

THE AUTOGRAPHS OF PETER THE DEACON

By PAUL MEYVAERT, O.S.B.
QUARR ABBEY, ISLE OF WIGHT

THE particular interest of Peter the Deacon's autographs derives from the bearing which they have on "one of the thorny problems of the Beneventan script", namely, the presence of ordinary minuscule in the Beneventan zone.¹ The expression is Professor Willard's, used in connection with *Codex Casinensis* 580.² Because of the importance of this manuscript for our present purpose we may begin by recalling some of its main features here. It is a *Lexicon Prosodiacum* of the eleventh century written partly in Beneventan (pp. 1-11) and partly in ordinary minuscule (pp. 11-80). Not only is the script of both sections contemporary, as in the case of *Cod. Cas. 230* and *Cod. Cas. 5*, but it can be conclusively shown that "the copying of the whole MS was performed by a single hand".³ The Beneventan portion of the work manifests a certain weakness through the presence of minuscule elements,⁴ while the minuscule part still retains "a certain Beneventan cast".⁵ Yet throughout there is

¹ Cf. E. A. Lowe, *The Beneventan Script* (Oxford, 1914), C. 5, pp. 84-92. Beneventan is a form of regional minuscule but for convenience sake 'minuscule' is used throughout as signifying ordinary or Caroline minuscule in opposition to Beneventan.

² H. M. Willard, "Codex Casinensis 580 T. *Lexicon prosodiacum* saec. XI", *Casinensia*, i (Monte Cassino, 1929), 297-304. At the end of Willard's article there are reduced facsimiles of fols. 4^r, 21^r, 36^r.

³ Willard, *Casinensia*, i. 303. In note 1 the author states that E. K. Rand, who examined the photographs of the manuscript, lent his support to this conclusion.

⁴ The frequent occurrence of a Caroline *a* at the end of a word or within it betrays a weakness. So does the fact that the "headings (names of authors, and *distinctiones*) hold to the Beneventan only for the first page. Then the Beneventan signs are abandoned" and the minuscule headings continued through the Beneventan portion of the work.

⁵ Willard, *Casinensia*, i. 302, n. 1: ". . . the Beneventan *ec* combination is kept up, and indeed is even found in the text of the *exempla* portion. The capital *J*, with the break through its centre so common to the Beneventan, is likewise carried straight through." To this can be added the fact that the familiar Beneventan *i* stroke is clearly visible in some of the words of the minuscule section. Cf. fol. 21^r, the *u* in the words *holocaustum*, *parasius*, *plurima*, etc.

a continuity "in the ordinary letter formation", which goes to show a real unity of hand.¹ The anomaly of the situation has been explained "by assuming that a northern scribe, on coming to a Beneventan centre, learned to write a regional hand; he became, so to speak, a Beneventan scribe by adoption",² and though he lapses more easily into the script with which he is most familiar the influence of his Beneventan training can always be felt.

The case of Peter the Deacon is somewhat different and the issue here is of a more serious kind. He entered Monte Cassino as a *puer oblatus* at the age of five about the year 1113.³ All his early schooling and training he received at the abbey, one of the main centres of the Beneventan script, at a time when the zenith of that script had not yet passed. Many of his works, however, considered to have come down to us in their autograph form are written in ordinary minuscule. It seems generally accepted by historians that Peter the Deacon did in fact make current use of both scripts and altogether six manuscripts are considered to be from his hand. Of these four are in Beneventan and two in ordinary minuscule.⁴ But the aggregate of leaves—some four

¹ Willard, *Casinensia*, i. 303. This is perhaps the point that needs most to be stressed here: ". . . the *g* throughout the work, has the same open lower bow and head with the bows on an oblique angle (this is true for the *o* and *p* as well) and horizontal connecting stroke, the *s* dropping slightly below the line, the *l* with the club shaped shaft and light up-curve as it strikes the line. Most significantly the stroke in these and in other letters, the way of attacking a letter, remains identical."

² Willard, *Casinensia*, i. 303.

³ Cf. E. Caspar, *Petrus Diaconus und die Monte Cassineser Fälschungen* (Berlin, 1909), referred to hereafter as *Petrus Diaconus*, pp. 21-2 for a discussion on the date of Peter's birth. The year 1107 seems the most probable in view of the data supplied by the first autobiography of *Cod. Cas.* 361.

⁴ The minuscule manuscripts are *Cod. Cas.* 257 and *Cod. Cas.* 361. Cf. *Codicum Casinensium Manuscriptorum Catalogus* for a summary description of the contents of these manuscripts (ii, pt. i, 68-71 and ii, pt. ii, 208-12). Their autograph nature is traditionally recognized. The Beneventan manuscripts are: (i) The *Registrum Petri Diaconi* = *Regesto* N. 3 of Monte Cassino (Lowe, *Beneventan Script*, p. 353) also traditionally considered to be Peter's work; cf. Bethmann, *Archiv*, xii 511; Caspar, *Petrus Diaconus*, p. 19, etc. (ii) *Codex Cas.* 518 = The *Registrum S. Placidi* (Lowe, *ibid.* p. 351) considered autograph for the same reason: cf. Bethmann, *Archiv*, xii, 509; Caspar, *Petrus Diaconus*, p. 19, etc. (iii) Munich *Cod. Lat. Monac.* 4623, the main text and the marginalia. The authority for this attribution is H. W. Klewitz, "Petrus Diaconus und die

hundred—for each of these groups is much the same. On palaeographical grounds alone this would constitute something of a phenomenon. What, one wonders, can have impelled a writer, presumably brought up on Beneventan from an early age, to make such abundant use of a script so entirely different from his own? Why this unnecessary expenditure of effort and attention? But granted that he does use both, it becomes interesting to enquire how far he succeeds in using each in its integrity. How far is there an influence of one script on the other, as in the case of the scribe of *Cod. Cas. 580*? It is clear that the problem when viewed in this way has more than a palaeographic interest. It may furnish the historian with a valuable tool with which to test some of his theories when it comes to attributing to Peter a work for the attribution of which the internal evidence is scant. Yet, despite its importance, the question of Peter's handwriting has never received the full attention it deserves. A few passing references to it will be found in the works of E. Caspar, H. W. Klewitz, W. Smidt and others, but the problem has never been studied by itself.¹

It should perhaps be stressed at the outset that the scope of this essay is necessarily limited. Our immediate concern is only with autographs as such. We are not trying to discover the whole share which Peter may have had in drawing up a work, but

Montecassineser Klosterchronik des Leo von Ostia" in *Archiv für Urkundenforschung*, xiv (1936), 414-53. Klewitz, however, only considered that part of the main text of the Munich manuscript had been written by Peter (fols. 130-89), the first section (fols. 85-129) being by Leo himself. W. Smidt, "Die vermeintliche und die wirkliche Urgestalt der Chronik Leos von Montecassino", *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, xxviii (1937-8), 286-97, accepted the main conclusions of Klewitz but maintained that the whole of the main text must be considered as Peter's work. (iv) *Cod. Cas. 413*, the marginal notes which have been added to the *Translatio S. Mennatis* of Leo of Ostia on fols. 133^r-136^v. Cf. Fr. Baudouin de Gaiffier, "Translations et Miracles de S. Mennas par Léon d'Ostie et Pierre du Mont Cassin", *Analecta Bollandiana*, lxii (1944), 5-32. Dom Maurus Inguanez in his description of *Cod. Cas. 413* (cf. *Cod. Casin. Manus. Catal.*, iii, pt. i, 16) appears to share this view since he writes: "In I et II transl. additamenta leguntur, quae in opinione est chirographa esse Leonis Ost.; haud scio vero an Petro diacono Casin. tribuenda sint."

¹ Cf. E. Caspar, *Petrus Diaconus*, pp. 19-20; H. Klewitz, *Archiv für Urk. For.*, xiv, 445-7, etc.

only whether the existing evidence justifies the accepted conclusion that he did in fact use two different scripts, and whether the manuscripts considered as his are truly from his pen. How is a manuscript judged to be the autograph of a particular author or not? It is evidently a fundamental prerequisite that the script in which it is written should be contemporary with him. The minuscule of the twelfth century differs from that of the ninth. With the advances made in palaeography during the past forty years we should not so easily confuse both these forms today and attribute to Peter a work in which he can scarcely have had a part.¹ But on this ground no serious objection can be raised against any of the manuscripts mentioned above. Because a work is in a script contemporary with an author, it does not follow that it is by that author.² Short of his signature to the

¹ It is on this ground that *Cod. Cas.* 316, containing among other works the *Synonima Ciceronis* which Caspar (p. 19), on the authority of Bethmann (*Archiv*, xii, 505), considered as Peter's autograph, can be excluded. The basis for the attribution is not clear. But Dom Maurus Inguanez (*Cod. Cas. Catal.*, ii, pt. ii, 150) points out that the entire manuscript is written by the same hand, which also wrote *Cod. Cas.* 323, and that the script is Caroline minuscule of the ninth century. A facsimile of page 141 from *Cod.* 316 is given at the end of vol. ii of the *Cod. Cas. Catalogus*. Another work, Beneventan this time, which can also be excluded is *Cod. Cas.* 391 containing *C. I. Solini Collectanea rerum memorabilium*. Caspar (p. 19, n. 2), again following Bethmann (*Archiv*, xii, 508), mentions this as an autograph. E. A. Lowe (*Beneventan Script*, p. 350) assigns the manuscript to the eleventh century. But the exclusion is made less on the basis of the script, which might still be contemporary with Peter, than because it does not correspond with the data in Peter's catalogues. He wrote an abbreviation of Solinus: "Solinum de miraculis breviavit." *Cod. Cas.* 391, however, is not an abbreviation but a complete text and most probably the one Peter himself used.

² On the subject of medieval writers and their autographs see P. Lehmann, "Autographe und Originale namhafter lateinischer Schriftsteller des Mittelalters", *Zeitschr. des deutschen Vereins für Buchwesen und Schrifttum*, iii (1920), 6-16 (reprinted in P. Lehmann, *Erforschung des Mittelalters* (1941), pp. 359-81). An analysis and criticism of the reasons assigned for the autograph nature of certain manuscripts would make a good study on the nature of evidence. It is not impossible that a few traditional positions would need modifying. To take but one example, E. A. Lowe, *The Beneventan Script*, pp. 330 and 350, mentions *Cod. Cas.* 413, which contains the *Vita et Translatio S. Mennatis*, as an autograph of Leo of Ostia. The suggestion that it is, may originally have been due to the existence of marginal notes in the section on the *Translatio*. A close examination of the script would show, however, that the *Vita* (fols. 128^r-131^v) and the *Translatio* (fols. 132^r-135^v) were written by different scribes. They do not use

work further evidence must be sought. We shall consider first the evidence that relates to the minuscule works and then deal with those that are in Beneventan.

The Minuscule Works.

Both the minuscule manuscripts, *Cod. Cas. 257* and *Cod. Cas. 361*, contain a biography of Peter the Deacon, written in the third person, and in each case this biography includes a list of his works.¹ The biography of *Cod. Cas. 361*, on fol. 71^r, is the shorter of the two; its catalogue comprises fifty items. That of *Cod. Cas. 257* (pp. 30-1) has sixty-eight.² It is the combined evidence of these two biographies which furnishes us with the proof for the autograph nature of the manuscripts. They offer every appearance of having been written by the same hand. The most noticeable thing about them is the evident fact that the catalogues in both manuscripts were not all completed at the same time. In the catalogue of *Cod. Cas. 361* successive additions were made, not in the margin, but in continuous

the same symbol for *quod*; they do not make the interrogation sign in the same manner; the scribe of the *Translatio* makes abundant use of supra-script *a* and forms it in a peculiar way, whereas the scribe of the *Vita* does not use it at all, etc. The fact that the whole work is not by the same hand is already sufficient by itself to bring the autograph nature of the manuscript in doubt.

¹ The biography of *Cod. Cas. 361* corresponds to c. 46 of the *Liber Illustrum Virorum Cenobii Casinensis*. Fol. 71^r is reproduced in *Sexti Julii Frontini de Aquaeductu Urbis Fomae* (Monte Cassino, 1930). See also Pl. I *infra*. For the printed text cf. ed. J. B. Marus (Lutet. Paris, 1666), reprinted in *Pat. Lat. 173*, 1048-1050. It should be noted that the text of J. B. Marus, and of all the editions which derive from it, is defective. No facsimiles of the biography of *Cod. Cas. 257* have been published. The text has been edited in *Bibliotheca Casinensis*, vol. v (Monte Cassino, 1894), *Florilegium*, pp. 51-2. Photographs of this second biography were examined in preparation for this article. I should like to take this occasion of expressing my thanks to Dom Ambrogio Mancone, Librarian of Monte Cassino, for providing me with these and with numerous other photographs of the Cassinese manuscripts mentioned in note ⁴ on p. 115 and for obtaining permission for me to reproduce some of them here.

² By one item is meant all that is grouped under one heading in the catalogues. Thus, for example, "de festivitate beati Marci sermones octo" is here counted as one item. A thorough study of the contents of these catalogues will be made by Professor H. Bloch in his forthcoming book, "Petrus Diaconus of Monte Cassino and the Revival of Roman History in the Middle Ages": cf., by the same author, "Monte Cassino, Byzantium, and the West in the Earlier Middle Ages", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, iii (1946), p. 166, n. 4.

order on the blank page. At least four groups of entries can be easily distinguished. The first, containing twenty-eight items, seems to be contemporary with the short biography which precedes it, and indeed with the whole of the *Liber de Viris Illustribus Casinensibus* of which it forms part. Then come two entries in a slightly smaller script (n. 29-30). A further group (n. 31-40), written once more in larger letters, does not use the original inner-bounding line of the previous sections but one which is rather further from the inside of the page.¹ This same bounding-line is again followed by the last group (n. 41-50) written in a much darker ink and whose script is less on a slant than that of the previous one.² In *Cod. Cas. 257* the major part of the catalogue (n. 1-65) appears to have been written all at one time, but the last three items (n. 66-8), occupying the four last lines of the text on page 31, were added later by the same hand, but using a thinner pen and a slightly darker ink.³ The main section of this catalogue (n. 1-65) includes the works mentioned in the list of *Cod. Cas. 361* but not always in the same order. An effort has been made to render the grouping more homogeneous. Thus, for example, the *Vita Sci. Severi* (n. 27) and the *Vita Sci. Constantii* (n. 45) of list one now occur together with the other lives of saints at the beginning of list two. Eighteen new items come in this second list. The two manuscripts themselves contain thirty-five of the works mentioned in the final catalogue, and all these works are written by the same hand which wrote the biographies.

In the face of this evidence it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the writing of the biographies and catalogues is the

¹ The inner margin has four vertical bounding-lines, the outer margin two. If numbered in continuous order from the inside of the page one can say that group I keeps to line 1 but generally oversteps line 6; group II keeps to lines 1 and 6; group III to lines 2 and 5; group IV to lines 2 and 6.

² It could be argued that the last entry: "Cantus beati marci composuit",—and possibly the one which precedes it (n. 49)—is a separate addition since the ink in which it is written appears to be much lighter than that of group IV. The phrase on the last line "et sanctorum Nicandri et Marciani" which completes this entry is by a different hand.

³ Cf. *Biblioth. Casinensis*, vol. v, p. 12: "Ultimae lineae incipiendo a verbis *Ystoriam gentis Troiane nigriori atramento quamvis eadem manu, non tamen eodem tempora scriptae sunt.*"

work of the author himself. The successive additions, always by the same hand, make it difficult to find another explanation. And since Peter is the author and the works are in ordinary minuscule we have very sound proof that he did in fact write in this script. The folios on which the autobiographies—for this is in fact what they are—occur can therefore be taken as a criterion for judging what is written by his hand.¹

A further proof can be adduced to strengthen this conclusion. E. Caspar, in his monograph on Peter the Deacon, has pointed out how much Peter likes to boast of his connection with the house of Tusculum.² At the beginning of *Cod. Cas. 257* there is a catalogue of Popes. The catalogue itself is not by Peter's hand, but several additions have been made opposite the names of Popes who belonged to the house of Tusculum to indicate this fact and these additions are by the same hand which wrote the two biographies.³ This further confirms the conclusion we had already drawn that they are due to Peter's pen.

We can now turn our attention to the script itself. What are its outstanding characteristics? The first impression which it leaves can best be given in Caspar's words. He describes the writing as "eine kleine breite, in der Linienführung nicht ganz

¹ Not all that is written by Peter's hand is mentioned in his catalogues. He makes no allusion to the transcriptions of Frontinus, Varro, and Vegetius, no doubt because they were only transcriptions and could hardly be considered as his "works", yet they must be included among the list of autographs together with the additions he made to the catalogues of Popes and Abbots found at the beginning of *Cod. Cas. 257*. A word should here be added concerning *Cod. Matrit. A 16*. K. Neff, *Die Gedichte des Paulus Diaconus* (= *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters*. Bd. III, Heft 4 Munich, 1908, p. 7) speaks of this twelfth century manuscript in Caroline minuscule and of Cassinese origin as "aus der Zeit und dem Kreise, vielleicht aus der Hand des Petrus Diaconus". This suggestion is repeated and used by H. Klewitz in his study of the Munich manuscript of the Cassinese Chronicle (cf. *Archiv für Urkund. Forsch.*, xiv. 428 and 430). But this manuscript cannot be an autograph of Peter for it is written by a trained scribe with a system of abbreviations different in important particulars from his; e.g. use of semi-colon for *-que*, open *r* for *-orum*, etc.

² Caspar, *Petrus Diaconus*, pp. 22-3.

³ These additions again occur in the final edition of the *Chronicon Casinense* (*Cod. Cas. 450*). It is the presence of these references in this edition together with the allusions to Atina which are the most conclusive proof that Peter did to some extent revise the first three Books of the Chronicle.

breuis angustius ex p[ro]p[ri]a faculo laiore p[ro]ximo p[ro]p[ri]a i p[ro]p[ri]a
 quem signat[ur] calix diluzina radica d[omi]n[u]m est. Quod fistula q[ui]p[ro]p[ri]a
 quod .S. E. ep[iscop]u[m] d[omi]n[u]m signent[ur] ualenu[m] emulic[ur] cu[m] se
 ras e loca ridere o[mn]i capite exersatione circa e loca d[omi]n[u]m q[ui]p[ro]p[ri]a cal
 ro[ta] ut ad linea ordinent[ur] nec al[ter]ius interior calix al[ter]ius fi
 plus erant superior q[ui]acur[ur] aq[ui]a b[er]e rapit[ur] min[us] ducit[ur] i
 nec alices quide[m] p[ro]p[ri]a fuer[ur] . he fistule solute uocant[ur] . 7 ut
 laxant[ur] uel coarctant[ur] . Adhuc illa aquarior[um] itolerabili
 lata uniu[er]s[u]m possessor[um] e[st] . aqua forata[m] nou[em] castella imponu
 quunt[ur] . quouenit ex[er]c[er]unt aqua[m] . In primis ergo hoc
 curatore creditur . n[on] eni[m] solu[m] ad ip[s]a[m] aqua[m] u[er]u[m] licet
 castella uel la p[ro]p[ri]a . q[ui] subinde 7 sine causa forata[m]
 aquarior[um] tollendus est reditus . que uocant[ur] puncta
 e[st] urbelat[ur] accessu sublice .

a) COD. CAS. 361, from fol. 31v (Frontinus),
 l. 1-6 by hand B (cf. p. 125 and n. 1).
 l. 7-14 by Peter the Deacon. c. 1132-33

si illic se
 tuum.
 si debet
 n[on] e[st] lon
 ginquus.
 outider[ur]
 utra[que] u[er]si
 quosq[ue] dis
 gnos[ur] ut
 d[omi]n[u]m
 u[er]u[m] n[on] am
 e[st] p[ro]p[ri]a

posui in ordinem hominum: s[er]uand[ur]a.
 p[ro]p[ri]a p[ro]p[ri]a d[omi]n[u]m carna loca qui p[ro]p[ri]a e[st]
 summu[m] monast[er]iu[m] l[et]u[m] l[et]u[m] u[er]u[m] e[st]
 motu[m] s[er]uand[ur]a p[ro]p[ri]a . quia . ip[s]us
 l[et]u[m] l[et]u[m] s[er]uand[ur]a u[er]u[m] e[st] p[ro]p[ri]a e[st]
 al[ter] p[ro]p[ri]a app[er]t[ur] i adu[m] munde
 sol[us] clat[ur] u[er]u[m] . d[omi]n[u]m au[tem] al[ter]
 e[st] p[ro]p[ri]a q[ui]p[ro]p[ri]a e[st] s[er]uand[ur]a s[er]uand[ur]a e[st]
 l[et]u[m] s[er]uand[ur]a e[st] s[er]uand[ur]a s[er]uand[ur]a
 p[ro]p[ri]a e[st] p[ro]p[ri]a s[er]uand[ur]a s[er]uand[ur]a
 du[m] e[st] e[st] s[er]uand[ur]a s[er]uand[ur]a . nec al[ter] ibi
 al[ter] e[st] s[er]uand[ur]a . e[st] s[er]uand[ur]a illuc i adu

b) The REGISTRUM PETRI DIACONI, from fol. 19r.

Libellos au quaplurimo
 sine de febr; hul; monaste
 in sine s angly de huffelo
 ab ipse libellis habet
 idem faceret. uer alii
 monasteria quod dudu a safa
 conul destrucari de ipsoy
 pecuniis reconcilata. et
 ut phoe idicul sub hul;
 canobu ditione uniuersa
 illa panno^{re} ostendat. ;
 illa alij glom^{re} h^{re}
 la facion de curia de magna. q^{re}
 dngentia u. e. f. u. madrosi. p. p. p.
 ludo i psona solido facionis. an
 ual et u p. an. solido. x. x.
 Jue i appug de curia inlyana
 solido ecc. p. an. sol. xx. iij. Jue ibide de curia que dr huffanu sol. c. p. an. sol. p.
 dul et p. sol. facionis. p. an. sol. iij. Jue ibide de curia inlyana sol. c. lxx. viij. p.

certuq; potuist. maxime
 legendi & equitior iudici
 scias au non olet de. spulc
 rector' sci benedicti. hul; o
 no decimo anno Johis. et a
 de tomaz dylia; uenia coc
 a p'fatio p'ncipe pandulfo
 laudo curia et ceteris pa
 cetera: brothe fte qd p

a) Munich, COD. LAT. MONAC. 4623 (Chronicon Casinense), from fol. 134v.

comitatu custode. ad uocacat. ad
 f. et ex quib; p'uis q'q; subacta ut
 fte as fite g'uarat p'ffacuos. Quod
 euat u spopondet. q. etyo qq; su' polleat
 usis mox q' p'ra q'onib; conuua. i sup
 ad et sic d'ing' f'ac' posuit. In ista
 comitatu quib; de se h'ac uita su
 uel f'ac' q' etyo ceteris noue f'ac'

b) COD. CAS. 413 (Translatio S. Mennatis), from fol. 133r.

lit demonasterio aureos
 uero nec omnia pro suo uelle expleuit. de
 re.
 caperent. monachos inde eicerent. et unum
 in thesaurum. cunctamque sub pelle ceteram.
Beniſibi in ſiciliam tranſmitterent. Quod
 tientes. rebellare. et magis mori quam ſe
 decernunt. Aduerſam autem quod in ſiciliam
 tria duo milia alemannos cum amone abbe

a) COD. CAS. 257. Autograph of Peter the Deacon, post 1137: from p. 111
 (Epistola II Guibaldi ad Lotharium).

car.
 laque.
 ar.
 ius

 i ad monasteriu
 ruula.

ab omni lumine

b) COD. CAS. 518=THE REGISTRUM S. PLACIDI, from fol. 61r.

sichere, etwas hastige und unsorgfältige Minuskel des 12. Jahrhunderts".¹ Professor Willard's phrase "an uneven ordinary minuscule" is more terse but still very much to the point.² An uneven or irregular minuscule is not, however, a particular class of the minuscule family and these comments can be put equivalently by saying that the writing does not seem to be due to the disciplined hand of a trained scribe.³ A certain improvement is noticeable in some of the later works but it remains that on the basis of the minuscule manuscripts alone we should have to conclude that Peter the Deacon could not write very well.⁴

So much for a general impression. We must now analyse the script more closely. It is minuscule but of a peculiar kind. It has, to quote a reliable authority in these matters, "einen eigenartigen Charakter",⁵ a flavour that is all its own. This makes it relatively easy to single out the features that go to constitute its individuality. The twenty-six sides of *Cod. Cas. 361* reproduced in Dom Maurus Inguanez' edition *Sexti Julii Frontini De Aquaeductu Urbis Romae* (Editio Phototypica, Monte Cassino, 1930) form the main basis for the following remarks. They include not only the transcriptions of Frontinus (fols. 22^r-33^r) and of a fragment of Varro (fols. 33^r-34^r) which are by

¹ Caspar, *Petrus Diaconus*, p. 19.

² *Casinensia*, i 304, n. 1.

³ In a letter to the present writer Dr. Lowe also stated that in his opinion the hand of *Cod. Cas. 361* could not be considered expert and disciplined. This point is of fundamental importance for a comparison with the Beneventan manuscripts which are attributed to Peter.

⁴ An evolution is noticeable between the script of the earlier and of the later works. A more complete study of the manuscripts themselves would be necessary in order to trace the different stages of this progress and it would prove of importance for helping to date the various works. After 1137 the writing becomes less cramped, the letters broader and better shaped, the abbreviation signs more carefully made. To a certain extent these differences can already be observed between the first two and the last two groups of entries in the autobiography of *Cod. Cas. 361*. But the contrast is best seen when one compares some pages of *Cod. Cas. 257* with the transcriptions from the classical authors in *Cod. Cas. 361* which must be among Peter's earliest works.

⁵ Dr. Franz Steffens, *Lateinische Paläographie* (2nd edn., Trier, 1909), Plate, n. 79 b, where fol. 30^r of *Cod. Cas. 361* is reproduced. The short commentary which accompanies this facsimile is of great interest since Dr. Steffens seems only to have known this one page of the manuscript and does not appear to have been aware of the identity of the scribe with Peter the Deacon.

Peter, but also the dedicatory preface to abbot Guibaldus (1137) of his *De Locis Sanctis* (fol. 34^r) and the page on which the first autobiography was written (fol. 71^r). If we discount the few lines in the transcriptions—there are 54 in all—which are due to other hands, this leaves us with a total of over 1,200 lines written by Peter himself, an ample foundation on which to base a judgement concerning the qualities of his script.¹ Photographs of twenty-four more pages, taken from *Cod. Cas.* 361 and 257 and comprising works written at different periods, were also examined to try to ascertain what constitute the most constant elements of the handwriting. Only points that are quite easily observable have been chosen in the following analysis.

(1) Uncial *a* is the rule in the Caroline minuscule of the twelfth century. Despite the variety of shapes that it can acquire at the hand of different scribes its basic pattern does not change in that the left-hand bow which is joined to the oblique downward stroke always begins below the top of this stroke (a). The degree of slant on the oblique stroke may vary as well as the distance between the top of this stroke and the place where the bow begins, but it is not frequent to find that both the top of the oblique stroke and that of the bow coincide (a). For Peter, however, this last shape is the rule. He always makes it, save when the letter begins a word or when it follows on *t* or *e*, but even here his more usual form often occurs. This letter can therefore be considered as one of the characteristic elements of his script.

(2) The way in which the letter *h* is made is also one of its distinctive features, for the stroke which forms the arch in this letter is invariably taken in a flourish below, sometimes well below, the baseline and normally turned inward (h h). This is the case whether the letter begins a word or not.

(3) The lower bow in the letter *g* is always closed (g).

¹ A facsimile edition of the Frontinus transcription alone (i.e. fols. 22^r-33^r of *Cod. Cas.* 361) is also available in C. Herschel, *Frontinus and the Water supply of the City of Rome* (Boston, 1899, 2nd edn. 1913). A reproduction of p. 108 of *Cod. Cas.* 257 will be found in Piscicelli-Taeggi, *Paleografia Artistica di Monte Cassino* (Mont Cassino, 1876), Latino, Tav. lxii. Cf. also the facsimiles accompanying this article: Pl. I; Pl. IIa; Pl. IVa.

(4) Capital Q formed as \mathcal{Q} is also a marked and constant feature. Peter throughout his works seems to know of no other way of making this letter.

(5) The abbreviations in particular are well worth noting. \mathfrak{q} is always used for *quod*. This abbreviation is not unknown to Beneventan script which prefers, however, the use of \mathfrak{q} or \mathfrak{q} .¹

(6) The abbreviation for *-orum* must also be singled out. It is quite common in most scripts of the period. Usually we find it written thus : \mathfrak{or} , with the bow of the *r* descending to the base line, an open space being left between it and the *o*. A few scribes, however, completely close the bow and write \mathfrak{or} .² It is this latter form which Peter invariably employs.

(7) His abbreviation for final *-us* is the semi-colon but he has a peculiar way of making the comma (;) with a little flourish that is all his own. "Mit . . einem grossen eckigen Komma" is Dr. Steffens' remark on this point.

(8) The use of the semi-colon also for *-que* is the general rule in Beneventan but is also frequently found in the minuscule of the period. Peter uses the comma by itself for this abbreviation (\mathfrak{q}). It is never very elegantly made and often both ends of the comma rest on the shaft of the *q* giving the letter the appearance of a *p* and *q* all in one : \mathfrak{q} .

(9) The tironian symbol, resembling an arabic seven (7) is made for *et*. Such at least seems to be what Peter intends, though more often than not it acquires a shape very much like

¹ Even in Beneventan a few scribes will adhere continuously to \mathfrak{q} for *quod*, as, for instance, the scribe of the main text of the *Translatio S. Mennatis* in *Cod. Cas.* 413 (cf. p. 117, n. 2 *supra*). But this is the exception rather than the rule.

² E. A. Lowe, *Beneventan Script*, p. 146, says that : "The upper bow of uncial 'r' is sometimes open, sometimes closed." If the plates in *Scriptura Beneventana* can be taken as representative of the script as a whole, then it would seem that the open bow is the rule, the closed bow rather the exception. It is curious that neither form occurs in the plates of vol. i (save the open form once, Pl. XIII in the Calendar of *Casanat.* 641 where it appears to be a later addition : "Nat. Scorum apostolorum etc. . . ."). In the plates of vol. ii the open bow is very frequently found, the closed bow rarely. (Cf. Pls. LXIV, LXXXV, C.)

an unfinished eight (2). We sometimes find it within a word and always with capital or small s for *set*, *set et* (S₂ s₂₂).

(10) Peter's abbreviation for final *-ur* (and sometimes for *er* within a word) is ~, which may be his own adaptation of the usual Beneventan (2) symbol for this ending.

(11) The sign for contractions and suspensions should also be mentioned, seeing that it is of some importance as a help for dating Peter's works. In the earlier works it usually takes the form of a short horizontal stroke with the end slightly raised (- ↗). In the later works the stroke is more undulated (~) and often is indistinguishable from the *-ur* abbreviation.¹

The above features are permanent ones and can be considered as those which best bring out the individual nature of the writing. When taken together they make it relatively easy to single out Peter's hand from any other. The orthographical peculiarities of the text do not strictly fall within the scope of this essay. A wider study of the two minuscule manuscripts would be necessary before a complete list could be drawn up. Yet it is worth pointing out that they do exist. Thus, for instance, Peter

¹ Without an extensive study of the two minuscule manuscripts it is difficult to assign a precise date for the change. No doubt it only took place gradually. The later form of the contraction sign is already found in the dedicatory preface of the *De Locis Sanctis* to abbot Guibaldus (1137) on fol. 34^r of *Cod. Cas.* 361. The earlier form of the sign, however, predominates in the work itself and goes to prove, together with the general character of the writing, which is more cramped, that the transcriptions from Bede and from the *Itinerarium Eucheriae* which make up this "work" must have been written a considerable time before 1137. They very probably belong to the same period as the other transcriptions of Frontinus and Varro. Another instance where the difference between the earlier and the later form of the contraction sign is easily observable is on page 154 of *Cod. Cas.* 361 in his *Liber de Ortu et Obitu Justorum Coenobii Casinensis*. Here, as Caspar (*Petrus Diaconus*, p. 54 and n. 3) pointed out, Peter has erased a large passage of his earlier *Vita S. Placidi*, in order to bring it into line with the much later life by "Gordianus". Lines 25-38—there are fifty to the page—have been rewritten, and the contrast between the shape of the sign in the inserted portion and the rest of the page is very marked. Another point of importance in helping to date the works is the extra flourish given to the horizontal stroke in final *t*. This flourish is absent in the earliest works c. 1132-33 (cf. Pl. IIa); becomes very pronounced in those written c. 1134-36 (cf. Pl. I); and then tends again to disappear in those dating from c. 1137 (e.g. the preface of *De Locis Sanctis*) and after (cf. Pl. IVa).

writes *iusta* for *iuxta*, *set* for *sed*, *adque* for *atque* (this last mostly in his earlier works). Even these few taken in conjunction with the script we have just analysed will afford us a valuable basis for comparison with the Beneventan works to which we must now refer.

The Beneventan Manuscripts

We have already said that it is natural to suppose that Peter the Deacon was brought up from an early age on the Beneventan script. But however reasonable, *a priori*, such an hypothesis may seem, it is necessary to examine very carefully the data that may lend it support. What concrete evidence is there for asserting that Peter wrote Beneventan at all? Let us take first, by itself, the witness of his minuscule script. Its general appearance is decidedly not "of a Beneventan cast". This is a point which becomes very clear when we compare it, for instance, with the writing of *Cod. Cas.* 580, already mentioned above, or with some of the lines in the transcriptions of Frontinus and Varro that are not by Peter himself.¹ Here the script often shows a marked Beneventan influence. To a large extent the contrast is due to the basic *i* stroke of the Beneventan script which is quite lacking in Peter's work. Since this particular stroke is used in forming many other letters (*m*, *n*, *u*, *h*, *t*) it sets

¹ H. Willard, *Casinensia*, i. 304, n. 1, gives a very misleading description of *Cod. Cas.* 361. He says that: "The scribe (perhaps Peter himself . . .) employs an uneven ordinary minuscule; but on several occasions . . . he slips into a hand that is semi-Beneventan, using the characteristic heavy shouldered *r*, the raised *e* before *c* and after *t* etc. . . ." (The word in italic is ours.) It is evident, however, from a glance at the facsimiles that it is not Peter's hand which is lapsing into one which is semi-Beneventan. Several other hands besides Peter's, each with its own characteristics, have worked on the transcriptions of Frontinus and Varro. Altogether six can be distinguished: hand A (fol. 31^r, l. 1-8); hand B (fol. 31^v, l. 1-7); hand C (fol. 31^v, l. 30-35); hand D (fol. 33^r, l. 34-41); hand E (fol. 33^v, l. 26-34); hand F (fol. 33^v, l. 35-51). A, B, and E appear to be trained Beneventan hands, and it is mainly in the sections written by them that Beneventan traits most frequently occur. Of them it can truly be said that they are trying to write minuscule but "lapse" into the script with which, as is evident, they are most familiar. The other hands, C, D, and F, do not appear to be disciplined hands. In this they resemble Peter, as well as in the fact that minuscule elements predominate in their writing. Nevertheless, each of these scribes makes use of some Beneventan signs which are not to be found in Peter's own work. For example, F uses *i* longa seven times; C, D and F use Beneventan *et* and *-ur*. See Pl. IIa for a facsimile of hand B.

the pattern for the script as a whole. The Beneventan scribe gives this stroke the shape of two lozenges joined to each other and standing on end (𐀀). He always avoids making it as a simple perpendicular line (𐀁).¹ For Peter, however, the straight line is the rule. But there are more points of difference than this one. We find that some of the scribes who worked on the transcriptions, though they attempt to keep to the minuscule script, frequently lapse into making Beneventan letters and abbreviations. They also betray their Beneventan training by the use of such characteristic elements as *i* longa and elongated final *r*. Peter's minuscule is remarkably free from any such traits and it would be hard to find a single point of close contact with the Beneventan script in the twenty-six pages of the Frontinus edition we have analysed.²

In the light of such evidence one is very much inclined to conclude that Peter did not write Beneventan at all. If he did, he was able, to a quite phenomenal degree, to avoid betraying this fact, in any way, in his minuscule works. His minuscule works, taken by themselves, certainly do not warrant the conclusion that he used any other form of writing. We must now see whether the Beneventan manuscripts which have been attributed to him by historians allow us to take a different view.³

¹ Cf. E. A. Lowe, *Beneventan Script*, pp. 127-9 for a discussion of the basic importance of the *i* stroke in the Beneventan script. The list of contrasts between Peter's minuscule and Beneventan could be indefinitely prolonged simply by taking chapter 7 of Lowe's work, dealing with the morphology of the script, and comparing what is there said with the minuscule of *Cod. Cas.* 257 and 361. The divergence appears on all counts, whether it is on the question of the bow—the letter *o* in particular, which in Beneventan is lozenge-shaped, in Peter's minuscule is round—the upright and descending stems, the horizontal connecting stroke, etc. It is precisely on these points, i.e. the way "of attacking a letter", that the scribe of *Cod. Cas.* 580 shows such consistency throughout both portions of his work (cf. p. 115, n. 1 *supra*).

² Very occasionally Peter makes a Beneventan letter; e.g. a Beneventan *C* occurs on fol. 31^r (l. 21) and fol. 31^v (l. 24) of the Frontinus transcription. He was constantly using Beneventan works and must have been perfectly familiar with all the peculiarities of the script. But such isolated elements do not offer serious proof that he ever wrote continuously in Beneventan himself.

³ It is perhaps worth pointing out that Peter the Deacon's name does not come in the list of Beneventan scribes given in c. 14 of *Beneventan Script*, pp. 320-33.

Let us first take the case of the marginal notes in the Munich manuscript of the Chronicle of Monte Cassino (*Cod. Monac. Lat. 4623*) and in the *Translatio Sancti Mennatis* of *Cod. Cas. 413*.¹ Even some of the most hurriedly jotted notes in the margins of both manuscripts preserve a regularity and evenness in the formation of the letters that can only be the work of a trained scribe. The letters and abbreviations throughout are in the purest Beneventan style. The following points will perhaps best bring out the contrast between the writing of the marginalia and that of Peter's minuscule works.

(1) One particularity of the marginalia is that they make frequent use of uncial *a*. But this letter never takes on the particular shape which it has in Peter's minuscule. The bow always begins well below the top of the oblique downward stroke (*a*). (2) The arch-stroke in the letter *h* regularly stops at the base-line, the stroke being turned outward when it reaches the line (*h*). (3) The lower bow of *g* is always open (*g*), never closed. (4) The peculiar form of capital *Q* which Peter uses does not occur. (5) The more usual forms of abbreviation are used for *quod*; *q̄* is very rarely found. (6) In the abbreviation for *-orum* a space is left between the *r* and the *o* (*or̄o*); the closed bow is never made. (7) The comma in the semi-colon for *-us* is neatly made and lacks the small flourish which Peter gives it in his minuscule. (8) The full semi-colon, and not merely the comma, is used for *-que*. (9) Beneventan *et* (*et̄*) alone is found in the marginalia; never the sign Peter uses for this word.

¹ Facsimiles of the Munich manuscript (*Cod. Lat. Monac. 4623*) will be found in Chroust, *Monumenta Palaeographica, Denkmäler der Schreibkunst*, ser. i, fasc. X (Munich, 1903), Pl. 2 = fols. 98^v, 146^r, 154^r, 186^r; Arndt-Tangl, *Schrifttafeln zur Erlernung der lateinischen Palaeographie*, t. ii (4th edn., 1906) Pl. 38; E. A. Lowe, *Scriptura Beneventana* (Oxford, 1929), Pl. LXXVIII = fols. 85^r, 120^v, 162^r, 188^r. A microfilm of the entire manuscript was examined in order to ascertain whether any of the marginalia might be attributed to Peter's hand. The marginal notes added to the *Translatio S. Mennatis Cod. Cas. 413* bear such a striking resemblance to those of the Munich manuscript that there is great probability they are by the same hand. (Cf. Pl. III a and b *supra*). It was this similarity, together with Klewitz's conclusion concerning the authorship of the Munich manuscript, which lead Fr. Baudouin de Gaiffier to attribute the marginalia of *Cod. Cas. 413* to Peter the Deacon.

(10) The *-ur* symbol of the minuscule manuscripts is also completely lacking; only the ordinary Beneventan *-ur* sign occurs.

We are therefore faced with a deep and wide divergence, even if we confine ourselves to these few points, between Peter's minuscule and the Beneventan marginalia for which he is supposed to be responsible.¹ Although the main text of the Munich manuscript is likewise considered his, it is of set purpose that only the marginal notes have been chosen for a comparison since it is evident that they were written *currente calamo* without any undue attention to neatness or form. They abound in abbreviations and are therefore the place where 'scribal idiosyncrasies' would be most likely to appear. If we take the evidence objectively we are forced to conclude that the hand which wrote the minuscule of *Cod. Cas. 257* and *361* cannot be the one that wrote the marginalia of these two Beneventan manuscripts. The evidence is sound and, on palaeographical grounds, hard to reject. The opposite conclusion would amount to an absurdity. We should have a writer giving different shapes to the same letter (*a, h, g, Q*), using different kinds of abbreviations, even different forms of the same abbreviation (*œ oz*) in the two scripts, for no apparent reason and always succeeding in keeping them quite distinct, never making the least slip. The conclusion that the marginalia are not by Peter would find yet further support in a study of the orthography. The Beneventan writer uses *iuxta, sed, atque*, to refer only to the

¹ Klewitz, in a note to his study of the Munich manuscript of the Chronicle (*Archiv für Urk. Forsch.*, t. xiv, p. 446, n. 6), says that an argument for attributing the marginalia to Peter the Deacon can be drawn from the fact that they make some use of Caroline *d*. The validity of this argument may be doubted. E. A. Lowe, *Beneventan Script*, p. 134, points out that Caroline *d* cannot be considered a foreign element in Beneventan script. "Some scribes show an exclusive preference for the Caroline form (cf. *Vat. Lat.* 3317). Where the preference is for the uncial form, there is a tendency to use the straight-shafted *d* in abbreviations (*qt, id*) obviously because the vertical shaft is more adapted to the horizontal abbreviation stroke". It is precisely in the abbreviations that the marginalia of Munich *C.L.M. 4623* and of *Cod. Cas. 413* make an occasional use of Caroline *d*. To this should be added the fact that the shaft of the *d* is always much longer than it is in Peter's minuscule.

examples which we gave above. But there seems hardly need to stress the matter any further.

It is impossible to conceive the marginal notes of the Munich manuscript of the Chronicle otherwise than as the work of an author going over and over his text, correcting and recorrecting it as many as three or four times. The fact, therefore, that Peter the Deacon did not write these marginalia is sufficient to disprove some of the main conclusions which H. W. Klewitz and W. Smidt had drawn concerning his share in the early editions of the Cassinese Chronicle. The data cannot easily be explained by suggesting that Peter used a scribe to perform this work of correction. The conclusion that the work is not his need not, however, automatically mean a return to the positions adopted by Wattenbach and Chroust concerning the genesis of the chronicle. Much that the more recent historians have said would seem to be of lasting value. They have shown, and this may yet come to be considered the most permanent element of their investigations, that Leo of Ostia himself can hardly have been the one responsible for the successive changes made to the first draft of the chronicle. They concluded, perhaps too easily, that if this were so then Peter alone could be the one to have made them. On the basis of internal criticism, even apart from any palaeographic considerations, a stronger case could be presented for showing that the alterations to the text are not due to Peter than for showing that they are. It must be remembered that no less than thirty years stand between Leo's appointment to the see of Ostia (c. 1101) and the time when Peter as *bibliothecarius* comes on the scene (1131), and we know by name at least one of the chroniclers of the intervening period: Guido. The palaeographic evidence will only help to confirm what a more penetrating criticism of the materials which Smidt and more particularly Klewitz had in hand might already have shown.¹ But to enter any further into the question of the

¹ The trend in the more recent developments concerning the history of the *Chronicon Casinense* are no doubt in part due to the order in which the studies of W. Smidt appeared. It is not impossible that if his "Guido von Monte Cassino und die 'Fortsetzung' der Chronik Leos durch Petrus Diaconus" in *Festschrift Albert Brackmann* (Weimar, 1931) had preceded the earlier essay

chronicle here would be out of place. It is sufficient to have shown that the last word on the history of this document has not yet been said.

We must now turn to the two Beneventan Registers, the *Registrum Petri Diaconi* and the *Registrum S. Placidi* (= *Cod. Cas.* 518), which historians have hitherto considered as Peter the Deacon's autographs.¹ His connection with both these volumes cannot be brought in doubt and the only real problem to be settled is whether it was he himself who wrote them or not. In the dedicatory preface to Abbot Seniorectus which opens the voluminous chartulary of Monte Cassino, Peter begins by recalling the obedience which had first been given him by his abbot: "injunxerat nobis jamdudum Pater tua reverende sagacitas, ut privilegia nostro coenobio a Romanis pontificibus facta volumine

"Über den Verfasser der drei letzten Redaktionen der Chronik Leos von Monte Cassino" in *Papsttum und Kaisertum, Kehr-Festschrift* (Munich, 1926) the whole problem would have been seen in a truer perspective. From the outset Smidt brought in Peter the Deacon as the only one who could be responsible for the changes made to the various editions of the chronicle. He confined his study, however, to the differences which existed between the first redaction (= Munich *CLM.* 4623—which he still considered as being Leo's) and *red.* 2, 3, and 4. Klewitz did no more than take this reasoning a step further by showing that similar differences were perceptible between the main text and the marginalia of the Munich manuscript. Peter the Deacon, he concluded, must also here have been at work. Klewitz failed to make a serious study of Peter's hand-writing in order to test the validity of his conclusion. His statement that part of the Munich manuscript was by Peter and part by Leo (cf. p. 115, n. 4. *supra*) certainly comes as a surprise in view of the fact that Wattenbach, Chroust, and E. A. Lowe had all clearly pointed out that the manuscript was in major part palimpsest (fols. 85-161^v) without any variation in the primary text (9 lines to the page). This obliges one to hold that it all belongs to the same period, whatever that may be, and the consequences of this fact for the history of the chronicle are quite considerable. Further, the data contained in Smidt's article on Guido were never sufficiently taken into account. One of the proofs put forward by Klewitz (p. 427 f.) for assigning the authorship of the marginalia to Peter is based on their connection with Peter's *Liber Illustrium Virorum Coenobii Casinensis*. But this is to forget that, on Peter's own admission, this is a work which he took over from Guido (cf. Smidt, *Guido*, pp. 302 ff.). The links between both works could point as well to Guido's authorship as to that of Peter. The evidence, at any rate, shows that it becomes necessary to proceed with great caution. These are only a few considerations concerning what is a very complex problem. The whole ground covered by Smidt and Klewitz will need to be gone over once more in the light of the conclusions we have reached about Peter the Deacon's handwriting.

¹ Cf. p. 115, n. 4. *supra*.

sub uno describerem.”¹ Seniorectus had later repeated his command, this time amplifying it to include all the privileges and donations which the abbey possessed: “volo simul et jubeo ut privilegia pontificum, praecepta imperatorum, regum, ducum ac principum, necnon oblationes quorumcumque fidelium in uno describantur volumine.” After mentioning the difficulties of the undertaking and underlining the help which Leo of Ostia’s chronicle had provided for the section on the *oblationes*, Peter gives the division of his work: “In sex porro decisiones librum statui dividere istum; in privilegiis, in praeceptis, in oblationibus, in libellis, in renunciis, in sacramentis.” These statements, taken by themselves, leave one with the impression that it was he who wrote the whole work. Yet some caution is necessary here, for in both the autobiographies only the preface of the *Registrum* is mentioned as his: “Fecit et prologum in libro privilegiorum.”² That is all. There is no direct allusion to the *Registrum* itself as there is, for instance, to the long commentary on the Rule which he did write himself: “Expositionem super Regulam Sci. Benedicti componens in libros quatuor divisit.”³ The contrast is rather striking, for modesty is not one

¹ The preface to the *Registrum* was edited by Gattola, *Accessiones ad Historiam Abbatiae Cassinensis*, i. 22 and again by Wattenbach in his introduction to the *Chronicon Casinense (Mon. Ger. Hist. Scriptores*, vii. 567-8). It is evident at a glance that this preface is based on the preface to Leo’s chronicle (*M.G.H. SS.*, vii. 574-6). Oderisius had first asked Leo to write the history of Desiderius and then told him to begin a chronicle including all the other abbots of Monte Cassino. Likewise Seniorectus first commands Peter to unite together the papal privileges and later tells him to include all the other documents. In these circumstances it is difficult to discern what is historical truth from what is merely literary artifice in Peter’s words.

² *P.L.* 173, 1049. The text of all the printed editions deriving from that of J. B. Marus reads: “Fecit et prologum in libros Privilegiorum ex rogatu Raynaldi subdiaconi Casinensis.” There is no mention of Raynaldus in any of the autobiographies. The quotation above is from fol. 71^r of *Cod. Cas.* 361. This item (n. 26) comes in the first group of entries (cf. p. 119 *supra*) and is followed by the mention of the *Vita S. Severi*. (n. 27) which was written about A.D. 1135. It would therefore seem that the preface to the *Registrum* was composed before this date. Since the preface seems to imply the completion of the *Registrum* itself, this indication may furnish a valuable clue for helping to date the Chartulary (cf. p. 134, n. 1. *infra*).

³ *Bibliotheca Casinensis*, v, *Florilegium*, 52 = the second autobiography of *Cod. Cas.* 257.

of our author's outstanding virtues. He is not the man to hide his share in a work when there is no special reason for doing so. On the contrary, "nonnumquam res suas nimium refert" is Mabillon's judgement on him.

What force then must be given to the expressions from the preface to the *Registrum Petri Diaconi* quoted above? It should be remembered that phrases like "statui dividere", "ut . . . volumine sub uno describerem" need not necessarily imply the calligraphic work that goes to the making of a volume. An interesting parallel is furnished by the *Registrum* of the abbey of Saint Clement of Casauria. Towards the end of the work, John Berardus, the author of this Chartulary-Chronicle, alludes to the renewal of the abbey library which took place under Abbot Leonas (1155-82). The writing of the chartulary belongs to this period and here is the manner in which the author refers to it: "Hunc quoque Librum Instrumentorum seu Chronicorum, quem ego Frater Johannes composui et ordinavi et Magister Rusticus scripsit, ipso (i.e. Abbot Leonas) permittente, imo jubente ac adminiculante, perfecimus."¹ Had John Berardus failed to tell us the share of Magister Rusticus we might easily have concluded, in view of the terms he uses, that the whole work was his.

The *Registrum S. Placidi* is not mentioned in Peter's autobiographies. This is most probably due to the fact that it is one of the later works and that the catalogue of *Cod. Cas. 257* was never fully completed or brought up to date. The omission can hardly be considered intentional since Peter does not seem to have wanted to hide the share which he had in preparing this volume. In the short chronicle which he added to the life of S. Placid by *Gordianus* he tells us how this *Vita* eventually found its way from the East to Monte Cassino and how on receiving it Abbot Raynaldus "nostre exiguitati contradidit precipiens, ut diligentius illam emendans futuris generationibus habendam contraderem".² There is no mention of this work of emendation in the catalogues since the *Vita S. Placidi* referred to there is the one now contained in the *Liber de Ortu et Obitu justorum*

¹ Muratori, *Rerum Ital. Script.*, ii, pt. 2, col. 914.

² Caspar, *Petrus Diaconus*, p. 64, n. 4.

Cenobii Casinensis. We have therefore not got the means, as in the case of the *Registrum Petri Diaconi*, of using the autobiographies as a check on the expressions which we find in the *Registrum S. Placidi* itself, and a phrase like the one just quoted might again lead us to believe that it was Peter who wrote the work himself. A final solution to the problem set by both Registers can only be reached by comparing closely the script of these volumes with the minuscule writing which we know for certain to be his. Such a comparison will reveal in each case that, whatever responsibility Peter may have for the material contained in these works, it was not he himself who wrote them.

Both the Beneventan volumes are finished products of the scriptorium, "Reinschriften" as H. W. Klewitz terms them.¹ This necessarily means that the basis for a comparison with the minuscule is somewhat narrower than in the case of the Beneventan marginalia, which abound in abbreviations. In the two Registers these are more rare. Yet there does remain sufficient ground to bring out the divergence between the script in both series of works.² The first difference results from the fact that both the Beneventan manuscripts are written by highly trained scribes. This is perhaps the most fundamental point. Peter's minuscule shows that his hand was not trained. It is difficult to conceive that the hand which wrote out the transcriptions of Frontinus and Varro in *Cod. Cas.* 361 could at the same time have been responsible for the beautiful and regular script of the *Registrum Petri Diaconi* which is contemporary with them. To this must also be added the fact that there is not the least trace of a minuscule influence in the Beneventan writing. It is in the purest Beneventan tradition. In the large Chartulary, in particular, the *i* stroke is very pronounced. With the exception of the remark concerning uncial *a*—which does not occur—nearly all the points of difference noted above on page 127 between the marginalia and the minuscule could be repeated

¹ *Archiv für Urkund. Forsch.*, t. xiv (1936), 446.

² A reproduction of fol. 79^r of the *Registrum Petri Diaconi* is given in Piscicelli-Taeggi, *Paleografia artistica di Monte Cas.*, Longobardo Cassinese, Tav. xlix. Photographs of eight folios of this *Registrum* and of twelve from the *Reg. S. Placidi* were examined in preparing this article. Facsimiles of these two manuscripts are given on Pl. IIb and Pl. IVb. *supra*.

here. What was there said about the letters *h*, *g*, *Q*, about the abbreviations for *-orum*, *-us*, *-que*, *-ur* and *et*, also holds for the two Beneventan Registers. The abbreviation for *quod* is occasionally found in the Beneventan manuscripts, but this is not unusual, and the stem of the *q̄* always ends with the "oblique hair-line going from right to left", which is never the case in Peter's work. So that once more the conclusion that Peter the Deacon did not himself write these two Beneventan Registers is the only one that adequately fits the facts.¹

¹ The links between Peter the Deacon and both the Beneventan Registers cannot be doubted. It seems also certain that he is responsible for most, if not all, the contents of the *Reg. S. Placidi*. But the extent of his connection with the *Registrum* which bears his name is a problem that would need very careful investigation. Reasons are not wanting for thinking that here again we have a case where Peter took over, completed and "edited" a work begun by one of his predecessors. Two main points can be advanced in favour of such a view. The first concerns the chronology of Peter's works. The recent study of Professor H. Bloch, "The Schism of Anacletus and the Glanfeuil forgeries of Peter the Deacon" in *Traditio*, viii (1952), 159-264 proves to be of vital importance for the history of the *Registrum*. From the way in which these forgeries, written early in 1133, are entered in the Chartulary—the Bull of Urban II (1097) after the section on papal privileges which closes with Calixtus II (1120), the other forgeries right at the end of the volume on fols. 253-4—it is clear that the major part of the *Registrum* had already been completed by the middle of 1133. (Cf. H. Bloch, p. 182, n. 98; p. 195, n. 156; p. 225, introd. to n. 4; p. 229, introd. to n. 5.) When we remember that Peter went into exile in 1128 (*P.L.* 173, 1049), was absent for over three years from Monte Cassino ("e qua per tempus, tempora et dimidium temporis absens fueram", *Prolog. in Vitam S. Apollinaris*, *P.L.* 173, 1081) and did not begin his activity as 'bibliothecarius' until his return (c. 1131-2), it becomes extremely unlikely that the large *Registrum*, together with the great amount of research in the archives which it involved, could have been accomplished in under two years. To this must be added, as a second point, the evidence of a document contained in the *Registrum* itself and published by Gattoja in his *Historia Abbatiae Casin.* (i. 54-6). This document relates the part played by Leo of Ostia in the last decade of the eleventh century, and especially in the year 1098 at Beneventum and Bari, in the litigations concerning the right of Monte Cassino over the abbey of S. Sophia at Beneventum. It is clear that the author of this long memorandum is not Leo of Ostia himself. He begins by quoting an earlier memorandum on the subject by Leo ("Legitur in Psalmista . . . proclamationibus repetitum", *Gattula*, p. 54) explicitly stating that he is doing so, and then goes on to mention what had occurred 'novissime' at Beneventum and at the council of Bari (1098). Neither can the author of this document be Peter the Deacon since it is evident from the whole context and the terms used that the writer was himself an eyewitness of the incidents he is narrating ("nobis persuasum est", "nos responsa", "nos . . . consurgentes, gratias egimus",

We began this essay with the strange anomaly of an author making abundant use of two entirely different scripts. On examining the evidence more carefully we found that the proof for the autograph nature of the minuscule works was very strong. Peter the Deacon certainly did write in this script and most of his works have come down to us in this, their original, form. A closer study of the writing in the Beneventan works suggested that there were serious reasons for doubting whether they were really Peter's autographs at all.¹ Peter the Deacon's normal way of writing appears to be minuscule. There is no real proof that he ever used any other form of script. This conclusion does not exclude the possibility that one and the same scribe could command two such different scripts as Beneventan and ordinary minuscule. The example of the scribe of *Cod. Cas. 580* is there to show that he could. How frequent such cases may have been and whether they were ever more than an exception is an open question. What is quite certain is that the autographs of Peter the Deacon cannot be cited as an instance of such a fact. But his autographs do still leave us with a very important problem, the presence of minuscule in a flourishing Beneventan centre. How must this be explained?

The following concluding remarks are put forward tentatively as a possible solution to the problem in the light of evidence we have met on the way. They may help to complete a little the picture given in chapter 5 of *The Beneventan Script*. Dr. Lowe admits that "after the twelfth century and also during that century, the ordinary minuscule may be said to assume the rôle

etc.). As the memorandum appears to have been drawn up for the express purpose of introducing the letter of Urban II to Anso (the then governor of Beneventum), which comes in its chronological place in the *Registrum*, it may be proof that parts of this work were already in existence long before Peter the Deacon comes on the scene. One must hope that an integral publication of the Chartulary will soon be possible, for only then may one expect to find a definitive solution to its history as well as to the intricate problem of its relations with the *Chronicon Casinense*.

¹ This conclusion raises the question of Peter's collaborators. Did he merely supply texts and "original" documents for the Beneventan scribes to copy out, or were others actively engaged in helping him to produce the "originals" themselves. A very minute study of the script in the surviving "originals" would be necessary before such a question could be answered.

of rival which, owing to the political and other circumstances, was destined to supplant the Beneventan".¹ No precise date is here assigned as a terminus *a quo* for the change although it seems implied that it only took place late in the twelfth century. Peter's minuscule suggests that the struggle had already begun at the beginning of that century. Yet somehow it seems hard to believe that so soon after the high tide of Desiderian times a decline had set in.

There is a distinction that may here be usefully kept in mind. In making his analysis of the script of *Cod. Cas. 361*, Dr. Steffens remarked that the peculiar nature of the minuscule showed that it was due rather to the hand "eines Gelehrten als eines Kalligraphen".² This is an interesting statement. Presumably in the twelfth century, as nowadays, not all the boys in the monastic school showed an inclination or a gift towards calligraphy. Was a uniform method of writing imposed on all or were the more promising pupils singled out to become trained scribes, the rest being allowed to do very much as they pleased?³ The real problem would then be at what period minuscule became the rival of Beneventan in the scriptorium itself? It is not without significance that the *Registrum Petri Diaconi* and the *Registrum S. Placidi* are still written in Beneventan. The fact that Peter and some of his contemporaries, all, as far as we can judge from the evidence of *Cod. Cas. 361*, not great adepts at writing, use minuscule, does not necessarily prove that the sovereignty of the Beneventan script was seriously threatened. But it does seem to prove that it was recognized in their time that minuscule was the easier of the two scripts and had certain practical advantages over the more traditional manner of writing.

If such is really the case it would imply that a considerable amount of minuscule was being written at Monte Cassino at the time. This could best be explained by referring back to the

¹ *Beneventan Script*, p. 92.

² *Lateinische Paläographie*, commentary to Plate, n. 79 b.

³ This is suggested by the heterogeneous nature of the script used by C, D, and F (cf. p. 125, n. 1. *supra*), the untrained hands who helped Peter in the transcriptions of Frontinus and Varro. The peculiarities of the other scribes (A, B, and E) are sufficiently explained by the fact that they are Beneventan scribes trying to write minuscule. These last show a consistency which the former do not,

great intellectual and artistic renaissance which had taken place under Desiderius. The Chronicle of Monte Cassino tells us how one of its effects had been that : “ multi ex multis et extimis terrarum partibus huc coeperunt confluere, et hylariter Desiderio recipiente, factum est ut intra ipsum biennium [after the consecration of the basilica in 1071] ad secundum circiter centenarium congregationis loci hujus se numerus porrexisset.”¹ No doubt many of the newcomers were skilled writers and not from the Beneventan zone. Was the abbey able to assimilate them all to its own cultural traditions ?

NOTE

Since writing the above essay I have had the opportunity to discuss thoroughly with Dr. E. A. Lowe some of the questions treated in it, in particular those concerning the relation of the script in *Cod. Cas.* 361 with the marginalia of Munich, *Cod. Lat. Monac.* 4623 and of *Cod. Cas.* 413. I should like to take this occasion of thanking Dr. Lowe once more for his great kindness in closely examining photos of the above manuscripts and also for his permission to give here his own views on the subject.

¹ III, 31 (*M.G.H. SS.*, vii. 722). This passage from the Chronicle should be linked with the letter which Desiderius caused to be sent to Hartwig, abbot of Hersfeld (1072, Dec. 12—1085). The letter was first published by Mabillon in his *Vetera Analecta* (iv, pp. 462-4) from a text he had found “ in operculo cujusdam codicis publicae bibliothecae Basileensis ” (id. p. 458). Mabillon did not know to whom the letter was addressed and it seems clear that his manuscript must have lacked the superscription which the letter has in Oxford, Oriel. *Cod.* 42, fol. 219b (XIIIs.—cf. H. O. Coxe, *Catalogus Codicum MSS. qui*, etc., vol. i (1852), Col. Oriel. p. 16) and in Brit. Museum, Add. 22,633, fol. 154^v (XIIIs.). Dummler, unaware of Mabillon’s publication, edited the text from the British Museum manuscript in *Neues Archiv*, iii (1878), pp. 189-91. The passage which is of interest to us here is the following : “ Verumtamen si in vestro perseverare volueritis desiderio [that is, in the desire to know more about Cassinese usages] nostrum quaecunque non displiceat consilium. Plerique nostre consuetudinis nostreque conversationis cupidi, de suis quem perspicacioris cognoscunt ingenii unum huc transmittunt ut non solum auditu verum etiam visu pro quibus mittitur perspiciat ; eoque modo quasi unus ex nobis hic, quidam per integrum annum, quidam etiam diutius manens, tandem omnibus perspectis ad sua certus cum gaudio redit. Hoc idem non ab re videtur nobis, si vobis placet, consilium—sic tamen, ut honori vestro consulentes, huius rei causa loci vestri tum etiam huius nostri commodo et honori provideatis ” (*N.A.*, id. p. 190).

The conclusion that the hand which wrote the major part of *Cod. Cas. 361*—and which the data show to be that of Peter the Deacon himself—could not also have written the marginalia of the two Beneventan manuscripts is not only one he considers to be sound, but he finds it difficult to see what other conclusion can be drawn as far as the *palaeographic evidence* is concerned. For Dr. Lowe the fundamental point, deciding the issue, is the fact that the script of the marginalia is manifestly by a trained hand, that of *Cod. Cas. 361* by a hand which is neither expert nor disciplined. This shows that the two series of works must have been due to different scribes.

I must also add that since this article went into type some unknown hagiographical works by Leo of Ostia have come to light. The evidence they throw on their author and his methods is new and unexpected, and is likely to prove of considerable importance for the history of *Chronicon Casinense*. In particular, it will now become a very delicate matter to decide whether it is really Guido and not Leo himself who is responsible for the marginalia of Munich, *Cod. Lat. Monac. 4623*, and consequently the suggestion put forward above (p. 129 and n. 1) may need to be modified. These new works will form the subject of a preliminary study by Father Paul Devos, S.J., Bollandist, and the present writer in a forthcoming number of the *Analecta Bollandiana*.