

segno e testo

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
OF MANUSCRIPTS AND TEXT TRANSMISSION

Il codice miscellaneo. Tipologie e funzioni
Atti del Convegno internazionale
Cassino 14-17 maggio 2003

A cura di
EDOARDO CRISCI e ORONZO PECERE

Copyright © Università degli Studi di Cassino (Italy)
ISBN 2-503-51738-2

L'Editore si dichiara disponibile ad assolvere eventuali obblighi nei confronti
delle Istituzioni e degli Enti che detengono i diritti sulla riproduzione delle immagini

Direzione
Edoardo Crisci (Direttore responsabile)
Oronzo Pecere

Comitato di redazione
Paolo De Paolis, Sebastiano Gentile, Marilena Maniaci, Alfredo M. Morelli, Michele Napolitano,
Giulia Orofino, Alessandra Peri, Antonio Stramaglia

Redazione
Maddalena Sparagna

Progetto grafico
Edmondo Colella

Università degli Studi di Cassino
Facoltà di Lettere – Dipartimento di Filologia e Storia
via Zamosch, 43
I-03043 Cassino
segnoetesto@unicas.it
+39 0776 299 3289

Distribuzione
Brepols Publishers
Begijnhof 67 – B-2300 Turnhout (Belgium)
E-mail: info@brepols.net
www.brepols.net
Tel. +32 14 44 80 20 – Fax +32 14 42 89 19

Periodico annuale: Autorizzazione del Tribunale di Cassino n. 75/03, del 9-6-2003

Finito di stampare nel mese di luglio 2004
presso La Buona Stampa
Via Benedetto Cozzolino, 86
80056 Ercolano Napoli

J. PETER GUMBERT

CODICOLOGICAL UNITS: TOWARDS A TERMINOLOGY FOR THE STRATIGRAPHY OF THE NON-HOMOGENEOUS CODEX

1. INTRODUCTION

In Brussels there is a famous manuscript, known as the 'Hulthem Manuscript', which contains 214 texts in Middle Dutch, ranging from elegant drama and love poetry to erotic narratives, prayers, an astrological text, a guide for a pilgrimage and much more¹. In Leiden there is a less famous manuscript which contains part of a sermon collection, part of Pliny's *Naturalis Historia*, and the tables for biblical history by Peter of Poitiers². Both contain various and very diverse texts; but in nature they are totally different. One was written by one person in one process; it is *homogeneous*, and the fact that it contains a multitude of texts was the result of a decision by the maker (or the person who gave him his order). The other combines three wholly different items: a fragment (three leaves) of a late-ninth-century homiliary from France; a substantial fragment (30 leaves) of an early-eighth-century Pliny from Northumbria; and a thirteenth-century Petrus Pictaviensis from France – that is complete, but it is only four leaves. What the three have in common is that they are big (about cm 40 x 30) and thin, and that a seventeenth-century owner (Alexandre Petau, †1672) thought that

¹ Of the immense bibliography, here only the most recent (and first complete) edition: H. Brinkman – J. C. Schenkel [ed.], *Het handschrift-Van Hulthem. Hs. Brussel, Koninklijke Bibliotheek van België, 15.589-623*, Hilversum 1999 (*Middeleeuwse Verzamelhandschriften uit de Nederlanden*, 7).

² Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Voss. lat. fol. 4.

they were more easily handled if bound together. The one is a typical *miscellany*; the other is a typical *composite*.

The distinction between these cases is most important, even if one 'merely' wants to edit one of the texts found in a manuscript. To declare that a manuscript is not homogeneous, that is: produced in a single process, but that it grew in stages and/or was put together from originally separate pieces, is one of the most important things that can be said about a manuscript. Understanding a manuscript in this sense – understanding its *stratigraphy*, as I have always called it – is vital, not only for abstract codicology but even for understanding the text in it, the precise form the text takes in this manuscript, and the combination with other texts in which it appears. But many philologists and other scholars, who use manuscripts in their research, are insufficiently aware of this matter, so that their use of the sources is often vitiated by serious methodological errors (they may, for instance, wrongly take a date given in one part of the volume as valid for other parts as well)³.

This wide-spread lack of understanding of the importance of the phenomenon of the non-homogeneous codex has caused a lack of interest in the various aspects of this problem. And one of the effects of this lack of interest is the absence of a terminology which is even remotely adequate for dealing with the complexities of the subject, «sulle quali il lavoro di riflessione è appena agli inizi», as Marilena Maniaci put it recently⁴.

One would tend to look for such a terminology in the *Vocabulaire codicologique* by Denis Muzerelle (1985)⁵, a work for which we may be extremely grateful but which does have its drawbacks. In the first place it does not give the terms Muzerelle thought essential, but those cur-

³ One should not, on the other hand, overestimate the importance of the stratigraphy; the Medieval reader was rarely bothered by it. After all, a copy of a 'composite' becomes a 'miscellany' (and so it is worthwhile to wonder, whenever one meets a miscellany, if there is a composite behind it).

⁴ M. Maniaci, *Archeologia del manoscritto*, Roma 2002, 73.

⁵ D. Muzerelle, *Vocabulaire codicologique. Répertoire méthodique des termes français relatifs aux manuscrits*, Paris 1985 (*Rubricae*, 1). There is also a Spanish translation/reworking: P. Ostos – M. L. Pardo – E. E. Rodríguez, *Vocabulario de codicología*, Madrid 1997 (the numbering is partly, but not wholly the same). For an English version there is, by A. I. Doyle, a «Codicological Vocabulary in English: Suggested Terms», following Muzerelle (only on the Web). The terms in these three are:

143.04 'unité codicologique' – 'unidad codicológica' – 'codicological unit'

143.06 'volume composite' – 'volumen facticio' – 'composite volume'

rent in Paris at the time; secondly it is by now 18 years old, which even in a slow-moving discipline like ours is not a negligible span of time.

His first definition is for the *Unité codicologique*, «a volume, part of a volume or set of volumes, which can be considered to have been produced as a single operation, executed under the same conditions of technique, place and time». This definition (strongly reminiscent of the 'dramatic unities') already shows that it is not easy to define what «one operation» is.

A *Volume composite* is «a volume created by combining independent codicological units» – a definition which leaves no room for the numerous cases where units are combined which are not quite independent and yet distinct.

These two are in the chapter *Aspects généraux du livre*. The other relevant terms are found in the chapter *Contenu du volume*; they are:

Recueil, «a volume which contains several texts»; it can be *homogène*, «set of independent texts copied by one person, at one place and at one moment into a volume» – this implies that it is a codicological unit; or it can be *hétérogène*, «a *recueil* formed out of *pièces* written at different places and times», which sounds like a volume composite, but a *Pièce* is defined as «each of the texts or each of the codicological units out of which a *recueil* consists» – and that «or» makes this definition ambiguous and useless: it does not make clear whether the *recueil hétérogène* is a codicological unit or not, since it is possible to write different texts at different times into one unit, so it is not possible to count the number of «*pièces*» in a volume unambiguously.

Also, a *recueil* can be *organisé*, if it contains «texts or codicological units [there is that «or» again] the combination whereof corresponds to an intention», that is: a combination of texts which makes sense (or of which we can make sense – it is not certain that medieval ideas on this

431.08 'recueil' – 431.12 'libro misceláneo', 'miscelánea' – 'collection', 'assemblage'

431.09 'recueil homogène' – 431.13 'miscelánea homogénea' – 'uniform collection'

431.10 'recueil organisé' – 431.14 'miscelánea organizada' – 'deliberate assemblage'

431.15 'recueil hétérogène' – 'miscelánea heterogénea' – 'miscellany'

431.16 'recueil factice' – 'miscelánea facticia' – [no suggestion]

431.17 'pièce', 'article' – 431.22 'pieza' [but restricted to «cada uno de los *textos*»!] – 'piece', 'article', 'item'.

Finally, there is Catalan version: M. Josepa Arnall i Juan, *El llibre manuscrit*, Barcelona 2002, which follows the Spanish version (but in alphabetical, not systematic order): 1852 'unitat codicològica', 1882 'volum factici', 1207-1211 'miscel·lània' with subtypes, 1371 'peça' (but with another solution of the problem: «each of the texts or the units which form a *col·lecció* or a *miscel·lània*»). See now the website <http://vocabulaire.irht.cnrs.fr/vocab.htm>.

subject were identical with ours); or it can be *factice*, if it consists of «heterogeneous *pièces* [not defined separately] arbitrarily joined purely for the needs of conservation in a library» – that must be volume composite, and so it is not a precise counterpart of the *recueil organisé*, of which it was explicitly left undecided if it was composite or not.

So Muzerelle's terms refer: to the question whether the book was written in one activity or is built up out of the results of separate activities; to the question whether it contains one text, or several; and in the latter case: whether these texts form a rational collection or not. But the terms do not constitute a logically coherent system; they mix reference to the physical makeup with reference to the contents; and they leave no room for the numerous graduations between the extremes.

Maniaci's *Terminologia del libro manoscritto* (1996)⁶ is not only more recent than Muzerelle's book, but also less dependent on actual usage among colleagues and more based on fresh thought.

Her *Unità codicologica* is identical with Muzerelle's: «a volume, a part of a volume or a set of volumes, which can be considered to have been produced as a single operation, executed under the same conditions of technique, place and time». On this basis she distinguishes a *Volume omogeneo*, which contains one single codicological unit (a term which was missing from Muzerelle), and a *Volume composito*, or just a *Composito*, which comprises several codicological units (she even adds that these «may even be from different periods or origin», thus tacitly recognising that distinct codicological units within a volume may have the same date and origin). A *Composito* in its turn can be a *Composito organizzato*, if the codicological units are joined «according to recognizable intentions», or a *Composito fattizio*, if they are joined «for purely accidental or external reasons».

Within the *Volume omogeneo*, on the other hand, there is a division between the *Libro unitario*, which contains one text, and the *Libro miscellaneo* (or plain *Miscellanea*), which contains several texts; it is a *Miscellanea organizzata* or *eterogenea* according to the recognizable plan in the combination of texts, or the absence of such a plan (for completeness' sake she also accepts Muzerelle's ambiguous definition of *Pezzo*, but she does not use it).

⁶ M. Maniaci, *Terminologia del libro manoscritto*, Roma 1996. The terms are on pp. 76, 211-212.

One can criticize some minor points. One regrets, for instance, that she says her «miscellanea eterogenea» is the same as Muzerelle's «recueil hétérogène», whereas her term means a homogeneous manuscript with a set of texts we do not understand, and Muzerelle's a book made at different times, regardless of the coherence between the texts. And she may be too severe in wanting her «libro unitario» to contain «a single text by a single author»: she would not consider a Book of Hours, or a Digest with the Gloss, or a Vergil with the anonymous introductory epigrams, as a «miscellanea» however «organizzata».

Apart from such details this is a good set of terms. But it still lacks provisions for the many shades between «made in one piece» and «built up out of independent items», and between «sensible» and «random» combinations; and it offers no way to cope with another important fact about manuscripts: that they do not stand still but develop.

Further one should mention the classic article on the *Booklet* by Pamela Robinson, of 1980, which was in a way the starting-point of the recent discussion, and a very valuable contribution by Birger Munk Olsen on the *Élément codicologique*, of 1998⁷. And I must mention Dutch work, especially by Jan-Willem Klein and by Erik Kwakkel, which I found helpful⁸.

⁷ P. M. Robinson, *The "Booklet", a Self-Contained Unit in Composite Manuscripts*, in A. Gruys – J. P. Gumbert [ed. by], *Codicologica 3: Essais typologiques*, Leiden 1980 (*Litterae textuales*). Also R. Hanna, *Booklets in Medieval Manuscripts: Further Considerations*, «Studies in Bibliography», 39 (1986), 100-111; B. Munk Olsen, *L'élément codicologique*, in P. Hoffmann [éd. par], *Recherches de codicologie comparée. La composition du codex au Moyen Âge, en Orient et en Occident*, Paris 1998, 105-129 (*Bibliologie*); The study by M. Maniaci, published in this same volume, came to my knowledge only during the conference; there was no time to harmonize the two texts; all I could do is to point out the more important correspondences. Of her article, only the first part concerns the material complexity of the codex; most is concerned with the presence of more than one text in a volume, which is an aspect I deliberately left out of my consideration (for the time being).

⁸ H. Kienhorst, *Middel nederlandse verzamelhandschriften als codicologisch object*, in G. Sonnemans [ed.], *Middeleeuwse Verzamelhandschriften uit de Nederlanden*, Congres Nijmegen 14 oktober 1994, Hilversum 1996 (*Middeleeuwse Studies en Bronnen*, 51), 39-60; E. Kwakkel, *Die Dietsche boeke die ons toebehooren. De kartuizers van Herne en de productie van Middel nederlandse handschriften in de regio Brussel (1350-1400)*, Leuven 2002 (*Miscellanea Neerlandica*, 27) (diss. Leiden); and Id., *Towards a Terminology for the Analysis of Composite Manuscripts*, «Gazette du livre médiéval», 41 (2002), 12-19. About 1994 Jan-Willem Klein drew up a «Voorstel voor een typologie van de codex», which was never published, but which I discussed with him at the time and which I consulted again now, with much profit. Myself I have often mentioned the problem, but never produced a systematic proposal. See: *Codicologie et histoire du droit: un manuscrit de répétitions de Jacques de Révigny*, «Tijdschrift voor Rechts-geschiedenis / Revue d'Histoire du Droit», 57 (1989), 105-108; *L'unité codicologique, ou: à quoi*

What I believe we should have is an analysis of, and a terminology for, the events which may happen in the life of a manuscript and the structures which are the result of these events:

- the boundaries which may be observed in a manuscript,
- the parts which are delimited by these boundaries,
- the units constituted out of these parts.

I have tried to analyse the field in somewhat more detail than has been generally done; but of course I have done this on the basis of my personal experience, which is no guarantee that all relevant phenomena are accounted for. And in order to keep the task within feasible limits, I have restricted myself, for the time being, to the physical makeup and growth of the book – although it is not possible to keep the text quite out of the picture.

2. CODICOLOGICAL UNIT AND BLOCK

Making a manuscript proceeds ‘horizontally’ in the writing order (= the reading order), at least normally; and ‘vertically’ in a number of stages. The first stage is selecting the material and making the *quires* (‘forming’ them, in the medieval word). The quires are the basis, the foundation of the manuscript; one cannot stress too strongly that they are the essential building blocks of the codex. It is true that the quire consists in its turn of double leaves or bifolia (and sometimes of single leaves), but normally those are not the elements one has to reckon with. And if quires are the essential building blocks of a manuscript, then *quire boundaries* are points which merit our special attention.

On this basis of quires the other stages of the work are imposed: first the layout and ruling (which, in a computer image, corresponds to the ‘formatting’); then the writing, which puts the text into the book and definitively fixes the order of the quires, and of the leaves within them; finally, but not necessarily, a further finishing: rubrication, dec-

bon les cahiers?, «Gazette du livre médiéval», 14 (1989), 4-8; *C Catalogue and Codicology – Some Reader's Notes*, in M. Hedlund [ed. by], *A Catalogue and its Users. A Symposium on the Uppsala – C Collection of Medieval Manuscripts*, Uppsala 1995 (*Acta Bibl. R. Universitatis Upsaliensis*, 34), 57-70; *One Book with Many Texts: the Latin Tradition*, in R. Jansen-Sieben – H. van Dijk [edd.], *Codices Miscellaneorum*. Brussels Van Hulthem Colloquium 1999 / Colloque Van Hulthem, Bruxelles 1999, Brussel 1999 (*Archives et Bibliothèques de Belgique / Archieven Bibliotheekwezen in België. Numéro spécial / Extranummer*, 60), 27-36. I gratefully acknowledge helpful suggestions by A. I. Doyle, some of which I incorporated into this text.

oration, illumination. The succession of these stages is virtually fixed (even if it is possible, for instance in Italy in the late Middle Ages, to buy pre-ruled paper and build your own quires out of it). But the relation of the stages with the 'horizontal' extension is less self-evident: it is quite possible to be working on the decoration of the front part of a manuscript while the quires of the end have not yet even been formed.

In many cases it will be possible to consider the making of a manuscript as one single operation: somebody decides to make a book with a certain text or set of texts, or to have it made; then the work is executed, and at a certain moment it is ready⁹. In actual fact this process can take quite a long time (in the case of a famous Dutch lectern bible¹⁰, 15 years); there can be several or even many persons involved in it (but these will work together – whatever form such collaboration may take –, or at least work under one single responsible authority); the work can be done at more than one place (for instance, because the scribe travelled to accompany his patron); but all these circumstances do not break the *unity of production*. The result is a *codicological unit*: a discrete number of quires, worked in a single operation and containing a complete text or set of texts (unless the work has for some reason been broken off in an unfinished state)¹¹.

There are some phenomena which often mark the *natural beginning or end* of a codicological unit. At the beginning it is the beginning of the text, especially if it begins (as is not rare until the twelfth century) on the first verso, leaving the recto blank. At the end there may be space left open after the text end, or the last quire or quires may be of irregular construction, or the script may be compressed or distended to make the text fit.

Within a codicological unit there may be *discontinuities or boundaries*: a switch to another watermark, a new set of quire signatures, a change in ruling technique or in number of lines... Any discontinuity – the most important being the boundaries of hands and of texts –

⁹ Cfr. the definition of an 'unité codicologique' as formulated by Ezio Ornatò, *La face cachée du livre médiéval*, Roma 1997, 629: «le résultat d'une initiative de copie dont l'objet est prédéfini».

¹⁰ Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, 31; see J. P. Gumbert, *The Dutch and Their Books in the Manuscript Age*, London 1990, 89.

¹¹ My 'codicological unit' corresponds approximately with Maniaci's 'unità modulare' (which she explicitly intended to correspond in essence with Munk Olsen's 'entité codicologique', being textually autonomous).

deserves the attention of the codicologist. But most of these boundaries do not break the unity of production: they merely mark *sections* within the codicological unit.

More important are the places where a quire boundary coincides with a boundary in any other aspect (and especially with a text boundary). Those are points where a unit may be split physically, and if there is a text boundary, the parts may have in a fashion a separate existence; and at those points it is even more essential than at simple section boundaries to ask whether there is unity of production, and whether for instance a date valid at one side of the boundary is also valid at the other side. Places where a quire boundary coincides with any other boundary are *caesuras*¹², and the quires between caesuras are a *block*. Since they are bounded by caesuras, blocks, like codicological units, necessarily contain a discrete number of quires (blocks can have more or less the same phenomena at natural beginnings or ends as do units¹³).

A block, however, is different from a codicological unit in not having a complete, independent text or set of texts; and this implies that their order is not arbitrary, being dependent upon the text order. For instance the scribe of the Vienna manuscript of the Second Part of Jacob van Maerlants *Spiegel Historiae*¹⁴ made each of the five books of this part as a separate block. There is no reason at all to doubt the unity of production and of purpose; evidently the blocks were meant from the start to come together as they are now, and in that order: any other order would be illogical. Yet the fact that this codicological unit is not constructed as one unbroken series of quires but is *articulated*, in blocks, should always be kept in view, if only because the block structure may allow the scribe to produce the blocks in a different order. An articulated codicological unit may comprise several volumes.

A text boundary – for instance of a book of Livy, or of one of a set of Hours – may accidentally coincide with a quire boundary; it is a matter of judgement whether one will consider this an irrelevant coincidence or evidence of planned construction in blocks.

¹² Maniaci also mentions caesuras; those which delimit 'unità modulare' she calls 'snodo'.

¹³ My 'block' corresponds approximately with Kwakkel's 'production unit'. It appears to be also more or less the same as Maniaci's 'blocco', although she does not explicitly define this term.

¹⁴ Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 13708, foll. 33-205; see Kwakkel, *Die Dietsche boeke* (cit. n. 8), 97-112, 264-271.

A special case of articulated codicological units are manuscripts copied after divided quires, as was often done especially in the Carolingian period. Here the model is taken apart and divided into segments (by quire boundaries); every monk receives two quires of the model and two blank quires, and is asked to copy the one into the other. The result is a series of blocks, each in a different hand; they may show the typical ending phenomena such as blank spaces, added leaves, compressed or dilated script¹⁵.

Unarticulated codicological units, on the other hand, are one single block; they are *uniform* if there are no section boundaries within them, and *homogeneous* if they are divided into sections but cannot be split (because the section boundaries do not coincide with quire boundaries).

To summarise this first step:

- a *codicological unit* is a discrete number of quires,
worked in a single operation,
containing a complete text or set of texts;
- it is *unarticulated*,
 - either *uniform* if there are no boundaries in it (except quire and possibly text boundaries),
 - or *homogeneous* if it is divided by boundaries (for instance of hands) into *sections*, but it is not *divisible* (because the boundaries do not coincide with quire boundaries);
- but it is *articulated* if it is divided by *caesuras* into *blocks* (which makes it divisible)¹⁶.

This definition of the codicological unit corresponds to Munk Olsen's 'élément codicologique': «the smallest unit which can have existed separately, because the text end coincides with a quire end». He had chosen this definition to make a distinction with the 'codicologi-

¹⁵ This method should not be confused (as still happens often) with the *pecia* method. In the latter, one scribe rents *pecia* after *pecia*, and the result – if all goes well – is a perfectly uniform book, with no boundaries, let alone caesuras in it.

¹⁶ In the case of what I call an 'articulated codicological unit' Maniaci speaks of 'concomitanza'.

cal unit' as it had been defined by Muzerelle, and by myself in earlier publications, and which more or less corresponds to what I have now called a 'block'.

3. VOLUME AND CODICOLOGICAL UNIT

Many of the volumes on our library shelves are single codicological units, whether articulated or not (they are *monomeric*). But many others are not: they are *composite manuscripts* or *composites*, because they contain two or more codicological units (delimited, of course, by caesuras)¹⁷. There is, for instance, a volume in the Leiden BPL collection¹⁸ which contains an eleventh-century booklet with Augustine, *De catechizandis rudibus*, a thirteenth-century Hugues of St Victor, *De institutione novitiorum* and similar texts, another thirteenth-century booklet with classical excerpts, and a fourth one, dated 1351, with Guil. de Boldensele, *Peregrinatio in Terram Sanctam*; the four were bound together by the Benedictines of Saint-Jacques of Liège shortly after 1400, evidently (like other composite volumes of the same provenance) in an action to clean up all the small fry of separate booklets that had been cluttering the top shelves of the library.

Such *independent codicological units* are just put one after another, like carriages of a train. The result is, that each unit has to be judged quite on its own: what is true for one of them (for instance its date or provenance) needs not be true for any of the others. And the order of the units is arbitrary: it has been decided at a given moment, by a Medieval owner or by a twentieth-century librarian, for good reasons or just at random – but in the last resort it is only the binder's thread which determines their arrangement. And this arrangement can be broken at any moment, by persons which may be authorised or not: just as one can shunt the waggons of a train, one can shunt unit A to come after instead of before unit B, or one can put C between them, or on the contrary take C out. And if the arrangement of units is once broken, there

¹⁷ It may be of interest to recall that once upon a time I was having a discussion on 'unités codicologiques' with a colleague, and it took us quite a time to discover that I meant by 'unité' the indivisible parts out of which a larger whole (a composite) was built up, whereas my partner meant the complete whole which was built up out of smaller parts!

¹⁸ It is Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 191 B. For the numerous manuscripts from the Leiden BPL *fonds* here quoted, see the relevant volume of *IIMM* (*Illustrated Inventory of Medieval Manuscripts*) which I hope to publish shortly.

is often nothing to tell us that it once existed. The independent codicological unit is approximately Pamela Robinsons 'booklet'.

But not all composites are composed out of completely disparate codicological units. Many composites were composed by a Medieval owner, and there is a good probability that most of the booklets he owned would be of roughly the same date and origin, simply because – even if Medieval manuscripts are quite durable and quite ready to travel – old and foreign booklets will always have been a minority among those available. In the same Liège cleaning-up action BPL 191 C was bound together out of thirteen paper booklets, all of the fourteenth century, which does not require much planning: thirteenth-century paper booklets, especially of quarto size, are rare.

But beyond this basic similarity one often has the impression, or even the certainty, that two or more units are really *related*, that is that they were made in the same circle at about the same time; perhaps the makers were aware of the others' activities (one might think of monks in a monastery, or laymen in what we call a 'workshop'), and perhaps it was intended from the start that the units should be joined. One might call such codicological units *homogenetic* (in contrast to *allogenetic* units, which one does not judge to come from the same circle and time)¹⁹. They may even be written by the same scribe (perhaps even on the same paper, in the same layout). But even such *monogenetic* units remain separate codicological units, as long as it is necessary to judge them separately (if only to decide *that* they are monogenetic), and as long as it is conceivable that they could be found separate or in a different order.

Manuscripts consisting of two or more related units – they will be called homo- or monogenetic composites – are very common. From the Leiden collection alone one can cite dozens of monogenetic composites almost at random: BPL 127 C, Orosius and Cassiodorus *Historia tripartita*, Southern Netherlands, Orosius dated 1465; BPL 128, Frontinus and Vegetius, France, fifteenth century; BPL 136 K, Statius, *Achilleis* and *Thebais*, Italy, twelfth century... Often one has the impression that a scribe produces, in the course of the years, a number of small units, which are meant to be bound up eventually, but which remain, unbound, in a cupboard until the scribe is satisfied with their

¹⁹ The terms 'homogenetic', 'allogenetic' find an approximate parallel in Maniaci's use of 'accrezione', 'convergenza'.

number; and when that moment comes, it is completely up to him to decide which ones shall go into one volume, and in which order, and perhaps to combine them with other, not homogenetic units; and it is also up to him to change his decision later – for what has been put together, can always be taken apart again. And if the scribe does not change his mind and his book, later owners can – it is not at all certain that the state in which we find a volume is the one intended by the original maker.

We find a different situation in another Leiden manuscript, BPL 43. The first 78 leaves contain the works of Vergil, to *Aeneid* 3, 116, written in the eleventh century, probably in France. The second part, 33 leaves, contains the rest of the *Aeneid*, and dates from the twelfth century. There can hardly be another reason to begin work at *Aeneid* 3, 117 than the desire to join on to 3, 116. Doubtlessly the first part had lost its end, or had remained incomplete, and the second part was made to remedy this situation²⁰. Now the second part is certainly a separate codicological unit: there is no unity of production with the first part; also its place in the whole is not arbitrary but determined by the text. But it does not contain a complete text (it has an *open beginning*), and it was not created independently: it is a *dependent codicological unit*. The other part might then be called the *kernel*, and the combination a *hypotactic composite* (as against the *paratactic composite*, where the parts can be moved at will).

There can exist dependent codicological units which do have a complete text. Early in the fifteenth century the Utrecht Carthusians owned a thirteenth-century booklet with some *Epistles* of Paul with the gloss, incomplete at the end²¹. Half a century later the end was completed (in a dependent codicological unit, of course), but also three different monks wrote three commentaries to other *Epistles* in separate booklets, which had the same shape which actually was felt to be too narrow, especially «so that they could form one volume and be bound together more easily». Here it is the design, not the text that is depen-

²⁰ Note, however, that the scribe of the second part felt no need to follow the layout of the first: instead of a column of 30 lines he crammed 62 lines on pages of the same size.

²¹ Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, 102; see J. P. Gumbert, *Die Utrechter Kartäuser und ihre Bücher im frühen 15. Jahrhundert*, Leiden 1974, 138-139 (Its width/height proportion is 0,64).

dent. But we only know this from a note in the book itself; without it, we would never have guessed that they are dependent units, because our knowledge of Medieval book sizes is too rudimentary.

BPL 92 is an incomplete Priscianus, *Institutio grammatica*, from the twelfth century (this unit consists of two blocks). It is preceded by another codicological unit with the beginning, also from the twelfth century; it is not certain whether this piece was made as a supplement (and therefore is a dependent unit), or merely was used as a supplement because it happened to fit (and so is an independent unit). The third unit is certainly dependent: it was made in the thirteenth century to supply the end of the main part, but only to the end of book 16 (the end of the so-called «Priscianus maior», which is often found apart). The last two books, on syntax («Priscianus minor»), were added later; but they date from the twelfth century, so they are certainly an independent unit.

To summarise this second step:

- A *monomeric* codex is a manuscript which contains a single codicological unit.
- A *composite* is a manuscript which contains two or more codicological units;
 - these can be
 - *independent* (and then they form a *paratactic composite*),
 - or *dependent* if they have been made to fit to a pre-existent *kernel* (and then they form a *hypotactic composite*);
 - these can be
 - *monogenetic* if they have been written by the same scribe,
 - or *homogenetic* if they come from the same circle and time,
 - or *allogenic* otherwise.

Having introduced the terms ‘mono-’ and ‘homogenetic’ for units within a composite, we will be able as well to use them for blocks within a unit (but not, of course, ‘allogenic’, because then there could not be unity of production between them). One might even use terms like ‘homogenetic’ or ‘dependent’ for units which are not actually within one volume but which formerly were, or which might have been (because their nature, especially their size, permits it – because they are, so to say, *compatible*).

4. DEVELOPMENTS OF THE CODICOLOGICAL UNIT

Now we must consider the changes that may affect a unit in the course of time. By losses, additions or replacements a codicological unit ceases to be an *undisturbed unit*.

A codicological unit may become *smaller* through parts of it being removed intentionally or being lost unintentionally. This causes *lacunae*; the remnant, a *defective codicological unit*, might be called a *torso* if it is substantial, and it is a *fragment* if it is small. A fragment, however small it is, is still a codicological unit. But it has lost its characteristic property of containing a complete amount of text.

It is also possible to remove part of a codicological unit (especially if it contains several texts, or a text in many articulations such as a collection of sermons) with the intention of allowing it a separate existence as a *severed unit*, apart from its *trunk*. This often needs surgery, because such a division is normally made in order to split up the series of texts contained in the original codicological unit, and the text boundary often does not coincide with a quire boundary, or even a leaf boundary; so in one of the resulting pieces some text belonging to the other may remain, which has to be deleted there (or otherwise marked as redundant) and to be supplied to the other.

On the other hand a codicological unit may *grow* by additions. In those cases another of the characteristic properties is lost: the unity of production. Sometimes the additions only concern the finishing phase, for instance completion of decoration which had been only partially executed, or the addition of glosses. This adds an extra layer to the structure; the discrete set of quires, however, which formed the basis of the original codicological unit, remains untouched; there is simply more on the same 'footprint', as it is now called. The codicological unit, now with a new top layer, will be called an *enriched*²² *codicological unit*.

The same term can be applied in another situation, where blank spaces have been filled with a *guest text*²³ (this most often happens with blank pages at the end; but margins can also serve: in The Hague there is a thirteenth-century *Epistles* of Paul with the gloss of Petrus Lombardus, where in 1412 someone managed to put the entire commen-

²² A. I. Doyle proposed *enhanced*.

²³ These are generally what Maniaci calls 'microtesti'.

tary of Petrus de Tarentasia into the margins²⁴). The boundary in an enriched unit separates two production processes; but since it is not a quire boundary, it is not a caesura; it is a *suture*.

With an enriched codicological unit it will often be possible to specify if the enrichment is mono- or homogenetic (and not 'simply' allogenic). But in such cases one will often find that it is difficult to pinpoint where precisely the suture between the original unit, result of a single operation, and the enrichment, which is a separate stage, can be found. Then one will speak of *continuous enrichment* (typical examples are the 'rapiarium' of the Modern Devotion, or the 'zibaldone' of the Italian tradition: books where one person, or a group of persons, keeps adding pieces behind or between the existing text(s) during a prolonged period).

Another possibility is the addition of a small number of leaves, for instance text additions on inserted strips, or a set of inserted miniatures. This does change the quire basis of the codicological unit, and especially the inserted miniatures – which may be of a quite different date and origin – can strictly be taken to be separate codicological units; yet, as long as the additions fit easily within the existing quire structure, one will not like to call the result a composite. It shall be an *enlarged unit*; and the added pieces shall be *infixes* (even if sticklers for accuracy might say that sometimes 'prefix' or 'suffix' would be the more correct word). The boundaries, which are neither caesuras nor sutures, shall be called *joins*.

It is also possible to add something at a place where something had been removed. If removal and addition are mono- or homogenetic, they constitute a *replacement*, and one will still speak of an enlarged unit. A good example of a monogenetic replacement is BPL 127 B, which contains Cicero, *De oratore*, written by Sozomenos of Pistoia early in the fifteenth century²⁵. A few years later an old manuscript containing a different, longer text was found; Sozomenos managed to see a copy of that and 'updated' his own copy, by replacing at a num-

²⁴ The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, 71 A 22; see *Schatten van de Koninklijke Bibliotheek, Tentoonstelling...*, 's-Gravenhage 1980, nr. 21.

²⁵ See J. P. Gumbert, *Cicerones Leidenses*, in C. A. Chavannes-Mazel – M. M. Smith [ed. by], *Medieval Manuscripts of the Latin Classics: Production and Use*, Los Altos-London 1996, 208-244: 229.

ber of places leaves with the old text by a slightly greater number of leaves with the new text – a job which entailed an amount of surgery.

But if the addition is much later than the removal (and, therefore, allogenetic), it is generally a case of *repair*. And if the additions have a reasonable bulk, say at least a quire, one will allow them the status of a dependent unit (and the result that of a hypotactic composite). An example of this is BPL 52, a Servius, written in Corbie around 800²⁵. Subsequently some quires of that book were lost; around 860 the lacunae were filled by writing new quires, which of course at their beginning fit neatly with the still extant parts, and at their end have the typical problems of making a good join with the old parts. But if the addition is merely a small piece, fitting effortlessly in the existing quire structure, one will rather call it an infix in an enlarged unit. An example is BPL 14 D, a Parisian Bible of the thirteenth century, which at some moment lost two leaves; later – maybe not until the eighteenth century – three leaves from a similar fourteenth-century Bible, which happened to fit the textual lacuna approximately, were inserted at that place.

A final important way of making an existing codicological unit substantially bigger: a scribe can begin to write a longish text on a blank piece at the end of a unit (like a guest text), and then continue his work on new quires, which he adds to the existing unit. One is tempted to call the new text a separate codicological unit; but it does not correspond to the definition: it does not comprise a discrete number of quires, and it is not separated from the old text by a caesura – because it begins *within* the old quires –, but by a suture. If the composite can be likened to a train, where the carriages are simply put one behind the other and can be given any desired order, here, in the *extended codicological unit*, the image is more like a trailer: the new piece rests in part upon the old base. It is characteristic of such an *accretion* that the scribe, on the moment he puts the first letter on the page, fixes the attachment and the order of the two for good – one can never again separate them (unless one resorts to surgery)²⁷.

Accretions can be, like other additions, allo-, homo- or monogenetic; and in the latter cases they can be continuous. Continuous monogenetic accretion is seen in the manuscript of the chronicle of Emo, abbot of the

²⁶ See the facsimile edition *Servii Grammatici in Vergilii Carmina Commentarii*, intr. G. I. Liefinck, Amsterdam 1960.

²⁷ My 'extended codicological unit' corresponds to Kwakkel's 'extended production unit'.

Premonstratensian abbey of Bloemhof in Frisia (†1237): of the first part a fair copy was written, under the direction of Emo himself, by one Menko; after a break of a number of years Menko, now himself abbot, continues the work, first writing the rest of Emo's draft, then a laudatio of Emo, and then his own chronicle, which he continues intermittently²⁸. Another autograph chronicle, that of Willelmus, procurator of the Benedictine abbey of Egmond (†1335), is similar: it began as a chronicle up to 1322, which was made into an enlarged unit by additions on margins, on small added leaves, and on more extensive insertions, some of which required surgery; then – although no precise point can be indicated – it grew gradually in a voluminous accretion up to 1332²⁹. Allogenic accretion is seen in BPL 3072, in which an Italian Franciscan had copied a number of texts in 1494 and left them unfinished (presumably because he died: he had been active as a scribe already thirty years earlier); a very different hand finished the last text.

To summarise this third step:

a codicological unit can

- remain *undisturbed*;
- or become smaller by loss: *defective unit* or *fragment*,
by removal of a *severed unit* (remains: a *trunk*);
- or grow by addition of a new layer: *enriched unit*,
by addition of a *guest text*: *enriched unit*,
by addition of an *infix*: *enlarged unit*,
by addition of an *accretion*: *extended unit*.

It is time to update our definition of a codicological unit:

- a *codicological unit* is
- a discrete number of quires,
 - worked in a single operation
– unless it is an *enriched*, *enlarged* or *extended* unit,
 - containing a complete text or set of texts
– unless it is an unfinished, *defective* or *dependent* unit.

²⁸ Groningen, Universiteitsbibliotheek, 116; see *Kroniek van het klooster Bloemhof te Witteveen*, intr. H. P. H. Jansen – A. Janse, Hilversum 1991 (*Middeleeuwse Studies en Bronnen*, 20).

²⁹ Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, cod. hist. 17; see Willem Procurator, *Kroniek*, ed. and transl. M. Gumbert-Hepp, Hilversum 2001 (*Middeleeuwse Studies en Bronnen*, 76).

5. DEVELOPMENT OF THE VOLUME

Apart from the question how a codicological unit was built up, and perhaps subsequently was enriched, enlarged or extended, one must also ask how it existed as a book. Has a codicological unit, which now stands alone, always been alone? Have several units, which now form a composite, been together for a long time, and always in the same combination? There should be a name for the combinations in which codicological units have actually been used, or at least been available for use. I would propose the name *file* for a number of codicological units (this number can also be 1) of which it can be seen that at some moment they constituted a combination available for use (the restriction «of which it can be seen» is necessary: often units will have been together without our being aware of the fact). The present situation will in any case also be a file³⁰.

There are some phenomena which mark the ends of files (which by definition are caesuras). Ownership marks, shelfmarks and similar notes are normally placed at the ends of a book as it is in a collection at that moment. Also the ends are most exposed to unintended and undesired influences, either of users (who put scribbles and irrelevant remarks there) or of rodents, dirt and abrasion. If such traces are found within a present-day file, they show that at an earlier moment the build-up of the files was different and that the units at either side of the *file boundary* existed separately. This can be illustrated with the composite BPL 102, which comprises four units. The first (Guil. de Conchis, *Liber philosophiae*, early twelfth century) ends with a dirty, dogeared leaf full of scribbles and drawings – a patent file boundary. The second (Jocundus, *Vita Servatii*) and the third (various poems, with a *Passio S. Christinae* added slightly later – so, an enlarged unit) were a file together. The fourth (Palladius, *De re rustica*, ninth century) has the so-called library mark of Egmond Abbey at the beginning, and a piece of music and some financial notes at the end. The present-day file was formed in 1465; it unites four codicological units, but three old files³¹.

³⁰ My 'file' corresponds to Kwakkel's 'usage unit'. For the various files seen in a present-day volume he uses the term 'usage phase', for which I have not provided a parallel. Maniaci calls it an 'assemblaggio'. A. I. Doyle proposed *string* instead of 'file'.

³¹ It is, therefore, an error of P. C. Boeren, *Jocundus, biographe de saint Servais*, The Hague 1972, 120, to say that «the MS. BPL 102 (...) was acquired under Abbot Walter (1129-1161)»; that is true of the first and last unit (both, incidentally, gifts from one

That a dependent unit will have formed a file with the kernel it depends on, seems logical. Otherwise it is often difficult to see whether two units ever formed a file, even if they are mono- or homogenetic. It can be seen if there is a *bridging enrichment*, for instance a common foliation, a layer of glosses; some of these – for instance the introduction of a guest text in blank spaces of two or more units – have the effect of welding the units together intimately into a *welded file*, so that they can never again be separated without breaking the guest text.

6. CONCLUSION

Now we need a test. When I gave a lecture on this subject in 1999³², I discussed some manuscripts from what I called «the wide zone between the homogeneous and the composite book», precisely to show that the existing terminology was not able to handle them. We ought to be able to do better now.

My first example was the codex we know as «the manuscript of the Egmond Annals»³³. Around 1100 it was a *composite* comprising four codicological units. The first, written in Egmond itself, contains mainly Einhard's Life of Charlemagne. On the blank pages at the end another Egmond scribe of the early twelfth century added another text, a saint's life, which he continued on added leaves, so this became a *homogenetically extended unit*. The second and third contain the so-called Cartularium of Radbod and the chronicle of Regino of Prüm; they are by the same hand, *monogenetic*, but not homogenetic with the rest (we do not know from where they are – perhaps Utrecht). The fourth unit, the Xanten Annals, is from Egmond again; another scribe added the description of a vision, and when that was longer than the available space he did not add new leaves but used some space left free in the third unit, thus creating a *welded file*. And the four units in this constellation also formed a file.

Some twenty years later a man we know as 'Hand C' took the fourth unit as a starting point for the compilation we call the Egmond

Deddo, priest at Rijswijk), but not of the second + third (the enlargement of the latter was written in the house before Walter's time).

³² Gumbert, *One Book* (cit. n. 8), 31–33.

³³ London, British Library, Cotton Tib. C.xi; see J. P. Gumbert, *Een en ander over het handschrift van de Egmondse Annalen*, in G. N. M. Vis et al. [ed. by], *Heiligenlevens, Annalen en Kronieken*, Hilversum 1990 (*Egmondse Studiën*, 1), 55–69.

Annals. He added text at the beginning, on added leaves – which made the welded file of III + IV into an *enlarged file* –, then in the last bit of free space in unit III; and he added text at the end – which made the enlarged file III + IV into an *extended file*. That was continued fifty years later by ‘Hand F’, who probably removed a final leaf, and certainly added a *dependent unit* (there are later continuations, but they survive only as fragments and permit no codicological description).

My second example was the hagiographical compilation in three volumes, composed by Zweder van Boecholt, Carthusian of Utrecht, from about 1421 to 1426³⁴. At first approach the book looks homogeneous; but thanks to some descriptions of the set in various stages, indices, and technical details its history can be rather precisely unraveled in six stages.

1. Zweder wrote a collection of saint’s lives [S]; that is a *codicological unit*. Then he wrote another set of hagiographical material [K] and immediately continued it with a copy of the summer volume of a *Pasionale*, which he had borrowed from the Cathedral chapter; he started with the month of May, and reached the middle of July [V-VII]. That is what eventually became the first *block* of the principal unit.

2. Zweder handed back the summer volume (presumably because the chapter itself needed it), borrowed the winter volume and wrote two blocks [X-XII, I-IV].

3. He separated the small piece [K] from [V-VII]; [K] now became a *severed unit*. This required some surgery, the end of [K] not being a quire boundary. Now he made the first unit [S], the severed unit [K] and the block [I-IV] into a *file* (the other parts that had already been written, [V-VII] and [X-XII], remained in his cupboard).

4. On second thoughts he took out [K] again; now [S] and [I-IV] were a file, and were bound together (as they still are).

5. Zweder again borrowed the summer volume, and finished his job: [VII-X]. But he did not start on a fresh quire, but on a piece that had remained free at the end of [V-VII]; and so [V-X] became

³⁴ Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, 391, see Gumbert, *Utrechter Kartäuser* (cit. n. 21), 80-90.

an *extended block*. That was bound; the available file now comprised two volumes.

6. The block [XI-XII] and the severed unit [K] were still in the cupboard. Not until 1426 did Zweder finish a Life of St Bernard (a separate codicological unit, [B]), and those three pieces were then bound together into Volume Three.

This example shows a scribe (who is at the same time an editor) wrestling with his material and only gradually coming to see how he wants to organise it. It also shows blocks being written in an order which is not their natural and final order. But if in 1999 I ended my discussion with the despairing remark: «It is anybody's guess what such a book should be called», I can now say: it is a *monogenetic composite*, comprising three *unarticulated units* (one being originally a *severed unit*) and one unit *articulated* in three *blocks* (one being an *extended block*). – I take that to be progress.

Practice will have to show how well this terminology does in reality. And reality is always more complicated and surprising than the best theory can predict.

To quote a final case: the Irish Priscian in Leiden, BPL 67, written in France³⁵. It is a composite; the first file consists of two monogenetic units (both by a scribe Dubthach), a thin one with Priscian's *Periegesis*, dated 838, and a fat one with the Grammar, articulated in two blocks, Priscianus 'maior' and 'minor' (and to this file yet another unit was added around 1100). Now towards the end of the second block of the main unit (Priscianus minor) there are some leaves by another Irish hand; and the way the main part joins on to these leaves makes it clear that they are not a later infix (which would make the whole an enlarged unit), but that they already existed when the main scribe came to this section, and that he simply incorporated a pre-existing object into his work. The leaves must be a fragment of an older book, which was put to a good use; and they are undoubtedly a codicological unit in their own right. But what about the unit they are embedded in? Must we create a term for this situation? It is better to make a note that this case does not fit our typology.

³⁵ See J. P. Gumbert, *The Irish Priscian in Leiden*, «Quaerendo», 27 (1997), 280-299.

Some final remarks. In the first place: fragments which are used for their material value and not for their text, such as binding fragments or palimpsest leaves, are to be considered units *in* the volume they are found in, but not *of* that volume.

Secondly: it can in many cases be stated unambiguously whether something is one quire or not. But whether two things are by the same hand, or from the same circle, or from a later stage, is often a matter of judgment. That does not matter, so long as one remains conscious of the fact, and so long as the material facts, which are at the basis of the judgment, remain accessible in the description. But this subjectivity is one of the reasons why it is better to distinguish more hands, blocks, units etc., rather than less. There is a tendency to take things together unless they are patently quite different; I think one should rather distinguish everything that can be distinguished; it is better to conclude, afterwards, that two things one thought different are actually one thing, than to have to concede that one thing is actually two.

A third point: analysis of manuscripts according to these principles – the stratigraphy of a codex – is necessary; numerous monographs show how fruitful this approach is, and how fatal its neglect³⁶. But who shall make these analyses? In the last resort, of course, those who really study the manuscript in depth. But most of those are focused on the text: they are philologists, historians, theologians...; they are (generally) not trained in a codicological view of manuscripts, and often not even aware that it exists. So the task rests on the maker of the catalogue: he (or she) sees the manuscript, he is accustomed to handle manuscripts, he does have a codicological view – or at least he ought to have it; he should be able to see what can be seen about the manuscript, and to explain it (that does not merely mean that he should enumerate the quires and the texts: a good reader of catalogues can find very interesting suggestions in a list of quires, but most readers have not the faintest idea that anything interesting can be found in a quire formula, and

³⁶ Some recent Dutch work: J. A. A. M. Biemans, *Het Gronings-Zutphense Maerlant-handschrift. Over de noodzaak der handschriftenkunde*, «Queeste», 3 (1996), 197-219; E. Huizenga, *Een nuttelike practijke van cirurgien, Geneeskunde en astrologie in het Middel-nederlandse handschrift Wenen, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek*, 2818, Hilversum 1997 (*Middeleeuwse Studies en Bronnen*, 54) (diss. Groningen); J. W. Klein, *De handschriften: beschrijving en reconstructie*, in B. Besamusca – A. Postma [uitg. d.], *Lancelot. De Middel-nederlandse vertaling van de Lancelot en prose overgeleverd in de Lancelotcompilatie*, I, Hilversum 1997 (*Middel-nederlandse Lancelotromans*, 4), 51-110.

even if they had they would not be able to find it; the author of the formula, who – one hopes – understands it, must say explicitly what is in it). So explaining the makeup of a manuscript, especially insofar as it consists of blocks, units and so, is an important task of the manuscript cataloguer, which he must not leave to the user of the catalogue, however learned that user may be in his own field. But the rules for the making of catalogues, such as they are in force now in various countries, simply refuse to see this...³⁷ It will be a long time before the codicological unit has taken its rightful place in manuscript studies³⁸.

³⁷ The *Richtlinien* of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft are more than laconic on «Zusammengesetzte Handschriften und Sammelhandschriften». The *Guida a una descrizione uniforme dei manoscritti e al loro censimento* of the Istituto Centrale per il Catalogo Unico (by V. Jemolo and M. Morelli, Roma 1990) has better proposals: «Uno dei primi problemi ... è quello di individuare se [il manoscritto] sia omogeneo o composito», going on with sensible remarks but not enough detail. The rules both for the series *I manoscritti medievali della Toscana* and for the new series *Manoscritti datati d'Italia* have, at the end of their list of things to describe, after binding, bibliography and plates, an extra paragraph «Nel caso di manoscritto composito...». It is only quite recently, in the «Règles de catalogue» for the *Catalogus codicum graecorum Helveticorum* (by P. Andrist, actual version 2003), that the stratigraphy of the codices is put in the first place.

³⁸ A Dutch version of this text, under the title *Codicologische eenheden – opzet voor een terminologie*, is being published by the Kon. Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Mededelingen Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks 67.2.

TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

* marks terms which themselves are defined in this list

codicological unit

a discrete number of quires, worked in a single operation (unless it is an *enriched, *enlarged or *extended codicological unit), containing a complete text or set of texts (unless it is an unfinished, defective or *dependent unit).

boundary

a place where there is a change in any feature of the manuscript (for instance watermark, layout, hand, decoration, text), except quire boundaries.

caesura

a *boundary which coincides with a quire boundary (this includes the ends of a codicological unit).

section

a part of a *codicological unit delimited by *boundaries.

block

a part of a *codicological unit delimited by *caesuras.

articulated

of a *codicological unit: which has *caesuras within it (and so is divided into *blocks). – Opp.: unarticulated.

homogeneous

of a *codicological unit: which has *boundaries (but no *caesuras) within it (and so is divided into *sections).

uniform

of a *codicological unit: which has no *boundaries within it.

monomeric

of a *file: which consists of a single *codicological unit.

composite

a *file which consists of two or more *codicological units.

allogenic

of *codicological units, *enrichments, *infixes, *accretions: which were not produced in the same circle and time; of *files: which consist of allogenic *codicological units.

homogenetic

of *codicological units, *enrichments, *infixes, *accretions: which were produced in the same circle and (approximately) the same time; of *files or *codicological units: which consist of homogenetic *codicological units or *blocks.

monogenetic

of *codicological units, *enrichments, *infixes, *accretions: which were produced by the same scribe; of *files or *codicological units: which consist of monogenetic *codicological units or *blocks.

dependent

of a *codicological unit: which was produced in order to be joined to a pre-existing *codicological unit. – Opp.: independent.

kernel

the *codicological unit to which a *dependent codicological unit is (or was meant to be) joined.

paratactic

of a *composite: which contains only *independent codicological units.

hypotactic

of a *composite: which contains (at least) one *dependent codicological unit.

undisturbed

of a *codicological unit or *block: which still is, in extent and content, as it was when first produced.

severed

of a *codicological unit: the smaller of the parts into which a *codicological unit has been divided.

trunk

of a *codicological unit: the larger of the parts into which a *codicological unit has been divided.

enriched

of a *codicological unit, *block or *file: to which matter has been added without changing the quire structure.

enrichment

the matter added to a *codicological unit, *block or *file without changing the quire structure.

guest text

a text which has been added, as an *enrichment, into an existing *codicological unit.

suture

a *boundary between the original text and a *guest text or an *accretion.

continuous

of an *enrichment or an *accretion: which is not separated from the original matter by a precise *boundary.

enlarged

of a *codicological unit: to which matter has been added by the addition of a limited number of leaves, which, however, do not fundamentally change the quire structure.

infix

the matter which has been added to a *codicological unit so as to form an *enlarged codicological unit.

join

the *boundary, in an *enlarged codicological unit, between the *infix and the original matter.

extended

of a *codicological unit: to which a substantial amount of matter – at least one quire – has been added.

accretion

the matter which has been added to a *codicological unit so as to form an *extended codicological unit.

file

a number of *codicological units (or a single codicological unit), of which it can be seen that at some moment they constituted a combination available for use.

file boundary

the *caesura at the end of a *file.

bridging enrichment

an *enrichment added to several *codicological units of a *file at the same time.