 143; closely related to **Pp**.

2485 (**Pe**); saec. xii/xiii; 'type I' with additions: epp. 1-2bis, 4-37, 40, 38-9, 41-60, 62, 61, 63, 65-7, 64, 68-83, 85, 84, 86-103, *Prologus*, 104-22, 145-5, 123, 126-31, 133, 132, 135, 134, 136-87, 189, 188, 190-3, 195, 194, 196-7, 198*, 199-200, 202, 201, 203-9, 212, 211, 282, 213-5, 219, 210, 216-8, 220-7, 283, 228-35, 187, 236-62, 264-5, 215, 266-71; another hand adds epp. 272-7 (cf. **PbPg**) and a marriage tract (also found in **Pm**). Originally very close to **PcPr**, but carefully corrected against and added from a better text related perhaps to **Pm**. In **Pe a.c.**, letters 198 and 199 were conflated as in

¹⁰⁷

Martin Brett (private communication).

PaPcPmPrQlWh; most of the missing ep. 198 is inserted, with only the last sentence missing (as in all ‘type I’ manuscripts).

2486 (***Pf***); saec. xii²; has epp. 12, 194, 197, 196, 25, 8, 16*, 27*, 35-6, 47, 60*, 63, 68*, 71, 73-4, 77, 104, 4, 6, 21, 26, 80, 82-3, 105, 85, 99, 122, 125, 155-6, 161-2, 123, 134*, 148, 19, 22, 24, 30*, 3, 40, 7, 10, 9, 13-5, 17*, 29, 38, 41-4, 46, 48-51, 53-5, 57-9, 62, 61, 65-7, 64, 69-70, 72, 81, 86, 88-91, 93, 96, 98, 101, 100, 102, 104*, 107, 111-2, 114-5, 118, 116, 165, 170*, 174-6, 119-22, 126, 128, 130-1, 133, 136-7, 123, 127, 129, 132, 135, 179-80, 182-3, 185-7, 189, 188, 190-1, 193, 195, 200, 202-7, 212, Schmitt II, 222, 108, 172, 171, 32, 220-1, 228-9, 232-4, 224, 214, 139-47, 149-52, Schmitt III, 153-4, 157, 160, 163-4, 177-8, 138, 192, 230-1, 242, 245, 106, 246, 250, 184, 273, 269, 266, 268, 256, 236-7, 239, 278, 215, 213, 255, 274, letter to Boneval.

Related to ***PIPu***; draws on the Jesus collection.

2487 (***Pg***); saec. xii²; ‘type I’ with additions (cf. ***PbPe***): epp. 10*, 11-2; 39*, 41-60, 62, 61, 63, 65-7, 64, 68-83, 85, 84, 86-94, 95*; 129*, 130-1, 133, 132, 135, 134, 136-65, 166*, 167-87, 189, 188, 190-3, 195, 194, 196-7, 198*, 199, 200, 202, 201, 203-9, 212, 211, 282, 213-5, 219, 210, 216-8, 220-7, 283, 228-35, 187, 236-62, 264-5, 215, 266-77; a letter of Bernard of Clairvaux (cf. ***Pb***). May depend on a model similar to ***Pe***.

2488 (***Ph***); saec. xii/xiii, ex Citeaux; mixed ‘type I/II’: epp. 1-2bis, 4-35, 40, 37-9, 287, 41-60, 62, 61, 63, 65-7, 64, 68-72, 82-3, 85, 84, 86-96, 73-81, 207-9, 212, 192, 211*, 282, 219, 210, 216-8, 220, 97-122, 124-5, 123, 126-31, 133, 132, 135, 134, 136-57, *Prologus*, 158-82, 184-7, 189, 188, 190-1, 193, 195, 194, 196-200, 202-5, 206in, 236ex, 264, 250. Copied from a misbound exemplar.

2489 (***Pj***); saec. xii/xiii, ex St Denis, Reims; complete ‘type II’: epp. 1-2bis, 4-37, 40, 38, 41-53, 55-60, 62, 61, 63, 65-6, 67*, 64, 68-83, 85, 84, 86-103, *Prologus*, 104-22, 124-5, 123, 126-31, 133, 132, 135, 134, 136-79, 180*/182*, 183-7, 189, 188, 190-1, 193, 195, 194, 196-200, 202, 201, 203-9, 212, 192, 211, 282, 219, 210, 216-8, 220-2, 227, 283, 228-35, 224-5, 278-9, 213-5, 223, 280, 236, 238-62, 264-5, 215, 266-70, 272-6. Closely related to ***Pn***.

2490 (***Pk***); saec. xii/xiii, ex La Charité; ‘type I’ with variants: epp. 1-2bis, 5-6, 9, 11, 13-5, 18-9, 21-5, 27-8, 31, 30, 33, 36, 40, 38-9, 42-3, 45-6, 48, 50-4, 58, 63, 66-7, 64, 68-71, 65, 72-4, 82, 84; 4, 7-8, 10, 16-7, 20, 26, 29, 32, 34-5, 37, 41, 44, 47, 49, 55-7, 59-60, 62, 61; 75, 77, 80, 96, 100, 105-6, 112, 115-6, 125, 123, 131, 133-4, 136-7, 140, 148, 155-6, 160-4, 166-7, 170-1, 176-7, 183-5, 190-2, 194, 197, 203, 205, 208, 212-4, 218; 186, 206, 187; 76, 78-9, 81, 83, 85, 84, 86-95, 97, 99, 103-4, 108-10; 93,

- 98, 102, *Prologus*, 107; 111, 113-4, 117-22, 124, 126-30, 132, 135, 138-9, 141-7, 149-54, 157-9, 165, 168-9, 172-5, 178-82, 187, 189, 188, 193, 195-6, 198*, 199-200, 202, 201, 204, 207, 209, 211, 282, 215, 219, 210, 216-7, 220-6, 284, 227, 283, 228-62, 264-5, 215, 266-71. Related to *Ma*.
- 2887 (*Pl*); saec. xii; has epp. 23, 25, 18, 67-8, 52-3, 277, 62, 160-1, 171, 191, 162-4, 166*, 167, 170*, 176-7, 183-6, 189, 188*, 190, 192, 194, 197, 203, 205-6, 208, 212-4, 218, 220-2, 224-6, 227*, 228-32, 236-7, 242-5, 246*, 247, 249, 251-2, 255; 4, 7-8, 10, 9, 13-5, 17, 26, 34, 29*, 32; 95; Anselmiana (also found in *BbCdPuQe*, cf. *LjWa*); epp. 102, 287, Schmitt I, 16*, 27*, 99, 122, 125*, 156, 123, 134*, 148, 80, 82, 73, 40, 24x, 63x, 256, 262, 35, 36, 37, 41, 44, 47, 49, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59*, 16*, 60*, 105, 27*; capitula; epp. 108-9, 88, 71, 93, 75, 104, 124, 120, 119, 111, 113, 126, 134*, 90, 76*, 94, 81, 128, 77, 39, 100, 101, 91, 32*, 6, 30, 16*, 11, 78, 79, 112, 21, 97, 87, 20, 22, 28, 33, 51, 42, 127, 61, 89*, 98; marriage tract; epp. 115, 5; 133, 85, 83, 84, 103, 43, 12, 87, 65*. Related to *PfPu*; draws on the Jesus collection.
- 2887A (*Pm*); saec. xii, ex friars of Loches; complete 'type I': epp. 1-2bis, 4-15, 156, 16-37, 40, 38-9, 41-60, 62, 61, 63, 65, 66, 67, 64, 68-83, 85, 84, 86-92, 93*, 94-109, 110-22, 124, 125, 123, 126-31, 133, 132, 135, 134, 136-87, 189, 188, 190-3, 195, 194, 196-7, 198*/199, 200, 202, 201, 203-9, 212, 211, 282, 213-5, 219, 210, 216-8, 220-7, 283, 228-35, 187, 236-62, 264, 265, 215, 266, 267*, 268-71, followed by Anselm pieces, a marriage tract (also found in *Pe*) and eight letters concerning the friars of Loches.
- 2888 (*Pn*); saec. xii, ex St Pierre, Beauvais; incomplete 'type II': epp. 1-2bis, 4-37, 40, 38, 41-53, 55-60, 62, 61, 63, 65-6, 67*, 64, 68-83, 85, 84, 86-103, *Prologus*, 104-22, 124-5, 123, 126-31, 133, 132, 135, 134, 136-179, 180*/182*, 183-7, 189, 188, 190-1, 193, 195, 194, 196-200, 202, 201, 203-9, 212, 192, 211, 282, 219, 210, 216-8, 220-2, 227, 283, 228-35, 224-5, 278-9, 213-5, 223, 280, 236, 238-62, 264-5, 215, 266-7. Closely related to *Pj*.
- 2889 (*Po*); saec. xii/xiii; incomplete 'type I': epp. 24ex, 25-8, 29in, 29ex, 30-35*, 72*, 287, 50-1, 52in, 52ex, 54, 56, 55, 57, 59, 58, 60in, 60ex, 62, 61, 63*, 65-7, 64, 68-83, 85, 84, 86-104, 106, 105, 107-8, 111, 109, 112, 110, 113-32*, 149-70, 172, 171, 173-85, 187, 189, 188, 190-3, 195, 194, 196-7, 198*, 199-200, 202, 201, 203-5, 207-9, 212, 211, 282, 213-5, 219, 216, 210, 217-8, 220-7, 283, 228-32, 234, 233, 235, 238-62,

- 264, 236, 215, 265-6, 269, 267, 270, 268, 237. The manuscript is incomplete and misbound. Not related to BN lat. 2887 (**PI**).¹⁰⁸
- 2890 (**Pp**); ex Jean Muret du Mans; partly arranged by recipient: epp. 71-7, 91, 116, 79-83, 85, 84, 86-89, 2, 156, 16, 161; 1, 2bis, 12, 25, 43, 46, 48, 65, 67; 89, 92, 94-5, 103-5, 108-10, 117, 135, 84, 93, 133; 54-5, 59-61, 63, 66; 125, 68-70, 90, 96-7, 111, 113, 115, 114*, 8*, 98-102, 106-7, 118-9, 122*, 49, 50*, 51-3, 56*, 57-8, 62, 134*, 4-7, 10, 78, 44*; two letters;¹⁰⁹ 287, 9, 11, 13-5, 17-24, 26-37, 40, 38-9, 41-2, 47, 64, 120, 126-8, 112, 121, 129, 143-4. Parallels to **Ka**; closely related to **Pd**.
- 2891 (**Pq**); from Buzet (d. Chartres); incomplete 'type II', divided in ten *libri*, containing I: epp. 2ex, 2bis, 4-25; II: epp. 26-37, 40, 38-9, 41-50; III: epp. 51-3, 55-60, 62, 61, 63, 65, 67, 64, 68-77; IV: epp. 78-83, 85, 84, 86-102; V: epp. 103-22, 124-5, 123, 126-7; VI: epp. 128-31, 133, 132, 135, 134, 136-52; VII: epp. 153-77; VIII: epp. 178-87, 189, 188, 190-1, 193, 195, 194, 196-200, 202, 201, 203; IX: epp. 204-9, 212, 192, 211x, 219 (Si quid de me), 210, 216-8, 220-1, 222*, 227, 283, 228-32; X: epp. 233-5, 224-5, 278-9, 213-5, 223, 280, 236, 238-47.
- 2892 (**Pr**); saec. xii, ex de Thou, ex Colbert; complete 'type I': epp. 1-2bis, 4-37, 40, 38-9, 41-60, 62, 61, 63, 65-7, 64, 68-83, 85, 84, 86-103, *Prologus*, 104-22, 124-5, 123, 126-31, 133, 132, 135, 134, 136-87, 189, 188, 190-3, 195, 194, 196-7, 198*/199, 200, 202, 201, 203-9, 212, 211, 282, 213-5, 219, 210, 216-8, 220-7, 283, 228-35, 187, 236-62, 264-5, 215, 266-71. Closely related to lat. 2483 (**Pc**) and 2485 (**Pe**), esp. before correction. Epp. 198 and 199 are conflated (see description of **Pe**).
- 2892A (**Ps**); saec. xii; complete 'type I', followed by 'Epistole de coniugio': epp. 1-2bis, 4, 6-14, 17-37, 40, 38-9, 41-4, 46-60, 62, 61, 63, 65-7, 64, 68-83, 85, 84, 86-98, 100-3, *Prologus*, 104-21, 124, 123, 126-9, 131, 133, 132, 135-47, 139-47, 149-54, 156-7, 159-60, 162-5, 168-9, 171-87, 189-93, 195, 194, 196-7, 198*, 199-200, 202, 201, 203-8, 212, 211, 283, 213-5, 219, 210, 216-7, 220, 223-4, 226, 284, 227, 283, 228, 230-1, 233-6, 187, 236-41, 244, 247-8, 250-1, 253-60, 262, 264-5, 215, 266-71; epp. 242-3, 245-6, 249, 252, 261, 129-30, 134, 148, 155, 161, 166-7, 170, 5, 15-6, 188, 209, 218, 221-2, 225, 229, 232, 45; 122, 125, 158, 211.
- 2893 (**Pt**); saec. xii, ex Colbertinus; 'type II' with additions: epp. 1-2bis, 4-37, 40, 38-9, 41-53, 55-60, 62, 61, 63, 65-6, 67*, 64, 68-83, 85, 84, 86-92, 94-103, *Prologus*, 104-22, 124-5, 123, 126-31, 133, 132, 135, 134, 136-87, 189, 188, 190-1, 193, 195, 194, 196-200, 202, 201, 203-9, 212, 192, 211, 283, 219, 210, 216-8, 220-2, 227, 282,

¹⁰⁸

Against Leclercq, 'Lettres d'Yves', 112.

¹⁰⁹

Both printed from this ms by Leclercq (ibid., 119-21).

- 228-35, 224-5, 278-9, 213-5, 223, 280, 236, 238-62, 264-5, 215, 266, 267-70, 272-6; epp. 277, 54, 287* are additions. Closely related to **Qd**.
- 2894 (**Pu**); saec. xii, ex Orléans; has epp. 244, 271, 248, 247, 249, 260, 265, 9, 243*; 43, 46, 48-51, 53-9, 60*, 62, 61, 63, 65-7, 64, 68-72, 74, 81-2, 85-6, 88-9, 38, 41-2, 90-1, 93, 96, 98, 101, 100, 102, 107, 111-2, 114-5, 118, 116, 119-20, 122, 125, 123, 126-31, 133, 132, 135, 134, 136-52, Schmitt III, 153-4, 155-7, 159-165, 170*, 174-80, 182-3, 185-8, 190-1, 193, 195, 194, 196-7, 200, 202-7, 212, Schmitt II, 12, 83, 222, 108, 172, 171, 32, 220-1, 228-9, 232-4, 224, 214, 192, 230-1, 241, 245, 106, 246, 250, 184, 273, 269, 266, 268, 256, 236-7, 239, 278, 215, 213, 255, 274, 287, Schmitt I, a grant for St Medard, epp. 259, 99, 105, 8, 16, 10, 7, 4-6, 24-5, 27, 19, 21-2, 26, 29, 36, 33, 35, 34, 37, 40, 44, 60, 261, 264, 253, 270, 189, a letter ('Dilectissimo suo G. frater H. '), epp. 226, 3, 95, Anselmiana (also found in **BbCdPIQe**, cf. **LjWa**), epp. 251-2, 254, 258, 11, 20, 18, 28, 30-1, 39, 45, 52, 75-6, 78, 84, 87, 92, 94, 97, 103, 109-10, 113, 117, 121, 124, 158, 166, 168, 173, 181, 199, 201, 209, 211, 282, 219, 210, 216, 218, 223, 225, 284, 227, 282, 235, 238, 240, 262*, 257, 267. Related to **PfPI**; draws on the Jesus collection. It shares many of the idiosyncratic reading Sackur reports for **Be** and contains the same grant for St Medard (see above).
- 3004 (**Pv**); 'type II' with omissions and inversions according to Leclercq.¹¹⁰
- 4221 (**Pw**); saec. xii, English; has epp. 1-2bis, 4-37, 40, 38-9, 41-54, *Prologus** (cf. **HbMhMkPyWcWd**), 55-60, 62, 61, 63*, 64, 68-83, 85, 84, 86-103, *Prologus*, 104-9. Closely related to **Py**.
- 4284 (**Px**); saec. xiii; appendix to *Panormia*.¹¹¹
- 5505 (**Py**); saec. xii; has epp. 4ex, 5-19, 20in; 61ex, 63*, 64, 68-80, 81in; 20ex, 21-37, 40, 38-9, 41-54, *Prologus** (cf. **HbMhMkPwWcWd**), 55-60, 62, 61in; 81ex, 82-3, 85, 84, 86-9. The manuscript is incomplete and misbound; closely related to **Py**.
- 10341 (**Pz**); a composite manuscript: fols. 1-153 are English, saec. xii^{2/3}, fols. 154-211 are French, saec. xii^{ex}.¹¹² 'Type I' with minor additions: epp. 1-2bis, 4-37, 40, 38-9, 41-60, 62, 61, 63, 65-7, 64, 68-83, 85, 84, 86-103, *Prologus*, 104-22, 124-5, 123, 126-31, 133, 132, 135, 134, 136-87, 189, 188, 190-3, 195, 194, 196-7, 198*, 199-200,

¹¹⁰ *ibid.*, 112.

¹¹¹ G. Fransen, 'Varia ex manuscriptis', *Traditio* 21 (1965), 515-9, here at 517.

¹¹² F. Avril and P.D. Stirnemann, *Manuscrits enluminés d'origine insulaire: VII^e - XX^e siècle* (Manuscrits enluminés de la Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, 1987); the respective dates of the two parts are those given by Michael Gullick, Hertfordshire, as reported by Martin Brett (private communication).

- 202, 201, 203-9, 212, 211, 282, 213-5, 219, 210, 216-8, 220-6, 284, 227, 283, 228-35, 187, 236-62, 264-5, 215, 266-71.
- 11381 s. xiii, Bernard Collet (+1755, canon of ND)¹¹³
- 13056 (*Qa*); a 'type II' according to Leclercq.¹¹⁴
- 14146 (*Qb*); saec. xii, from Bec (?); a collection of letters by St Anselm and letters and sermons of Ivo, containing epp. 1-2, 30, 33, 39, 42, 185, 103, 122, 243.
- 14192 (Not seen), contains epp. 204* (fragment, end only) , 205-12, 214, 216* (beginning only).¹¹⁵
- 14193 (*Qc*); saec. xii; has epp. 2bis, 4, 7-12, 16-9, 22-5, 26*, 163, 41.
- 15165 (*Qd*); saec. xii, ex St Victor; 'type II' with additions: epp. 1-2bis, 4-37, 40, 38-9, 41-53, 55-60, 62, 61, 63, 65-7, 64, 68-75, 77-83, 85, 84, 86-92, 94-103, *Prologus*, 104-22, 124-5, 123, 126-31, 133, 132, 135, 134, 136-87, 189, 188, 190-1, 193, 195, 194, 196-200, 202, 201, 203-9, 212, 192, 211, 283, 219 (Si quid de...), 210, 216-8, 220-2, 227, 282, 228-35, 224-5, 278-9, 213-5, 223, 280, 236, 238-62, 264-5, 215, 266, 267-70, 272-6; adds epp. 277, 287*, 263, a sermon and a letter of the Paris chapter. Closely related to *Pt*.
- 16250 (*Qe*); saec. xii, ex Sorbonne; has *Prologus*, epp. 2; 1, 12, 25, 43, 46, 48, 65, 67, 3; 81, 88-9, 92, 94-5, 103-5, 108-10, 117, 135, 276; 84, 87, 93*, 133; 54-5, 59-61, 66, 68, 24, 236-7; 13, 85, 83, 161; 8, 35, 134, 90, 111, 125; 36; 115; 77, 123 ; 37, 122; 162, 155; 16, 70; 74, 148; 72*, 73, 80, 82, 26, 78, 69, 29; 32, 17, 99; 156, 63, 287x, 34, 96, 40, 7, 10; 101, 14-5, 9, 22, 71, 106, 23, 27; Anselmiana (also found in *BbCdPIPu*, cf. *LjWa*); Ivo, ep. 215, letter of Symeon of Durham; Ivo, epp. 250, 176, 157, 150; 170-1, 58; 152, 185; 30, 177, 184; 21; 20, 172, 44; 165, 167; 131, 183; 140, 163, 41*, 4, 26, 194, 160, 186; 189, 62; 118, 49, 86, 143, 107; 5, 91*, 116, 121, 179, 187, 190, 227*, 244; 188*, 252, 225, 214; 212, 137, 166, 251, 75, 100, 213, 221, 243, 112*, 249, 203, 229*, 246*, 230, 220, 206, 242, 232x, 164, 208, 228x, 256, 222; 191, 231, 262, 197, 224, 255, 226, 57, 192; 56, 245, 205, 116, 137. Letters arranged by recipient similar to but more systematic than *KaPdPp*.
- 16713 (*Qg*); saec. xii, ex Bec; complete 'type I': epp. 1-2bis, 4-37, 40, 38-9, 41-60, 62, 61, 63, 65-7, 64, 68-83, 85, 84, 86-93, 94-103, *Prologus*, 105-122, 124-5, 123, 126-31, 133, 132, 135, 134, 136-87, 189, 188, 190-3, 195, 194, 196-7, 198*, 199-200, 202,

¹¹³ Pellegrin, *Bibliothèques retrouvées* (1988), 104

¹¹⁴ Leclercq, 'Lettres d'Yves', 116.

¹¹⁵ Elizabeth A.R. Brown, "*Franks, Burgundians, and Aquitanians*" and the Royal Coronation ceremony in France, Trans. of the American Philosophical Society, 82/7 (1992), 19.

201, 203-7, 209, 212, 211, 282, 213, 215, 219, 210, 216-8, 220-6, 284, 227, 282, 228-35, 187, 236-62, 264-5, 215, 266-71.

18219 (*Qh*); saec. xii, ex Paris chapter of Notre Dame; fragment of the Jesus collection, containing ep. 35, canon law fragments by another hand, *Prologus**, 12, 25, 8, 16, 27, 36, 47, 63, 68, 71*. The manuscript is misbound and several folios are missing, some of which are the single leaves in BN lat. 18248; the missing final part of this manuscript is London, BL Add. 10973 (*Lh*).

18585 (*Qj*); saec. xii; fragment containing epp. 69-83, 85, 84, 86-89, 90*; 1-7, 8*, 68*, 287*.

18586 (*Qk*); saec. xii/xiii; has epp. 1-2bis, 4-37, 40, 38-9, 41-9, 50*, 53ex, 54-60, 62, 61, 63, 65-6, 67*.

Paris, BN nouv. acq. lat. 3041 (*Ql*); saec. xii; imperfect 'type I': epp. 1-2bis, 4-37, 40, 38-9, 41-60, 62, 61, 63, 65-7, 64, 68-83, 85, 84, 86-103, *Prologus**, 114ex, 115-22, 124-5, 123, 126-31, 133, 132, 135, 134, 136-63, 164*/166ex, 167-87, 189, 188, 190-3, 195, 194, 196-7, 198*/199, 200, 202, 201, 203-9, 212, 211, 282, 213-5, 219, 210, 216-8, 220-7, 283, 228-35, 187, 236-46, 247*. Conflates epp. 164/166 and epp. 198/199 (see description of *Pe*); the end of the *Prologus* and epp. 104-14 were originally present but later cut out.

Parma, Biblioteca Palatina Cod. 988 (*Qm*).¹¹⁶

Poitiers BM 290 (70) (*Qn*); saec. xiv, ex Fleury.¹¹⁷

Praha, Knihovna Metropolitní Kapituli ms G XXXI; saec. xv, followed by *capitulatio*.¹¹⁸

Rouen, BM 542 (*Rb*); saec. xii, ex Lyre; a 'type I' ms.¹¹⁹

BM 543 (O 27) (*Rc*); saec. xii, ex St Ouen, ex Lyre; also a 'type I' ms.¹²⁰

Saint-Omer, BM 253 (*Sa*); ex St Bertin; 81 letters largely ordered by recipient; related to *Va*.

Trier, Stadtbibliothek 587 (1876) (*Ta*); saec. xiii/xiv; 195 letters, beginning with Urban II and ending with ep. 287.¹²¹

†Trier, olim St Maximin 1796 (*Tb*); 212 letters.¹²²

Troyes, BM 1924 (*Tc*); ex Bouhier; 227 letters.¹²³

¹¹⁶ P.O. Kristeller, *Iter italicum* (London, 1963-97), vi, 134.

¹¹⁷ *Catalogue générale* xxiv (1894), 86.

¹¹⁸ A. Podlaha, *Soupis rukopisů Knihovny Metropolitní kapitoly pražské* (Prague, 1910-22) ii, no. 1024.

¹¹⁹ *Catalogue générale* i (1886), 127; cf. Nortier, *Bibliothèques médiévales*, 142; see her comments (ibid., 125-6 and 135-6) that the Lyre mss may have been copied from Bec exemplars.

¹²⁰ See last note.

¹²¹ M. Keuffer and G. Kentenich, *Verzeichnis der Handschriften des historischen Archivs* (Trier, 1914), 276. According to the catalogue, a nineteenth-century hand in this ms refers to another Trier ms (*Tb*) containing 212 letters of Ivo. I have not been able to identify this ms.

¹²² See last note.

Utrecht, University Library 816 (Gr. 274) (*Ua*); saec. xiii/xiv; fragmentary, now begins with ep. 5, ends in ep. 120.¹²⁴

Valenciennes, BM 482 (*Va*); saec. xii/xiii, ex St Amand; 126 letters, largely ordered by recipient; related to *Sa*.

Città del Vaticano, BAV lat. 3473 (*Vb*); saec. xiii.¹²⁵

lat. 3837 (*Vc*); saec. xvi.¹²⁶

lat. 3838 (*Vd*); saec. xii.¹²⁷

lat. 3998 (*Ve*); saec. xiii.¹²⁸

lat. 6024, fols. 179-211 (*Vf*); saec. xiii; 84 letters.¹²⁹

Ottob. 472 (*Vg*); saec. xvii.¹³⁰

Ottob. 735 (*Vh*); saec. xiii.¹³¹

Ottob. 3298 (*Vj*); saec. xiii.¹³²

Pal. Lat. 24¹³³

Reg. lat. 60 (*Vk*); saec. xii, ex Pontlevoy (d. Chartres), ex Pithou; 'type I' with variants; ends with epp. 273-7 and ep. 54 (repeated).¹³⁴

Reg. lat. 79 (*VI*); saec. xii², ex Pithou; has ep. 60*, *Prologus*, 108-9, 88, 111*, 71, 93, 62*, 75, 104, 124, 120, 119, 111, 113, 9, 36, 125, 126, 134*, 90, 76*, 105, 95, 94, 92, 81, 128, 23-4, 77, 102, 39, 100-1, 91, 32*, 6, 15, 30, 16*, 11, 14x, 17*, 55, 78-9, 112, 49, 21, 53, 97, 87, 70, 18, 20, 22, 28-9, 33, 35, 41*, 51, 34, 37, 42, 58, 80*, 56, 127, 61, 89*, 98, verses on Maundy Thursday, 41*, 114, 60*, 67, 5, 57, 96, 4, 133, 85, 83-4, 103, 68, 44, 110, 131, 54*, 60*, 43, 12; 'Expositio cuiusdam'; epp. 65*, 48, 59, 86; 'In epistola ad Hebraeos'; Ivo, ep. 73*.

¹²³ Leclercq, 'Lettres d'Yves', 117.

¹²⁴ P.A. Tiele and A. Hulshof, *Catalogus manu scriptorum Bibliothecae Universitatis Rheno-Trajectinae* (2 vols., Utrecht, 1887-1909), i, 209.

¹²⁵ P.F. Kehr, 'Papsturkunden in Rom', *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse* (1903), 1-161, 8.

¹²⁶ *ibid.*, 9, cf. Brasington, 'Letters of Ivo', 171.

¹²⁷ Kehr, 'Papsturkunden in Rom', 9.

¹²⁸ *ibid.*, 9-10.

¹²⁹ Z.N. Brooke, 'The register of Master David of London, and the part he played in the Becket crisis', in H.W.C. Davis (ed.), *Essays in history presented to Reginald Lane Poole* (Oxford, 1927), 227-45, here at 228-9. I owe this reference to Christopher Brooke.

¹³⁰ Kehr, 'Papsturkunden in Rom', 60.

¹³¹ *ibid.*, 61.

¹³² *ibid.*, 68.

¹³³ 'Dr Ludwig Bethmann's Nachrichten über die von ihm für die *Monumenta Germaniae historica* benutzten Sammlungen von Handschriften und Urkunden Italiens, aus dem Jahre 1854', *Archiv* xii (1858-74) 332 describes this ms as coming from S. Maria Magdalene in Franckental (OSA), and containing 'Ivonis epp. aliquot'.

¹³⁴ Kehr, 'Papsturkunden in Rom', 54.

Reg. lat. 147, fols. 1-27 (**Vm**); saec. xii; contains the Rochester collection: epp. 4-5, 8, 10, 12, 16, 27, 35-6, 37*, 41*, 20-1, 24-6, 29-30, 32, 40, 44, 49, 58-60, 63, *Prologus*, 105, 83, 85, 88, 90, 125, 123, 131, 171, 156, 172, 176-7, 183-6, 189*; 73-4, 287, 3, 47, 77, address of ep. 250, 80*.

Reg. lat. 248 (**Vn**); saec. xii^{ex}; 'type I' with omissions and inversions.¹³⁵

Reg. lat. 1580 (**Vo**); saec. xiii.¹³⁶

Venezia, Bibl. Naz. Marciana ms lat. Z 84: saec. xv, 88 letters.¹³⁷

Wien, ÖNB Cod. 533 (**Wa**); saec. xii; has epp. 8, 12, 16, 35, 24-5, 59, 60, 4-5, 10, 27, 36, 37*, 41*, 26, 29, 32, 40, 44, 49, 58, 63, 66, 20-1, 43, 6, 47, 68*, 71, 73, 99, 122, 125, 155-6, 161, 74, 165, 170*, 77, 22, 80, 82-3, 105, 85, 162, 123, 134*, 148, 19, 30*, 3, 7, 9, 13-5, 17, 34, 95, 287, 86, 163, 42, 33, 38, 46, 48, 50-1, 53-7, 62, 61, 65, 67, 64, 69-70, 72, 89-91, 93, 96, 101, 100, 104, 107, 111-2, 114-5, 118, 116, 119-21, 126-32, 135-6, 138-9, 141-7, 151, 153, 174, 175-80, 182-3, 185-7, 189, 188, 190, 222, 108, 172, 171, 220-1, 228-9, 232-4, 224, 214, 231, 268, 256, 239, 278, 215, 213, 255, 274, 191, 193, 195, 194, 196-7, 200, 202-7, 212, Schmitt II, 133, 157, 140, 150, 152, 160, 81, 98, 88, 137, 149, Schmitt III, 154, 159, 164, 102, 192, 230, 241, 245, 106, 246, 250, 184, 273, 269, 266; Anselmiana (also in **Lj**, cf. **BbCdPlPuQe**); Anselm, *De concordia* (also found in **LjMj**). Influenced by both the Jesus collection and the Rochester collection.

Cod. 587 (II) (**Wb**); saec. xiii; 120 letters.¹³⁸

Cod. 806 (IV) (**Wc**); saec. xii, perhaps from Hessen area; has 200 letters, with excerpt from prologue after ep. 54 (cf. **HbMhMkWdPwPy**).¹³⁹

Cod. 2229 (**Wd**); saec. xii, ex Salzburg; has 200 letters, *Prologus* excerpt after ep. 54 (cf. **HbMhMkWcPwPy**) and John VIII, JE 3258 at the end (also found in **MfMhMk**).

Cod. Ser. 292 (**We**); saec. xiii², Germany; thirteen letters, mostly incomplete.¹⁴⁰

Wolfenbüttel, Helmst. 1024 (**Wf**); saec. xii, fols. 3v-29r, containing epp. 71-108.¹⁴¹

¹³⁵ A. Wilmart, *Codices Reginenses latini I: codices 1-250* (Vatican City, 1937), 599-600.

¹³⁶ *Les manuscrits de la Reine de Suède au Vatican: réédition du Catalogue de Montfaucon et côtes actuelles* (Studie et testi 238, Vatican City, 1964), 87.

¹³⁷ G. Valentinelli, *Bibliotheca manuscripta ad s. Marci Venetiarum* (Venice, 1868-73) ii, no. VIII, 82, where the last letter appears to be an abbreviation of ep. 77.

¹³⁸ *Tabulae codicum manuscriptorum praeter Graecos et Orientales in Bibliotheca Palatina Vindobonensi asservatum* (11 vols., Vienna, 1864-1912), i, 102.

¹³⁹ *ibid.*, 135; Brasington, 'Letters of Ivo', 170.

¹⁴⁰ O. Mazal and F. Unterkircher, *Cod. Ser. N. 1-1600* (Katalog der abendländischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek: "Series Nova" (Neuerwerbungen) 1, Vienna, 1965), 100-1.

Worcester, Cathedral Library Q.1 (**Wi**); saec. xii¹; ‘type I’ with ep. 287 added at the end and the *Prologus* placed at the very beginning.

¹⁴¹

O. von Heinemann, *Die Helmstedter Handschriften* (Die Handschriften der Herzoglichen Bibliothek zu Wolfenbüttel: Alte Reihe, 5 vols., Wolfenbüttel, 1884-1888), iii, 15. – The reference to Helmst. 1221 (ibid., 115) is mistaken; the ms does not contain Ivo’s letters.