



UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI



<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Helda

---

## Contextualizing the Publication of Dudo of Saint-Quentin's Historia Normannorum

Leinonen, Lauri

2023

---

Leinonen, L 2023, Contextualizing the Publication of Dudo of Saint-Quentin's Historia Normannorum. in The Art of Publication from the Ninth to the Sixteenth Century. Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia, no. 93, Brepols, Turnhout, pp. 47-82. <https://doi.org/10.1484/M.IPM-EB.5.133081>

---

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/578800>

10.1484/M.IPM-EB.5.133081

---

cc\_by\_nc

publishedVersion

---

*Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.*

*This is an electronic reprint of the original article.*

*This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.*

*Please cite the original version.*

THE ART OF PUBLICATION FROM  
THE NINTH TO THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

INSTRUMENTA PATRISTICA ET MEDIAEVALIA

Research on the Inheritance of Early and Medieval Christianity

THE ART OF PUBLICATION  
FROM THE NINTH  
TO THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

Edited by

Samu NISKANEN

with the assistance of

Valentina ROVERE

BREPOLS

2023

# INSTRUMENTA PATRISTICA ET MEDIAEVALIA

Research on the Inheritance of Early and Medieval Christianity

---

Founded by Dom Eligius Dekkers († 1998)

Gert PARTOENS Alexander ANDRÉE Rita BEYERS Emanuela COLOMBI  
Georges DECLERCQ Jeroen DEPLOIGE Paul-Augustin DEPROOST  
Greti DINKOVA-BRUUN Anthony DUPONT Jacques ELFASSI Guy GULDENTOPS  
Hugh HOUGHTON Mat hijs LAMBERIGTS Johan LEEMANS Paul MATTEI  
Marco PETOLETTI Dominique POIREL Kees SCHEPERS Paul TOMBEUR  
Toon VAN HAL Marc VAN UYTFANGHE Wim VERBAAL

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 716538 (MedPub, Medieval Publishing from c.1000 to 1500) and from the Academy of Finland under grant agreement No 324246 (APEME, Authorial Publishing in Early Medieval Europe from c.400 to 1000).

D/2023/0095/39  
ISBN 978-2-503-60296-7  
E-ISBN 978-2-503-60297-4  
DOI 10.1484/M.IPM-EB.5.131849  
ISSN 1379-9878  
E-ISSN 2294-8457

© 2023, Brepols Publishers n. v./s.a., Turnhout, Belgium.

This is an open access publication made available under a CC BY-NC 4.0 International License: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, for commercial purposes, without the prior permission of the publisher, or as expressly permitted by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics rights organization.

Printed in the EU on acid-free paper.

## Table of Contents

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Preface . . . . .   | 7   |
| Abbreviations . . . . .   | 9   |
| Samu NISKANEN, Introduction . . . . .   | 11  |
| Jesse KESKIAHO, Publications and Confidential Exchanges.<br>Carolingian Treatises on the Soul . . . . .   | 23  |
| Lauri LEINONEN, Contextualizing the Publication of Dudo of<br>Saint-Quentin's <i>Historia Normannorum</i> . . . . .   | 47  |
| Tuomas HEIKKILÄ, Publishing a Saint. The Textual Tradi-<br>tion of the Life and Miracles of St Symeon of Trier . . . . .  | 83  |
| James WILLOUGHBY, The Chronicle of Ralph of Coggeshall.<br>Publication and Censorship in Angevin England . . . . .  | 131 |
| Jakub KUJAWIŃSKI, Nicholas Trevet OP (c. 1258–after 1334)<br>as Publishing Friar. Part I. Commentaries on the Authors<br>of Classical and Christian Antiquity . . . . . | 167 |
| Luca AZZETTA, Errors in Archetypes and Publication.<br>Observations on the Tradition of Dante's Works . . . . .   | 269 |
| Marco PETOLETTI, The Art of Publishing One's Own Work.<br>Petrarch's <i>De vita solitaria</i> . . . . .   | 293 |
| Valentina ROVERE, To Publish <i>Post Mortem</i> . Boccaccio's<br>Latin Works and Martino da Signa. . . . .  | 311 |
| Outi MERISALO, Publishing in Laurentian Florence. Jacopo<br>di Poggio Bracciolini's Edition of Poggio's <i>Historiae<br/>Florentini populi</i> . . . . .                | 331 |
| Giovanna MURANO, History Rewritten. Francesco Guicciardini's<br><i>Storia d'Italia</i> and Fiammetta Frescobaldi . . . . .  | 347 |
| Jaakko TAIHKOKALLIO, Theories, Categories, Configurations.<br>A Historian's Point of View on the Study of Publishing<br>in Manuscript . . . . .                         | 371 |
| Abstracts . . . . .   | 383 |
| Contributors . . . . .  | 391 |

|                             |     |
|-----------------------------|-----|
| Manuscripts Cited . . . . . | 397 |
| General Index . . . . .     | 405 |

## Preface

Nearly all the chapters in this volume began as papers presented at the 2020 colloquium, *Authorial Publishing from the Carolingian Period to the Renaissance*. The two exceptions are the contributions of Jakub Kujawiński and James Willoughby, which were subsequently solicited. The colloquium, which was held remotely due to restrictions on travel during the Covid-19 pandemic, was held on 29–30 October 2020 under the auspices of the University of Helsinki and two research projects, *Medieval Publishing from c.1000 to 1500* and *Authorial Publishing in Early Medieval Europe*, funded by the European Research Council and the Academy of Finland respectively.

Dr Valentina Rovere has established the indices and assisted me in various ways in the process of editing the papers. Dr James Willoughby revised the essays for English and, in doing so, made observations on details of subject matter, for which several authors expressed their gratitude. I am very grateful to them both.

I was inducted into the territory of medieval authorial publication by Professor Richard Sharpe, who supervised my postdoctoral research at Oxford. He was planning a monograph on the subject, to be titled *Editio*. His untimely death in March 2020 robbed us of that, as it did the keynote he would have read at the colloquium, which should have joined the other essays here. Richard was a brilliant scholar, *doctissimus et acutissimus*, and this volume is dedicated to his memory.

Samu NISKANEN

## Contextualizing the Publication of Dudo of Saint-Quentin's *Historia Normannorum*

Lauri LEINONEN  
(Helsinki)

This paper asks how Dudo of Saint-Quentin published his *Historia Normannorum* (hereafter *HN*) and to what effect.<sup>1</sup> Identifying his pertinent social network, I seek to assess contributions not only by Dudo but also other parties involved in the process. The subtext of the following inquiry is the interplay between *HN*, the setting of its publication, and Dudo's intended audiences. The principal evidence consists of *HN*'s paratexts, particularly the explanatory rubrics that accompany many of the verses embedded in the text.

<sup>1</sup> Previously the work was usually known by the editorial title *De moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum*, given to it by André Duchesne for the *editio princeps*, in *Historiae Normannorum scriptores antiqui, res ab illis per Galliam, Angliam, Apuliam, Capuae principatum, Siciliam, et Orientem gestas explicantes, ab anno Christi DCCCXXXVIII ad annum MCCXX*, Paris, 1619, pp. 49–160. Jules Lair preserved that title in his edition, *De moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum*, Caen, 1865 (Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie, 23) [henceforth *HN*, ed. LAIR]. The title by Duchesne derives from a passage in which Duke Richard I commissions the work; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 119. Even so, the title, not known from sources before Duchesne's edition, is hardly authorial. The most common medieval titles appear to have been “Gesta Normannorum” and “Historia Normannorum”; see, for example, “Incipit Historia Normannorum”, BL, Cotton Nero D. VIII, fol. 72<sup>r</sup> (s. xii), and “Hec sunt Gesta Normannorum”, Bern, Burgerbibliothek, Bongars Cod. 390, fol. 103<sup>r</sup> (in an eleventh-century hand). In recent scholarship, and here, the work is called *Historia Normannorum*; B. POHL, *Dudo of St Quentin's Historia Normannorum: Tradition, Innovation and Memory. Writing History in the Middle Ages*, York, 2015, p. 38; E. CHRISTIANSEN, *Dudo of St Quentin: History of the Normans. Translation with Introduction and Notes*, Woodbridge, 1998, p. xiii.

Dudo of Saint-Quentin was a Frank from the county of Vermandois.<sup>2</sup> In his youth he received a fine literary education. At some point he was made a canon of the collegiate church at Saint-Quentin. In 987 he was sent on a diplomatic mission to Normandy, during which he obtained preferment in Rouen. He was, in other words, one of the many foreign *literati* whom the Normans recruited in the eleventh century. This trend was connected to local efforts to reform the practices and administration of the church and ducal government that has since been dubbed a “renaissance” by some scholars.<sup>3</sup> Dudo served in the court of the Norman dukes in administrative roles from the early 990s. At some point he was promoted to the office of a ducal *cancellarius*, which represented the pinnacle of his secular career.<sup>4</sup> Dudo was rewarded for his administrative and literary work with benefices, which Duke Richard II later donated, at his request, to the collegiate church of Saint-Quentin in 1015, most likely in preparation for Dudo’s return there.<sup>5</sup> Some time

<sup>2</sup> The most comprehensive recent work on *HN*, including an extensive biography of its author, is POHL, *Dudo of St Quentin’s Historia Normannorum*. The most recent translation, accompanied by scholarly notes, is CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*. The most recent critical edition is Jules Lair’s from 1865 (*HN*, ed. LAIR). See also the *codex optimus* transcript, with translation, by F. LIFSHITZ, *Dudo of St. Quentin (c. 965–died before 1043): Gesta Normannorum, written betw. 996–1015* [Translation], originally published as part of the ORB website in 1998 and republished as part of the Internet Medieval Sourcebook in 2019. Accessed January 30, 2020: <<https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/source/dudu-stquentin-gesta-trans-lifshitz.asp>>, transcript: <<https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/source/dudu-stquentin-gesta-transcription-lifshitz.asp>>. Lifshitz’s work is based on one manuscript, SBB-PK, Phill. 1854, and offers a very valuable control to Lair and Christiansen.

<sup>3</sup> POHL, *Dudo of St Quentin’s Historia Normannorum*, pp. 161–62; J. M. ZIOLKOWSKI, *Jezebel: A Norman Latin Poem of the Early Eleventh Century*, New York, NY, 1989, p. 39.

<sup>4</sup> Dudo apparently attested a ducal confirmation of a gift of lands to Saint-Quentin on 8 September 1015; BnF, Collection de Picardie, 352, no. 1, printed in *Gallia Christiana*, 11, Appendix, n. 2, cols 284–85. While the attestation reads “Odo cancellarius scripsit et subscripsit”, the name has been taken as Dudo’s: D. DOUGLAS, “The ancestors of William Fitz Osbern”, *The English Historical Review*, 59 (1944), pp. 62–79, at 73–74; and M. FAUROUX, “Deux autographes de Dudon de Saint-Quentin (1011, 1015)”, *Bibliothèque de l’école des chartes*, 111 (1953), pp. 229–34, at 230.

<sup>5</sup> The 1015 charter records the donations of two benefices Dudo had received from Duke Richard I to the church of Saint-Quentin; for the charter,

thereafter, Dudo, already at an advanced age, was elected dean of Saint-Quentin's.<sup>6</sup> He published *HN* shortly after his relocation to Vermandois.<sup>7</sup> He died in 1027 at the latest.<sup>8</sup>

The *Historia Normannorum*, Dudo's only known work, was written between c. 996 and 1015 × 1020.<sup>9</sup> Until recently there was a

see the previous footnote. The document provides a *terminus post quem*, as Dudo was still chancellor at the time. He is also styled as "pretiosi martyris Christi Quintini canonicus" and "fidelis idoneus" of Richard II, suggesting that he was still in the duke's service and not yet a deacon; cf. F. LIFSCHITZ, *Dudo of St. Quentin*, Introduction. M. H. GELTING, "The courtly viking: education and mores in Dudo of Saint-Quentin's Chronicle", in *Beretning fra toog-tredieite tvaefaglige vikingesymposium*, ed. by L. BISGAARD, M. BRUUS, P. GAMMELTOFT, Højbjerg, 2013, pp. 7–36, at 9, n. 8.

<sup>6</sup> Dudo styled himself deacon in the prefatory letter: "Dudo, super congregationem Sancti Quintini decanus"; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 115.

<sup>7</sup> The first possible publication date of c. 1015 is based on the approximate year Dudo became dean of Saint-Quentin (see above, nn. 4 and 5); see POHL, *Dudo of St. Quentin's Historia Normannorum*, pp. 106–08). It cannot be known whether Dudo published *HN* immediately after becoming dean. It has been noted that of the persons mentioned in the prefaces, only Count Rolf is presumed to have died before 1020, for which reason c. 1020 has been taken as a *terminus ad quem*; CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, pp. xii–xiii; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 125. So, a safe dating for the publication would be 1015 × 1020.

<sup>8</sup> A dean of Saint-Quentin by the name of Vivian is known to have occupied the stall in February 1015, and another dean, Rothard, is known either from 1021 or 1027. No records have survived of the deans of the collegiate church from the time in between; POHL, *Dudo of St. Quentin's Historia Normannorum*, p. 111. CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, p. xii.

<sup>9</sup> The first terminus, c. 996, derives from Dudo's remark that he had hardly started writing the work when Richard I died: "Stylus nostrae imperitiae nedum primas partes operis attigerat"; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 119. Dudo dated this event to 996; *ibid.*, p. 299. In two manuscripts the year is, however, given as 1002; *ibid.*, p. 299, n. 3, cf. LIFSCHITZ, *Dudo of St. Quentin*, Introduction. Dudo refers to a two-year period before Richard I's death as a time when he frequently visited the duke, and the commission happened "quadam die" during these two years; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 119. The commission could, then, have been given already in 994, as proposed, for example, by G. C. HUISMAN, "Notes on the manuscript tradition of Dudo of St. Quentin's *Gesta Normannorum*", *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 6 (1984), pp. 122–35, at 122; and N. WEBBER, *The Evolution of Norman Identity, 911–1154*, Woodbridge, 2005, p. 13. The impression from Dudo's words is that he did not start writing immediately and could dedicate more time to the project only after Richard I's death; therefore, c. 996 seems more appropriate than c. 994–96 or c. 994–c. 1002 for the starting date. For the year of completion, see n. 7 above.

consensus that *HN* was published in two authorial recensions, an earlier “prose redaction” and a later “verse redaction” complemented by a dedicatory letter and poems.<sup>10</sup> However, Benjamin Pohl has persuasively argued that the manuscripts carrying the “prose redaction” must ultimately descend from exemplars which did include the poems as well. The surviving evidence suggests that the redaction with the poems and the dedicatory letter, datable to 1015 × 1020, is the first and only version published by our author. The copies without the poems result from scribal activity at various stages of transmission.<sup>11</sup>

*HN* was a commission, an aspect of crucial importance if one wishes to understand the work in its context. A providential history, it furnished the new *gens* of the Normans with an heroic past, an etiological myth of equal worth to that of their Frankish neighbours.<sup>12</sup> *HN* recounts the arrival in Normandy of the Northmen in the early tenth century and their subsequent rise to dominion there, with special emphasis on the process of Christianization. The work concludes with the death of Duke Richard I in 996.<sup>13</sup> *HN* was the first comprehensive history of the Northmen’s

<sup>10</sup> HUISMAN, “Notes”, p. 135. Huisman dated the two redactions to c. 996 and c. 1015 respectively.

<sup>11</sup> POHL, *Dudo of St Quentin’s Historia Normannorum*, pp. 84–108, 136–42. Cf. L. SHOPKOW, *History and Community: Norman Historical Writing in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, Washington, DC, 1997, p. 184, n. 29.

<sup>12</sup> WEBBER, *Evolution of Norman Identity*, pp. 18–52. R. H. C. DAVIS, *The Normans and their Myth*, London, 1976, pp. 51–57. Dudo extended the genealogy of the Normans back to Troy through the mythical forefather Antenor: “Igitur Daci nuncupantur a suis Danai, vel Dani, glorianturque se ex Antenore progenitos; qui, quondam Trojae finibus depopulatis, mediis elapsus Achivis, Illyricos fines penetravit cum suis”; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 130. Tracing a nation’s lineage to Troy was commonplace, already done in Frankish contexts with reference to the same Antenor. Recourse to Antenor, then, was to demonstrate that the Normans and the Franks shared in the same cultural heritage and were equals. For Dudo’s employment of the concept *translatio imperii*, see POHL, *Dudo of St Quentin’s Historia Normannorum*, pp. 124–36, 197–223. For structural resonances with Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica*, see L. SHOPKOW, “The Carolingian world of Dudo of Saint-Quentin”, *Journal of Medieval History*, 15 (1989), pp. 19–37, at 29.

<sup>13</sup> Dudo styles Richard I as “dux Northmannorum”, e.g. *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 267. He uses the title of duke as well for Rollo and William I Longsword: “vade nunc ad Robertum ducem”, “gloriosissimus dux praepotensque comes Willelmus”; *ibid.*, pp. 172 and 179 respectively. It is unlikely that the Norman

settlement in what became Normandy.<sup>14</sup> It made an impact, at least in the long run. It served as a key source for later Anglo-Norman historians, such as William of Jumièges and William of Malmesbury. *HN* survives today in fourteen manuscripts. Their chronological distribution suggests a moderate but sustained interest from the eleventh to the thirteenth century.<sup>15</sup> Neither autographs nor primary copies survive. The oldest extant manuscripts, Bern, Bürgerbibliothek, Bongars Cod. 390 and Rouen, BM, 1173/Y11, date roughly from 1050–1075.<sup>16</sup>

*HN* is prosimetric, that is, prose is interspersed by verse: the work includes ninety-one poems.<sup>17</sup> The testimony they offer as to

rulers were officially dukes before the time of Richard II. Dudo may well have used the word “dux” as a general term for a military leader. While I follow Dudo’s practice of using the terms “duke” and “ducal court”, since they adequately describe the position and powers of Richard II’s predecessors, I acknowledge that as a technical term “duke” is inaccurate before his time. Cf. WEBBER, *The Evolution of Norman Identity*, pp. 29–30.

<sup>14</sup> POILL, *Dudo of St Quentin’s Historia Normannorum*, pp. 34–35. Dudo’s sources are a much debated topic. The present consensus is that he utilized written works, such as Flodoard of Reims’ *Annals*, and relied on oral tradition. Dudo credits Count Rolf of Ivry as his main source in poem 5, as demonstrated by its rubric “Versus ad Comitem Rodulfum, hujus operis relatores”; *HN*, ed. LAIR, pp. 125–26. On Count Rolf, see further below, n. 37.

<sup>15</sup> POILL, *Dudo of St Quentin’s Historia Normannorum*, pp. 18–33, Appendices 1 and 2.

<sup>16</sup> Bern, Bongars Cod. 390 was copied in Normandy, c. 1050–1075, and Rouen, BM, 1173/Y11 in Jumièges, Normandy, c. 1050–1075; POILL, *Dudo of St Quentin’s Historia Normannorum*, p. 263, Appendix 1.

<sup>17</sup> The total number of poems is in some respects open to discussion. Lair does not number the poems in his edition, and there is some disagreement about which poems are individual pieces. For instance, while Christiansen numbered eighty-nine poems in his translation, Pohl suggests that Christiansen’s poem li is composed of two discrete items since a rubric “Hic loquitur ad librum” follows line 16 in three manuscripts: CCCC 276 (fol. 95<sup>r</sup>), BL, Royal 13 B. xiv (fol. 42<sup>r</sup>), and Antwerp, Museum Plantin-Moretus/Prentenkabinet, 17.2 (fol. 43<sup>v</sup>); POILL, *Dudo of St Quentin’s Historia Normannorum*, p. 268. Another case is Christiansen’s poem xiii, interrupted by the rubric “Oratio eleaico carmine decursa” after line 74 in the above-mentioned three manuscripts (fols 64<sup>v</sup>, 8<sup>r</sup> and 11<sup>v</sup> respectively); see CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, pp. 23–25, and *HN*, ed. LAIR, pp. 138–40. The total would then be ninety-one; POILL, *Dudo of St Quentin’s Historia Normannorum*, p. 68, n. 69 arrives at the same figure. I have included Christiansen’s numbering in Table 1 for reference.

whom Dudo intended his piece to be received — the subject of the third section of this essay — are central to my main argument. The work is divided into four books, each attending to the life and times of a different Norman leader. As a result, *HN* reads as a serial biography of “Hasting” (*Alstignus*), Rollo, William I Longsword, and Richard I.<sup>18</sup> The books grow in length as the text progresses. The crux of the whole work stands out clearly: the fourth book on Richard I is longer than the three preceding ones put together.<sup>19</sup> The fourth book is also characterized by a higher literary ambition. It carries a large proportion of the poems, fifty-two out of ninety-one, as itemized in Table 3. Their metrical variation is likewise wider; in Book IV the reader encounters the bewildering variety of thirty-three different metres whereas in the preceding three books there are only eight. Table 4 summarizes the distribution of metres.<sup>20</sup>

*HN* boasts a wealth of paratextual elements. Each book is preceded by prefatory texts, both in verse and prose, and each book ends with an epilogue. The first book — and thus the whole work — goes with ten prefatory texts, the second book with two, the

<sup>18</sup> Serial biographies had roots in antique and subsequent Christian literature, such as Suetonius’ *De vita Caesarum*, the *De viris illustribus* tradition and episcopal *gesta* as well as Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica*; СИРОКОВ, “The Carolingian world”, pp. 27–29. The leaders personified *Normannitas* and their whole new *gens*; WEBBER, *The Evolution of Norman Identity*, p. 33.

<sup>19</sup> The first three books and the prefatory matter together amount to roughly nine tenths of the length of Book IV; CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, p. xiii. The prefatory matter of the fourth book, comprising fifteen poems and a prose preface — more than the prefatory matter of all the previous books put together — likewise accentuates the pre-eminence of Book IV and its protagonist, Richard I; *HN*, ed. LAIR, pp. 210–18. Dudo himself draws a distinction between the last book and the preceding ones in poem 54: previously he has written only about the deeds of the Danes, but now a “daunting mass rises before him”, more important than the previous ones; “Dacorum olim, themata vili,/Ardua currenti mihi gesta/Consurgit moles modo torva”; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 215, translation CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, p. 91.

<sup>20</sup> These figures are based on Christiansen’s division of poetic metres; CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, pp. 236–37, with the corrections noted above in n. 17.

third with three, and the fourth with sixteen.<sup>21</sup> Several poems within the text carry passages of paratextual nature, such as direct addresses to readers or dedicatory verses to patrons. The poems and paratexts are of significance here as they provide insights into Dudo's authorial process, ending with publication. It is on their evidence that this essay seeks to contextualize publishing in a social framework. The obvious starting point for this inquiry is the dedicatory letter preceding the work. Identifying one dedicatee and three commissioners by name, the letter furnishes the fundamental parameters for this essay.

### The Dedication and Commissions

The addressee of Dudo's dedicatory letter is Bishop Adalbero of Laon.<sup>22</sup> Adalbero was one of the greatest sources of ecclesiastical power in the Frankish kingdom and close to King Robert II. He was a famously learned man and a poet.<sup>23</sup> The cathedral school was especially famous during his incumbency. The choice of Adalbero as the dedicatee seems likely to have been connected to Dudo's relocation to Saint-Quentin, although his exact motives are not clear. Several previous attempts to account for Dudo's choice

<sup>21</sup> The prefaces to the first book are, in the order of appearance, the dedicatory letter, verse "Allocutio ad librum", poem to Richard II, verse "Trepidatio et dissuasio", poem to Archbishop Robert of Rouen, poem to Count Rolf, three more poems to Archbishop Robert of Rouen, and a prayer; *HN*, ed. LAIR, pp. 120–28. These pieces act as a preface to the whole work. The other books have prefatory materials of varying length and number, which concern the book in question and its protagonist rather than the whole work. The second book, on Rollo, has a verse preface and a prayer; *ibid.*, pp. 138–40. The third book, on William, has a verse preface, a prefatory prayer, and a prose preface; *ibid.*, pp. 176–79. The fourth book, on Richard I, is prefaced by eleven poems on the Muses and their praises to Richard I, a verse preface addressed to Archbishop Robert, a verse preface on Richard I, a prayer, another verse preface to Archbishop Robert, and a prose preface; *ibid.*, pp. 210–18.

<sup>22</sup> "Inclyto et pie venerando, quem genus ornat, sapientia decorat, Adalberoni episcopo sanctae Dei Laudunensis ecclesiae cathedra residenti, sibi commissarum ovium ducamen ante divinae majestatis conspectum, Dudo, super congregationem Sancti Quintini decanus"; *ibid.*, p. 115.

<sup>23</sup> One poem by Adalbero has been preserved, the *Carmen ad Rolbertum regem*, a satirical piece dedicated to king Robert II written c. 1026 when the king was still in his adolescence; *PL*, 141, cols 771–86.

of dedicatee have been made.<sup>24</sup> One approach has been to situate the dedication in a larger framework, to explain it from the perspective of major fluctuations in political and cultural currents. For instance, it has been proposed that *HN* was used as a tool for political rapprochement between the Franks and the Normans — either a recognition of an alliance between the parties or an attempt to establish one.<sup>25</sup> However, there is no evidence to connect *HN* to any specific political *entente*. The fact that the work was published only after Dudo had left Normandy likewise undermines arguments to the same effect. Alternatively, it has been suggested that the dedication to Adalbero stemmed from Dudo's anti-Cluniac sentiments. Yet, Adalbero became widely known as a champion of the anti-Cluniac cause only after Dudo had dedicated *HN* to him.<sup>26</sup> The dedicatory letter and *HN* do not betray any hint of sentiments that could be held as somehow anti-Cluniac. If there were immediate political motivations at play in *HN* in addition to the evident efforts to validate the Normans as a *gens*, they are not obvious to modern readers. Attempts have also been made to explain the dedication in the framework of a personal connection between Adalbero and Dudo.<sup>27</sup> No evidence of such a relationship

<sup>24</sup> CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, pp. xxvii–xxix provides an overview of four most common interpretations. According to him “none of these four explanations [...] is wholly satisfactory”.

<sup>25</sup> ШНОРКОВ, “Carolingian world”, p. 33.

<sup>26</sup> As per Volpelius-Holzenorff, according to CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, pp. xi–xii, xxviii. Volpelius-Holzenorff's dissertation is unpublished, and I have not had the opportunity of consulting it.

<sup>27</sup> A close relationship between Adalbero and Dudo has been argued for on the basis of an earlier, false supposition that a prose redaction of *HN* was written in the 990s. The same scholar has also proposed that an early copy of Flodoard's *Annals* was made by Dudo himself in Laon, the main evidence for which is a copy possibly having the title *Gesta Normannorum*. This is a distant possibility at best. It cannot be known who was responsible for the copy of *Annals* and where this was made; and the said title may have been a later addition. S. LECOUTEUX, “Une reconstitution hypothétique du cheminement des Annales de Flodoard, depuis Reims jusqu'à Fécamp”, *Tabularia*, Guillaume de Volpiano: Fécamp et l'histoire normande, published online 15 January 2004 (accessed 19 April 2019): <<http://journals.openedition.org/tabularia/1923>>, DOI: 10.4000/tabularia.1923, pp. 7–10, 32–36. ШНОРКОВ, “The Carolingian world”, pp. 22–27, puts forth Liège as the probable place of Dudo's earlier education on the grounds of her stylistical analysis of *HN* and

prior to *HN* exists, however.<sup>28</sup> Nor was Adalbero Dudo's direct superior. The deans of Saint-Quentin were directly subject to the counts of Vermandois, and Saint-Quentin belonged to the diocese of Noyon.<sup>29</sup> The primary reason for Dudo's having dedicated his work to Adalbero could hardly have been political or on the basis of a personal friendship. A fourth approach to account for the dedication is that Dudo was seeking to benefit from his new position as dean of Saint-Quentin and gain literary recognition outside Normandy.<sup>30</sup> Subscribing to that argument, this essay considers the dedicatory letter in terms of what such letters tended to be: a tool for publication.

To appreciate the dedication to Adalbero in context, the roles of all parties involved in publication and the target audiences must

its allusions and quotations. Her reasoning is plausible and, at the very least, shows that Dudo is unlikely to have received his education with Adalbero at Reims under Gerbert of Aurillac.

<sup>28</sup> Dudo recounts having only heard of Adalbero's fame and refers to his desire to visit him: "Quocirca, memorande Pater, postquam inclyta fama ex tuis miris actibus expressa aures meas irrupit, animis meis indesinenter stimulos ad te divertendi ministravit"; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 118. Therefore, Dudo could hardly have had an active or very deep relationship with Adalbero, even though some form of prior acquaintanceship is possible. The dedicatory letter does not convey references to any existant personal relationship.

<sup>29</sup> The collegiate church of Saint-Quentin was established in the tenth century when the counts of Vermandois, especially Albert I († 987) replaced the monks of the former monastery with secular canons. The counts retained the titular abbacy and appointed a dean to preside over the canons. The deans acted directly under the counts' direction and reported to them, not to the bishops of Noyon or the archbishops of Reims; POILL, *Dudo of St Quentin's Historia Normannorum*, pp. 110–11; CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, p. xxvii; C. C. BRINKMANN, "Dudos Dedikationen: Formen und Funktionen der Widmung in der *Historia Normannorum* des Dudo von St. Quentin", in *Literarische Widmungen im Mittelalter und in der Renaissance: Konzepte – Praktiken – Hintergründe*, ed. by C.-F. BIERITZ, C. C. BRINKMANN, T. HAYE, Stuttgart, 2019 (Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters, Band 21), pp. 75–100, at 95.

<sup>30</sup> CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, pp. xxvii–xxviii; SHORP, *History and Community*, pp. 187–88. POILL, *Dudo of St Quentin's Historia Normannorum*, pp. 107–08, regards the reasons for the dedication to be two-fold: Adalbero was a famous literary figure, and Dudo earnestly sought "peer-review" and proof-reading from him. BRINKMANN, "Dudos Dedikationen", pp. 96, 100, considers Adalbero the central figure in the publication and thinks that *HN* was aimed primarily at the Capetian court.

be identified. Dudo's initial incentive to write is presented in the dedicatory letter. The project began as a commission from Duke Richard I (932–996), in whose court Dudo was employed in an administrative role. By Dudo's own account, Richard requested that he write about the deeds and habits of the Normans and the laws the duke had established in the lands conquered by Rollo, his ancestor.<sup>31</sup> Duke Richard did not live to see the work's completion; he died soon after the commission.<sup>32</sup> His son and successor, Richard II (996–1026) and his half-brother, Count Rolf of Ivry († after 1015/17) encouraged, or ordered, Dudo to continue writing the text, which he had merely started by that time.<sup>33</sup> By ensuring that the commission still stood, Richard II and Rolf of Ivry essentially recommissioned Dudo. Dudo belittled his own volition

<sup>31</sup> “Certum te reddere volo, ut non rearis me huic operi haesisse voluntarie, nec illud spontanea voluntate coepisse. Ante biennium mortis ejus ut more frequentativo fui apud eximium ducem Richardum, Willelmi marchionis filium, volens ei reddere meae servitutis officium, propter innumera beneficia quae absque meo merito mihi dignatus erat impartiri. Qui quadam die adgrediens coepit brachiis piissimi amoris me amplecti, suisque dulcissimis sermonibus trahere, atque precibus jocundis mulcere, quia etiam detestari et jurare in charitate, ut, si qua possem ratione, animis suis diu desideratis moderer: scilicet ut mores actusque telluris Normannicae, quid etiam proavi sui Rollonis quae posuit in regno jura describerem”; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 119. Dudo also refers later to the commission by Richard, in a poem to Archbishop Robert in which he urges the archbishop to look upon his composition, which “Richard the famous in this fleeting world, and/Claimant by right of the country eternal,/Made me write, albeit with brevity” (“Ricardi celebris orbi labanti,/Aeterna patria, jure potentis,/Quanquam sat breviter scribere fecit”); *ibid.*, p. 126, translation CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, p. 12.

<sup>32</sup> “Stylus nostrae imperitiae nedum primas partes operis attigerat, heu pro dolor! quum lacrumabilis fama Ricardum, toto orbe principem, obiisse nuntiavit”; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 119.

<sup>33</sup> “Omnia haec in dolore hujus principis postposuissem, propter nimium fletum intolerabilemque planctum, qui non solum cor meum, verum etiam totius corporis membra quassans torquebat, nisi per praecellentissimum filium ejus, patricium Ricardum, adhuc superstitem, et praecipuum comitem Rodulfum res eadem repraesentaretur. Instistunt ambo praecibus, ut quod memorabilis vitae dux Ricardus precando praeceperat exsequer; et ne propositum, quod illi sponderam, in bilinguitatis vitium versum, videretur ullo mendacii inquinamento pollui, sed pollere totius modullis intellectus intimis, contestantur. Acquiescens ergo praeceptis precibusque eorum, opus exsecutus sum quod, licet dialecticis syllogismis, nec rhetoricis argumentis non gloriatur”; *ibid.*, pp. 119–20.

to write according to the common medieval *topos* of authorial modesty.<sup>34</sup> The way he communicated the terms of his commission, namely that it had been renewed, also has parallels in earlier literature.<sup>35</sup> Yet, there is no reason to think that compliance with cliché would have been the sole reason for Dudo to invoke the circumstances of his commission.<sup>36</sup> The affair was more than a literary gesture. As a dynastic history, *HN* served the interests of the Norman court at large. Support by the court was also practical and influenced Dudo's work; Count Rolf's oral accounts were among his main sources.<sup>37</sup>

<sup>34</sup> This model in which the author laments his unworthiness to write and does so only by command of a superior was prevalent in Latin prefaces throughout the Middle Ages. It derived from classical authors and was common in saints' lives of the Antonian model. T. JANSON, "Latin prose prefaces, studies in literary conventions", *Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis, Studia Latina Stockholmiensia*, 13 (1964), pp. 116–40; B. COLGRAVE, *Two Lives of Saint Cuthbert: A Life by an Anonymous Monk of Lindisfarne and Bede's Prose Life*, Cambridge, 1985, p. 310.

<sup>35</sup> One parallel is Heiric of Auxerre's prologue, which likewise presents a setting of commission and recommission after the first commissioner had passed away; MGH, *Poetae*, 3, pp. 428–32; CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, p. xxiii.

<sup>36</sup> BRINKMANN, "Dudos Dedikationen", p. 84.

<sup>37</sup> Count Rolf is styled the "narrator" or even one type of "author" of the work in the rubric and the text of the verse eulogy: "Versus ad comitem Rodulfum, hujus operis relatorem", "Cujus quae constant libro hoc conscripta relatu./Digessi attonitus, tremulus, hebes, anxius, anceps"; *HN*, ed. LAIR, pp. 125 and 126 respectively. The rubric could also refer to the recommissioning of the work, as noted by CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, p. 180, n. 49. However, the text seems to prove Rolf was one of Dudo's main sources; this reading of the evidence seems to be the more usual one. William of Jumièges also attributes to Count Rolf the role of eyewitness and main source: "Principium namque narrationis usque ad Ricardum secundum a Dudonis, periti uiri, hystoria collegi, qui quod posteris propagandum karte commendauit a Rodulfo comite, primi Ricardi fratre, diligenter exquisuit"; *The Gesta Normannorum Ducum of William of Jumièges, Orderic Vitalis, and Robert of Torigni*, ed. E. M. C. VAN HOUTS, 2 vols, Oxford, 1992–1995, vol. 1, p. 4. What is more, Dudo was the scribe of the charter documenting Rolf's 1101 donation to St Ouen; DOUGLAS, "The ancestors of William Fitz Osbern", pp. 69–73. Rolf also acted as a mediator when Dudo transferred his benefices to the church of Saint-Quentin in 1015; *Gallia Christiana*, 11, Appendix, n. 2, cols 284–85.

The dedicatory letter thus records that the Norman lords commissioned *HN* and that Dudo, somewhat surprisingly perhaps, chose to dedicate it to Bishop Adalbero of Laon. However, if the testimonies of *HN*'s other paratexts are accounted for, a more varied picture emerges. As mentioned above, each of the four books is prefaced by one or more dedicatory poems and some poems within the text proper have a dedicatory function. In these, another son of Duke Richard I rises to the fore, namely, Robert II the Dane (989–1037), archbishop of Rouen and count of Évreux. Archbishop Robert was an important man at Rouen and in Normandy. A member of the ducal family, he was a powerful lay magnate; as archbishop of Rouen, he was at the apex of ecclesiastical power in the duchy. Robert was a great benefactor to his cathedral.<sup>38</sup> His contribution to the advancement of education was considerable.<sup>39</sup> While not mentioning Robert in the dedicatory letter, Dudo addressed seven lengthy eulogies to him, more than to any other person apart from the four protagonists.<sup>40</sup> When we consider the way the poems to Robert are arranged within *HN*, his centrality becomes even more evident. Robert was the addressee of four poems prefacing Book I (and, as such, the

<sup>38</sup> ZIOLKOWSKI, *Jezebel*, p. 40; B. S. BACHRACH, "Writing history for a Latin audience c. 1000: Dudo of Saint Quentin at the Norman court", *Haskins Society Journal*, 20 (2008), pp. 58–77, at 66. In the history of the archbishops of Rouen, written in the time of Archbishop John II (1067–1079), Robert was depicted as a great benefactor of the church, although his wordly style of living was lamented; he was married with sons. He was strongly contrasted with his predecessor, Hugh, as a way of highlighting the financial developments and ecclesiastical reforms achieved under Robert; Rouen, BM, Y 27, pp. 32–33 (later pagination); printed in *PL*, 147, col. 277. The tone is repeated in the verse catalogue of the archbishops following the prose history: "Successit hugo legis domini uiolator,/Clara stirpe satus. sed christi lumine cassus./Insignis presul claris natalibus ortus, Rotbertus felix deuoto fine quieuit"; Rouen, Y 27, p. 39.

<sup>39</sup> The first decades of the eleventh century saw an advancement of education in Normandy, a program which modern scholarship credits to Archbishop Robert; ZIOLKOWSKI, *Jezebel*, pp. 37–47; C. J. McDONOUGH, "Warner of Rouen, Moriut: a Norman Latin poem from the early eleventh century", *Studies and Texts*, 121 (1995), p. 9; CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, p. xi; BACHRACH, "Writing history", pp. 65–66.

<sup>40</sup> The number depends on how individual poems are counted, for which see n. 17 above.

whole work).<sup>41</sup> He is also the only dedicatee of poems prefatory to Book IV, which was, as has been mentioned, the most hefty and important.<sup>42</sup> In addition, Robert features, again alone, in a poem towards the conclusion of Book IV's main narrative. The poem is situated immediately before the end of the account of Richard I's life; only Richard's death and a few pious acts follow the poem.<sup>43</sup> Excluding the four protagonists, *HN* praises no other living person as prominently as Robert. For instance, Richard II and Count Rolf, the declared commissioners, are addressed only in one poem each.<sup>44</sup>

The passages on Robert betray how Dudo perceived him in relation to his work. Robert is referred to as the author's patron.<sup>45</sup> He was requested to correct the work, thereby emphasizing his contribution to the authorial process and, by implication, his learning.<sup>46</sup> However, such requests were a literary convention and should not be taken as evidencing that the addressee would have complied. Dudo also requested that Adalbero amend the work.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>41</sup> Prefatory material of Book I: dedicatory letter, *Allocutio ad librum*, verse to Duke Richard II, *Trepidatio et dissuasio*, verse to Archbishop Robert, verse to Count Rolf, verse to Archbishop Robert, verse to Archbishop Robert, verse to Archbishop Robert, prayer; *HN*, ed. LAIR, pp. 120–28.

<sup>42</sup> Prefatory material of Book IV: Exhortations by the Muses (eleven poems), preface to Archbishop Robert, verse preface, prayer, preface to Archbishop Robert, prose preface; *ibid.*, pp. 210–18.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 292.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 122, 125–26.

<sup>45</sup> “O venerande, pie, recolende, verende patrone,/Praesul Rotberte, o recolende pie”; *ibid.*, p. 125.

<sup>46</sup> “Quod restat siquidem, quodque instat, conditor almus,/Respice propitius, quaeso, favens precibus./Praesentes operas miserans compone, precamur,/Et sensus cumules, oraque fructifices”; *ibid.*, p. 217, lines 79–82. Christiansen notes that Archbishop Robert is not directly named in the poem, and the lines could alternatively be read as directed to God; CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, p. 209, n. 315. Yet, the poem carries the rubric “Praefatio ad presulem Rotbertum” with slight variation in all the six manuscripts that have the poems: CCCC 276, fol. 95<sup>v</sup>; Royal 13 B. XIV, fol. 42<sup>v</sup> (“Praefacio ad presulem”); Antwerp, 17.2, fol. 44<sup>r</sup>; Rouen, 1173/Y11, fol. 30<sup>r</sup>; SBB-PK, Phill. 1854, fol. 48<sup>v</sup>; and Cotton Nero D. VIII, fol. 104<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>47</sup> “ut quae in hoc codice suis tenebris obscura videntur, per te ad lucem referantur”; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 118; “ut omnis scrupulositas injustae ambiguitatis tuis acutissimis bipennibus, ex purissimo calibe totius sapientiae confectis, funditus atque radicitus amputetur. Pene dimidia pars hujus operis

It should be mentioned that Robert was a patron of other writers, even if only one is known by name: Warner of Rouen dedicated his two known satires to Robert.<sup>48</sup> Although not mentioned in the dedicatory letter, Archbishop Robert was among Dudo's most significant patrons.<sup>49</sup> Indeed, Robert features so prominently in *HN* that if the work did not include the dedicatory letter, he could certainly be taken to have been its primary dedicatee. The frequent addresses to Robert imply that he had been Dudo's principal literary patron in the course of composition. Adalbero of Laon, in contrast, makes no appearance in *HN* other than in the dedicatory letter.

minime videtur respicere ad negotium utilitatis, nisi, te messore, sarriatur carduis superfluitatis"; *ibid.*, p. 119. See BRINKMANN, "Dudos Dedikationen", p. 83.

<sup>48</sup> Warner was a grammarian, a poet, Dudo's contemporary, and the author of at least two satirical poems written for the Norman elite. Warner dedicated his first satire, known as *Moriuhl* after its protagonist, to Archbishop Robert and Duchess Gunnor: "Rotberto domino subnixo presulis ostro,/Et matri domine illius eximiae, Vuarnierius dubia non spe confisus utrisque/Nunc et post obitum uiuere per Dominum"; BnF, lat. 8121A, fol. 2r; ed. McDONOUGH, "Moriuhl", p. 72. His second satire, often referred to as "Poem to the Monk of Saint-Michel", was dedicated to Archbishop Robert: "Rotberto doctis fulgenti semper alumnis,/Warnerius famulus quicquid amat dominus"; L. MUSSET, "Le satiriste Garnier de Rouen et son milieu", *Revue du Moyen Âge Latin: Études, Textes, Chronique, Bibliographie*, 10/4 (1954), pp. 237–66, at 259, lines 1–2. Both of Warner's works were written c. 996–1026, roughly contemporarily with *HN*; *ibid.*, pp. 243–44. Other Norman poets contemporary with Dudo and Warner are elusive figures. Warner's *Moriuhl* is an invective against this Irish grammarian, resident in Rouen, and quotes a line from a poem supposedly written by Moriuhl. Furthermore, the two poems *Jezebel* and *Semiramis* were probably Norman products of about the same time; see, respectively, ZIOLKOWSKI, *Jezebel*, and P. DRONKE, *Poetic Individuality in the Middle Ages. New Departures in Poetry 1000–1150*, pp. 66–113. Both *Jezebel* and *Semiramis* are in style and substance connected with the literary circle in Rouen to which Robert's patronage was crucial. They survive in a single manuscript. As the book also carries Warner's satires, some scholars attribute them to him, while others consider them anonymous productions from the same circle; e.g. ZIOLKOWSKI, *Jezebel*, p. 37; DRONKE, *Poetic Individuality*, pp. 80–84. Furthermore, two grammarians, Hugh and Albert, are known from Rouen. Dudo mentions lively competition and vituperation among poets in Normandy (which manifested also in *Moriuhl*); *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 120, lines 13–16.

<sup>49</sup> BRINKMANN "Dudos Dedikationen", pp. 97–98 also notes Robert's centrality, although with some reservations.

### Remembrance and Target Audiences

A recurring theme in the poems to Archbishop Robert is the exhortation to remember. In the beginning of the first poem to him, Dudo uses a repetitive mantra: "Remember, O remember his memorable concerns/How worthily he lived: now, remember O!"<sup>50</sup> It is of interest that most of these passages in *HN* are directed to Archbishop Robert.<sup>51</sup> Robert is also referred to directly as a reader in several addresses. "Look upon this composition of mine!/With holy hand, touch what I bring you, beseeching,/— Things unattempted by masters of grammar:/And search for and read of the deeds of the past", Dudo beseeches Robert. "Accept what I have revealed/In the form of a treatise prosaic/[...] and,/As you read [...]/Ponder them long, and whatever/Good things you find there, remember." "Imitate now these/Deeds of your father/Faithfully published/Clearly illumined/Memorable deeds/As *you will find them/Here in this volume* [emphasis mine]."<sup>52</sup> It is obvious that Dudo envisaged the archbishop reading his work. These exhortations should be understood as something more than merely a suggestion about preserving a personal memory of the deeds recounted. The import of Dudo's words is in fact an insistence that Norman history is remembered *as it is written in HN*. The exhortations are not the words of a man begging for attention or readership; rather, they bespeak his confidence in the importance of his

<sup>50</sup> "Suspice gesta tui proavi, praesul recolende./Et locupletis avi suscipe gesta tui./Quin etiam meritis patris super aethera non,/Participis Christo quin etiam meritis,/Illius atque bonis animum depasce benignis,/Instrue te exercens illius atque bonis./Mirificos recolens actus sermones retracta./Affatusque suos mirificos recolens./Et memora, memora causas ejus memorandas,/Digne quae gessit nunc memora, memora"; *HN*, ed. LAIR, pp. 123–24, translation CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, pp. 9–10.

<sup>51</sup> Six poems (4, 6, 7, 8, 51 and 88) addressed to Archbishop Robert refer to Duke Richard I, exhorting the archbishop to remember his father; *HN*, ed. LAIR, pp. 123–25, 126–27, 127–28, 214 and 292 respectively.

<sup>52</sup> "Quae digesta meo, suscipe, sensu./Sacra tange manu quae fero supplex,/Intemptata sc̄is grammaticae artis:/Ac rimare legens quaeque peracta.", "Ingenio reserata meo/Thematis ordina prosaici/[...]/Gesta legens, replicando diu./Quae bona repperies memora.", "Tunc imitare/Hos patris actus,/Numine claro,/Satque retracta/Quos memoralis/Inveniesque./Quamvis inepto/Codice in isto"; *HN*, ed. LAIR, pp. 126, 126–27 and 128 respectively, translations CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, pp. 12, 13 and 14 respectively.

work to Robert. Dudo considered Robert the primary receiver and keeper of memory within the Norman elite. He exhorts the archbishop to ensure that memories of the Norman past will be kept alive. *HN* was to be the prime instrument of that project. That role as guardian of the past explains in part why Robert was so central to publication efforts. It was probably also a factor that in his capacity as archbishop of Rouen, Robert would have had the means to stimulate dissemination.<sup>53</sup>

The concept of remembrance found application elsewhere in *HN*. An address to Duke Richard II, which concludes a poem dedicated to him, exhorts him to remember.<sup>54</sup> In contrast to the exhortations to Robert, this one has a less commanding tone. The address to Richard shows that Dudo also envisaged lay magnates as recipients of his work. Most men of that class were illiterate or only partly literate. In such a case, reception could have taken place through the mediation of oral recitation, either in Latin or a vernacular rendition.<sup>55</sup>

Dudo obviously considered poetry to be the optimal means of ensuring that memory was transmitted through the generations. He lamented, no doubt with rhetorical exaggeration, that he could not write the whole thing in verse; “expressed in this [verse heroic], ‘men’s valiant deeds’ [would] live on”.<sup>56</sup> He also connected verse to remembering elsewhere, as in the poem *Apostropha ad Urbem*,

<sup>53</sup> BRINKMANN, “Dudos dedikationen”, p. 98.

<sup>54</sup> “Quae cernis memora libro modeste;/Hic despase tuum cor, atque pectus,/Innecti ut valeas quibus recensis”; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 122.

<sup>55</sup> ШИОРКОВ, *History and Community*, pp. 184–87; ШИОРКОВ, “The Carolingian world”, p. 31. Pohl has pointed out that several manuscripts bear *positurae*, punctuation apparently meant to ease recitation and rhyme bracing. He argues that the *positurae*, together with illumination in some copies, prove the “multimedia” nature of *HN*, that its message was transmitted through aural and visual mediums, in addition to translations, to the non-Latinate Norman courtly audience. B. POHL, “Poetry, punctuation and performance: Was there an aural context for Dudo of Saint-Quentin’s *Historia Normannorum*?”, in *Tabularia. Autour de Serlon de Bayeux: la poésie normande aux XIe–XIIe siècles* (2016), published online 28 September 2016 (accessed January 30, 2020): <<http://journals.openedition.org/tabularia/2781>>, DOI: 10.4000/tabularia.2781, p. 194.

<sup>56</sup> “Rusticus inscitiae quamquam nostrae stylus ornet/Diversi variis heneris metris opus istud,/Praevacuum nimis, indignumque opis, artis inopsque,/Rhetoricque favi redolentis nectari exsors,/Heroico potius metro pol-

directed to the city of Rouen: “But as in days past I was not of your sojourners,/I cannot rightly recount what he endeavoured to do./If only you had possessed some warbling poets/By whom the good he pursued would have been matter for study!/The teachers are to blame, that you lack rhetoricians;/Educate now in the arts boys unacquainted with metre/That what the great father’s posterity achieves/They may know how to contrive into verse polymetric.”<sup>57</sup> Dudo attributed a dearth of evidence for the Norman past to the fact that there had not been poets to compose verses about it. It was his mission to make sure that the same thing would not happen again.

### **A School-Book for Teaching Poetry and Grammar**

The poems in *HN* betray yet another intended audience, the schools. Manifesting Dudo’s passion for versification, the poems are a central component in *HN*’s design. A great many metres, thirty-three in total, are employed, some rare and obscure.<sup>58</sup> The variety is such that it certainly reflects the writer’s appreciation of the needs of his target audiences.<sup>59</sup> The poems are itemized in Table 1; their number per book and the variety of metres are summarized in Tables 3 and 4. I will refer to the poems by their numbering in Table 1.

lere deceret;/Hoc lucubrata vigent quia fortia facta virorum”; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 280, translation CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, p. 154.

<sup>57</sup> “Sed, quod colonus non fui quondam tuus,/Nescio digerere quae studuit facere./Utinam poetas possideres garrulos,/Quis bona quae studuit elucubrata forent./Quod vatibus culpa est, cares rhetoribus./Instrue nunc pueros artibus innumeros,/Successio quidquid peraget magni patris,/Carmina multicano elucubrare sciant”; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 273, translation CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, p. 147.

<sup>58</sup> For a full list, see CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, pp. 236–37, Appendix. This has some minor errors, of which his footnotes are free: as for Dactylic hexameters, xlv should read liv, and lxxxvii should read lxxxiv and lxxxviii; as for Phaelecian Hendecasyllabic pentameter, lxiv should read lxv. Note that Christiansen’s terminology sometimes differs from those in the rubrics.

<sup>59</sup> Poetry was the most important mode of literature aimed at members of the Norman court. Examples include Warner’s two satires, *Jezebel*, *Semiramis*, and the anonymous *Encomium Emmae Reginae*. POILL, “Poetry, punctuation and performance”, pp. 192–93.

In those six extant *HN* manuscripts that convey its poems,<sup>60</sup> as many as fifty-one poems are accompanied by explanatory rubrics.<sup>61</sup> These identify the metre of the poem in question.<sup>62</sup> Explanations for well-known metres are usually brief.<sup>63</sup> More exotic metres are introduced in detail so that the poetic feet are identified and their order is given.<sup>64</sup> The explanatory rubrics help the reader conceive of the syllabic structure and the prosody and rhythm for

<sup>60</sup> SBB-PK, Phill. 1854; Rouen, 1173/Y11; CCCC 276; Royal 13 B. xiv; Antwerp, 17.2; and Cotton Nero D. viii; for descriptions, see POHL, *Dudo of St Quentin's Historia Normannorum*, pp. 18–33.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 264–67, Appendix 3, lists forty-nine explanatory rubrics. In addition to those, there are two more rubrics found in manuscripts: “ΜΩΝΟΚΩΛΩ ΜΩΝΩΚΤΡΟΦΩ ΔΕΚΥΡΣΑ [/ΔΥΚΥΡΣΑ]” precedes poem 1 in CCCC 276, fol. 57<sup>r</sup>, Rouen, 1173/Y11, fol. 2<sup>r</sup>, SBB-PK, Phill. 1854, fol. 4<sup>r</sup>, Royal 13 B. xiv, fol. 2<sup>v</sup>, and Antwerp, 17.2, fol. 3<sup>v</sup>. The rubric “Heroicum” precedes poem 84 in CCCC 276, fol. 123<sup>v</sup> (“Eloicum”), and Royal 13 B. xiv, fol. 92<sup>v</sup> (“Heloicum”).

<sup>62</sup> The term “explanatory rubrics” was coined by POHL, *Dudo of St Quentin's Historia Normannorum*, pp. 146–51 and Appendix 3, pp. 264–67. I am here indebted to his discussion as well as to Dr Pohl personally, who kindly provided me with images of the Rouen, Royal, Anwerp, and Berlin manuscripts. The rubrics were largely overlooked in earlier research; Duchesne omitted them altogether and Lair reported them in footnotes. The explanatory rubrics are sometimes accompanied by other rubrics, introducing the addressee or the topic of the poem in question, e.g. “Metrum monocolon asclepiadium tetrastrophon constans pedibus quattuor spondeo duobus cori iambis et pirrichio. Praefatio tercij libri”, and “Apostropha ad Arnulfum. Metrum gliconicum constans trocheo cori iambo et pirrichio”; CCCC 276, fols 78<sup>v</sup> and 103<sup>r</sup> respectively. Often, especially in Book IV, poems are preceded by explanatory rubrics alone; e.g. CCCC 276, fols 106<sup>r</sup>, 107<sup>v</sup>, 109<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>63</sup> For example, “Metrum heroicum cum elegiaco”; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 210, n. 1.

<sup>64</sup> For example, “Iambicum traicum fenarium metrum in quo et spondeus et iambus et dactilus et anapestus in primo loco invenitur, in tercio semper spondeus, in quinto saepissime spondeus”; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 212, n. 1. Some explanatory rubrics run to forty words and take several lines in the manuscript. An extreme case is the explanatory rubric for poem 81, “Hoc genus iambicum est yponatium”; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 270, n. 4. On CCCC 276, fol. 121<sup>r</sup> the rubric fills eight lines, whereas the poem it serves is only seven lines long. Most of the explanatory rubrics are five to ten words in length. On occasion they betray difficulty in naming or describing the metre. Consider the rubric for poem 78: “Metrum dactilicum almanium constans trimetro ypercatalectus versus est cui una sillaba super est habet sibi subiectum feretrarium quod constat spondeo dactilo item spondeo sed in loco primo spondeus est ubi ana-

recitation.<sup>65</sup> Equipped with explanatory rubrics, Dudo's poems exemplify a great variety of poetic metres, common and rare. By form and function, the poetic sections operate as a metrical textbook, such as Bede's *De arte metrica*.<sup>66</sup> In the latter, concise explanations of the syllabic structure and metre precede short specimen poems. The analogy between these portions of *HN* and textbooks on poetic metre is too clear to have been accidental. Dudo composed the explanatory rubrics, I argue, primarily for the benefit of the classroom.

Crucial to my argument is the question as to whether the explanatory rubrics were authorial or later insertions by an involved reader.<sup>67</sup> This problem arises from the fact that eight of the four-

pestum contra regulam in centi metro traditum inveniamus"; *ibid.*, p. 266, n. 1.

<sup>65</sup> In some manuscripts there are also diagrams, or braces to connect verses ending in rhyming syllables. These work as both didactic and recitative guides, making it possible to visualize the rhymes and the metre; POILL, "Poetry, punctuation and performance", *passim*, and his *Dudo of St Quentin's Historia Normannorum*, p. 151.

<sup>66</sup> For example, poem 42 is preceded by the explanatory rubric: "Metrum fallueticum, constans spondeo, dactilo et tribus trocheis"; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 211, n. 3. In his *De arte metrica*, Bede introduces this metre, the Phalaecian pentameter, with the words "Est igitur metrum dactylicum Falleucium pentametrum, quod constat ex spondeo et dactylo et tribus trocheis"; Bede, *De arte metrica*, ed. by B. KENDALL, Turnhout, 1975 (CCSL 123A), p. 132. The rubric for poem 44, in Sapphic pentameter, reads: "Metrum sapphicum continuatum, constans trocheo spondeo et dactilo et duobus trocheis"; CCC 276, fol. 93<sup>v</sup> (note that *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 211, n. 6, erroneously wants the word "trocheo"). Cf. Bede, *De arte metrica*, ed. KENDALL, p. 132: "Metrum dactylicum Sapphicum pentametrum constat ex trocheo, spondeo, dactylo, duobus trocheis, cui metro post tres uersus additur semis heroici uersus". CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, p. 207, nn. 303, 305 notes that Dudo's explanatory rubrics give odd descriptions of the metres, disregarding, for example, choriamb as the second foot of the Phalaecian hendecasyllabic pentameter. This is, however, characteristic of Bede, as demonstrated in detail in S. HEIKKINEN, *The Christianisation of Latin Metre: A Study of Bede's De Arte Metrica*, Helsinki, 2012, pp. 141–52. Bede might well have been Dudo's source; at least, his rubrics testify to Bedan influence. Bede's *De arte metrica* was listed in the earliest booklist from Rouen, an inventory from the time of Archbishop Geoffrey (1111–1128); Rouen, Y 27, p. 128 (fol. lxii<sup>v</sup>).

<sup>67</sup> For instance, Lair and Christiansen considered the explanatory rubrics a later addition: CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, p. xxxvi, and pp. 206–08 nn. 301–07, 310; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 219, n. 6. Christiansen

teen extant manuscripts do not include the rubrics or the poems. No autograph, which would straightforwardly resolve the issue, survives. However, Benjamin Pohl has demonstrated that all the extant manuscripts ultimately descend from copies carrying the poems and that the latter's transmission from one generation to the next was a precarious affair. Importantly, some manuscripts make it evident that poems were deliberately omitted. For instance, BL, Cotton Claudius A. xii omits most of the poems and all the explanatory rubrics, although its direct exemplar, BL, Royal 13 B. xiv has them.<sup>68</sup> The tendency to exclude materials resulted in copies deprived not only of poems but also of the dedicatory letter to Adalbero.<sup>69</sup> This and certain other features in *HN*'s reception imply that its prosimetric nature met with a lukewarm reception in some readerships.<sup>70</sup> Copyists skipped the non-prose and/or non-narrative passages, deeming them superfluous. Explanatory rubrics naturally fell victim to elimination whenever poems they were connected to were omitted. The inclusion of the explanatory rubrics was not certain even if the pertinent poems were copied.<sup>71</sup>

attributed both the explanatory rubrics and the marginal glossae to a Canterbury scribe, whom he called the "C metrist".

<sup>68</sup> POHL, *Dudo of St Quentin's Historia Normannorum*, pp. 27–28 and 30.

<sup>69</sup> Bern, Bongars, Cod. 390 is a case in point. Written in Normandy c. 1050–1075, it is one of our oldest copies; POHL, *Dudo of St Quentin's Historia Normannorum*, pp. 22, 262. While the dedicatory letter and all poems bar four (10, 17–18 and 28; Bern, Bongars, Cod. 390, fols 2<sup>v</sup>–3<sup>r</sup>, 12<sup>r</sup>–13<sup>r</sup> and 32<sup>r</sup>, respectively) are omitted, paraphs indicate from fol. 14<sup>v</sup> onwards where missing poems ought to be. The manuscript obviously descends (ultimately) from an exemplar which had all the poems and, one assumes, also the dedicatory letter.

<sup>70</sup> POHL, *Dudo of St Quentin's Historia Normannorum*, pp. 226–27. William of Jumièges, who frequently relied on *HN*, rejected Dudo's hermeunetic style completely and rarely quotes *HN* without thoroughly rephrasing the text. In the dedicatory letter to King William I he asserts that he avoids the "elegant and weighty style used by rhetoricians". Such statements were cliché but one is tempted to see a critical allusion to Dudo. VAN HOUTS, *The Gesta Normannorum Ducum*, I, pp. lv, 4–7. Robert of Torigni, however, reintroduced several chapters from Dudo into his recension of *Gesta Normannorum Ducum*; *ibid.*, pp. lxxx–lxxxii.

<sup>71</sup> Explanatory rubrics were sometimes left out even when the exemplar supplied them. As shown in Table 1, Royal 13 B. xiv does not include three explanatory rubrics (poems 4, 80 and 87), which may be assumed to have been present in its exemplar.

Yet, all six manuscripts that convey the poems in a systematic manner have at least some explanatory rubrics, an obvious indication that the rubrics were part of *HN* at an early stage of transmission.<sup>72</sup>

The said six copies fall in two branches, something that suggests that the explanatory rubrics were not only very early, but also authorial. The first constellation includes the three copies that stand closest to the early dissemination. The two oldest manuscripts preserved, Rouen, BM, 1173/Y11 (Jumièges, c. 1050–1075) and SBB-PK, Phill. 1854 (Normandy, c. 1075–1100), only convey three explanatory rubrics, introducing poems 1, 2 and 13.<sup>73</sup> They must ultimately descend from a copy or copies which also carried the other rubrics, evidencing an early date for the rubrics' existence.<sup>74</sup> Importantly, the third manuscript in this group, Cotton Nero D. VIII (England c. 1175–1200), preserves five explanatory rubrics, those for poems 13, 86, 87, 88 and 89.<sup>75</sup> It has recently been argued that it is "extremely likely" that the Nero manuscript descends from the same early exemplar as the Rouen manuscript.<sup>76</sup> The odds are that the ultimate shared ancestor of the Rouen, Berlin, and Cotton Nero manuscripts had more explanatory rubrics than those three copies convey. In other words, explanatory rubrics were excluded in the course of transmission. What

<sup>72</sup> According to HUISMAN, "Notes", p. 123, these six manuscripts represent the "verse redaction". There is some confusion in the argument, however: at p. 125, Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, VLF 47 (France, s. xvi) is included in the group of manuscripts with the poems, but at p. 126 it is mentioned as one in which the poems are omitted. The Leiden manuscript omits all poems except for the final four lines of poem 10 (fol. 6<sup>r</sup>), and poems 11, 17 and 18 (fols 9<sup>v</sup>–10<sup>r</sup> and 15<sup>v</sup>–16<sup>v</sup>). It most likely descends directly from the Rouen manuscript; POILL, *Dudo of St Quentin's Historia Normannorum*, p. 27.

<sup>73</sup> Rouen, 1173/Y11, fols 2<sup>r</sup>, 2<sup>v</sup> and 7<sup>r</sup>, and SBB-PK, Phill. 1854, fols 4<sup>r</sup>, 5<sup>r</sup> and 13<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>74</sup> POILL, *Dudo of St Quentin's Historia Normannorum*, pp. 32–33. The Rouen manuscript was to be a lavishly illuminated luxury copy. It was left unfinished for some reason. The absence of the explanatory rubrics was probably intentional, reflecting the purpose intended for the volume. As noted above, copyists whose main interest was *HN*'s historical value skipped the versifications and their rubrics. The Berlin manuscript might have been copied directly from the Rouen manuscript or a shared exemplar; *ibid.*, p. 23.

<sup>75</sup> Cotton Nero D. VIII, fols 79<sup>r</sup>, 127<sup>r</sup>, 130<sup>v</sup>, 132<sup>r</sup>, 133<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>76</sup> POILL, *Dudo of St Quentin's Historia Normannorum*, p. 29.

is more, the rubrics of the first group match those in the second group, to be introduced below. It is highly unlikely, then, that explanatory rubrics would have been inserted at some later stage. Such a scenario would mean either that several copyists made original contributions precisely to the same effect independently of each other, or that transmission was strictly linear because textual variation between rubrics in different manuscripts is diminutive, mainly orthographic.<sup>77</sup> Neither scenario can carry weight. To conclude, a single person must have been responsible for the explanatory rubrics and they were present in the earliest phases of dissemination observable to us.

The three manuscripts that constitute the second branch are Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 276 (St Augustine's abbey, Canterbury, c. 1100–1125),<sup>78</sup> BL, Royal 13 B. xiv (England, c. 1150–1175),<sup>79</sup> and Antwerp, Museum Plantin-Moretus/Prentenkabinet, 17.2 (England, c. 1175–1200).<sup>80</sup> The manuscripts are closely related and probably shared an exemplar (or exemplars).<sup>81</sup>

<sup>77</sup> Christiansen notes one major difference in the rubrics in the endnotes to his translation: the rubric of poem 42 differs in manuscripts CCC 276 and Royal 13 B. xiv (CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, p. 207, n. 303). This discrepancy, however, resulted from a scribal error: the copyist of Royal 13 B. xiv attached the explanatory rubric of poem 41 to poem 42 (fol. 40<sup>r</sup>).

<sup>78</sup> CCC 276 is a composite volume, incorporating two originally independent books, which were put together at St Augustine's abbey sometime in the twelfth century; B. C. BARKER-BENFIELD, *St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury*, 3 vols, London, 2008 (Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues, 13), vol. 2, pp. 924–25. Datable to the late eleventh century, the first unit carries Paul the Deacon's redaction to Eutropius' *Breuiarium ab urbe condita*. This study is concerned with the second unit, fols 55–134.

<sup>79</sup> POHL, *Dudo of St Quentin's Historia Normannorum*, p. 30.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 18–20.

<sup>81</sup> It has been suggested that CCC 276 was the exemplar of the other two: GELTING, "Courtly viking", p. 34. I will argue below why this seems unlikely. CCC 276 is a compilation. It has been proposed that it probably derived *HN* from a Norman source, possibly from Mont Saint-Michel; POHL, *Dudo of St Quentin's Historia Normannorum*, pp. 24–26, 70–72. Mont Saint-Michel, as a ducal monastery, would presumably have acquired a copy not long after the first publication. Pohl observes that this group of three manuscripts reveals "considerable loyalty to the text's original form", and that they were produced as part of the text's canonization in the Anglo-Norman collective memory; *ibid.*, pp. 74–76, 241–42. CCC 276 also includes some glosses in the main hand, most of which are found in *HN*, ed. LAIR, pp. 210–13. They

In combination, these three volumes convey fifty-one explanatory rubrics. Their distribution is suggestive of a governing principle: their frequency of appearance corresponds to Dudo's emphases. Table 1 lays out the poems and their rubrics in all six manuscripts. The arrangement in the three English manuscripts is as follows. In the first three books the prefatory poems have explanatory rubrics, while the poems within the text proper and the epilogues lack them. Those poems in Books I–III that are unaccompanied by a rubric are in hexameter, apart from one in elegiac distich (no. 9); both metres would have been well known to those with any previous engagement with Latin poetry. Most of the explanatory rubrics are situated in the fourth book, where they accompany almost every poem. In Book IV only poems 51–58, 76, and 90–91 (the two final poems) are devoid of rubrics. The variety of metres in Book IV is also much greater, as presented in Table 4; its fifty-two poems are in thirty-three different metres, with only six in heroic verse. The application of rubrics in Book IV differs from that in Books I–III in that most of the poems within the text proper are also equipped with them. The same applies to about half of the poems in hexameter; those devoid of rubrics belong to the above-mentioned poems 51–58, 76 and 90–91. In Book IV their frequent application resonates with this section's importance and length over Books I–III.<sup>82</sup>

appear also in Royal 13 B. xiv, fol. 40. Additionally, CCC 276, fol. 94<sup>v</sup> has a marginal note marked with a trefoil, "Scilicet ypaton, meson, synemenon, diezeumenon, yperboleon" (quoting Boethius, *De musica* 1, 21.1), which is repeated on Royal 13 B. xiv, fol. 42<sup>r</sup>. These glosses were copied into Royal 13 B. xiv either from CCC 276 or its source. They cannot be attributed to Dudo or any other known party. See also HUISMAN, "Notes", pp. 130–31; POHL, *Dudo of St Quentin's Historia Normannorum*, pp. 148–49.

<sup>82</sup> One function of paratexts and rubrication lies in their definition of textual hierarchies through their visual distinctiveness. CCC 276, visually impressive, has numerous explanatory rubrics in red ink, followed by the poems, each verse of which begins with a coloured initial. The poems are written in smaller script to separate them from the body of the prose text. The beginning of the fourth book is different from the first three books in terms of presentation. It is clear at a glance that this is the most important section. Those manuscripts in which the poems and the rubrics are absent, e.g. Cotton Claudius A. xi, do not communicate the said hierarchy by visual means. The pictorial scheme that was meant to be executed in Rouen, 1173/Y11 also supports the textual hierarchy: the places left for illuminations are

The explanatory rubrics comprehend practically all the metres applied in *HN*, thirty of the thirty-four, as summarized in Table 2. The only four metres (Christiansen's metres 19, 23, 24 and 26) lacking explanatory rubrics are situated in the gap extending from poem 51 to 58. Some rubrics repeat explanations found in others: for instance, "Metrum dactilicum tetrametrum quod constat spondeo dactilo catalecto" appears no less than four times.<sup>83</sup> Most metres are introduced several times. It seems unlikely, then, that the primary governing principle was to introduce systematically each metre in use. As shown in Table 1, they were applied methodologically to the prefatory poems and throughout Book IV, an authorial design.

The said three gaps in Book IV that lack explanatory rubrics raise the question as to whether or not the poems in question had originally had them. CCCC 276, likely to represent an earlier stage in transmission than its two English companions, is helpful here. Three absences, those in poems 76 and 90–91, can be attributed with some confidence to scribal error or recourse to a defective exemplar. While the manuscript introduces poem 76 with the rubric "Apostropha ad Ricardum", this does not describe the metre, which would simply have been the *heroicum*. Scribal error or a lack of space on the page may explain the absence. Or the explanatory rubric might have been wanting already in the exemplar, as the Royal manuscript also lacks it. Another explanation would be that heroic metre, very common and known to all students of Latin poetry, had been judged in the first place not to need a gloss. As for poems 90–91, the text of CCCC 276 breaks off slightly before them in the middle of fol. 134<sup>v</sup>.<sup>84</sup> A straightforward explanation would be that the source on which the copyist drew was defective at the end. Elsewhere the manu-

concentrated in the fourth book (twenty-one places for illumination were left on leaves 28<sup>v</sup>–48<sup>v</sup>), with only a fraction of that number in the three other books (seven spaces are left on fols 6<sup>r</sup>–9<sup>v</sup>, mainly to accompany the early history of Rollo). On the programme of illumination of the Rouen manuscript, see POILL, *Dudo of St Quentin's Historia Normannorum*, pp. 165–97.

<sup>83</sup> *HN*, ed. LAIR, pp. 126, 213, 264, and 296.

<sup>84</sup> The text breaks off at the beginning of the second column on the verso of the final leaf of quire X (fol. 134). The missing text amounts to two pages in Cotton Nero D. viii, and four and half pages in Royal 13 B. xiv.

script is executed with diligence and care, with one notable exception. Most of the aforementioned poems 51–58 that lack the rubrics are textually corrupt. The order of lines is confused, in stark contrast to the perfect presentation elsewhere.<sup>85</sup> With no indication of any break, narrative or otherwise, corruption ceases before poem 59. CCCC 276 possibly received poems 51–58 from a source other than its main source, which, then, would have been defective in this section. The putative secondary source would not only have been of an inferior textual quality but would also have lacked the said rubrics.

Poem 58 can be cited in demonstration that the source of CCCC 276 (or a lost intermediary) did not bear explanatory rubrics at this point and had a different layout. The poem is short, running to eighteen lines.<sup>86</sup> Longer and shorter verses alternate, the former consisting of a spondee, choriamb, and two dactyls, and the latter of a spondee, choriamb, and a short syllable.<sup>87</sup> Yet, the hand responsible for CCCC 276 copied first the long verses and only then the shorter. Such an uncharacteristic error would have been caused by reading two columns in the source manuscript as consecutive entities rather than a device to demonstrate the change of metre from verse to verse. That is, the copyist seems first to have copied the left-hand column with the longer verses and then the right-hand column with the shorter verses. It is hard to see how the scribe, whose work was otherwise of high quality, could have committed such a mistake if the layout of the exemplar had remained constant,

<sup>85</sup> The copyist frequently miscopied bicolomnar arrangements into one column, as explained below. Such an error occurs in poems 51, 52, 53, 57 and 58. See also POHL, *Dudo of St Quentin's Historia Normannorum*, pp. 240–51, Appendix 4–5. HN, ed. LAIR, p. 214, n. A, and p. 219, n. 7 also notices the confusion characterizing this section in CCCC 276. Note also that Cotton Nero D. VIII confuses the line order in poems 51, 54 and 57 (fols 103<sup>v</sup>, 104<sup>r</sup> and 105<sup>r</sup> respectively).

<sup>86</sup> HN, ed. LAIR, p. 221; CCCC 276, fol. 97<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>87</sup> The metre is described by Christiansen as “slightly irregular Third or Lesser Asclepiadic tetrameters (the endings pyrrhic rather than trochaic) alternating with Pherecratean dimeters or trimeters (ending short rather than long)”; CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, p. 210, n. 325. The other five manuscripts have the correct, alternating line structure.

or if his source had a rubric introducing the metre.<sup>88</sup> Several poems that use alternating verses are correctly presented in CCCC 276, and they also have explanatory rubrics.<sup>89</sup> The textual corruption that characterizes fols 94<sup>v</sup>–98<sup>r</sup> hints at some irregularity in transmission.

The Royal and Antwerp manuscripts avoid the errors found in the corrupt section of CCCC 276. Poem 58, for example, is given in the correct order in the Royal manuscript, which presents it as continuous text.<sup>90</sup> In the Antwerp manuscript the poem is set in two columns without errors.<sup>91</sup> Amending these corruptions in CCCC 276 would have been impossible without recourse to another source. The Royal manuscript also includes the conclusion of Book IV, although it lacks the explanatory rubrics for the last two poems.<sup>92</sup> The Royal and Antwerp manuscripts are, then, hardly direct copies of CCCC 276, although the three manuscripts must have been closely connected. Solid conclusions are not possible as the requisite text-critical evidence from the manuscripts is not reported in printed editions.<sup>93</sup> To conclude, several of the anoma-

<sup>88</sup> The confusion betrays the fact that the copyist of CCCC 276 did not scan the metre while writing. The confused order of verses in poem 58 and elsewhere could hint at an imperfect command of Latin prosody. It seems improbable that a copyist who committed such glaring errors could have composed rubrics for the more exotic metres.

<sup>89</sup> For example, poem 26, the prefatory “Oratio” of the third book, utilizes four different alternating metres. Its explanatory rubric reads “Metrum tetracolon tetrastraphon. id est quattuor metri generibus. a quarto facta replicatione. Habet enim primum uersum adonium. secundum archilodium. tertium feretacium. quartum gliconium.” The lines are written in the correct order; CCCC 276, fol. 79<sup>r</sup>. The same observations, *mutatis mutandis*, apply, for example, to poems 72 and 73, *ibid.*, fols 115<sup>r</sup> and 115<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>90</sup> Royal 13 B. xiv, fol. 45<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>91</sup> Antwerp, 17.2, fol. 46<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>92</sup> Royal 13 B. xiv, fol. 45<sup>r</sup>, fol. 108<sup>v</sup>. MS Antwerp lacks several quires at the end, containing the latter half of the fourth book; POHL, *Dudo of St Quentin's Historia Normannorum*, pp. 18–19.

<sup>93</sup> POHL, *Dudo of St Quentin's Historia Normannorum*, pp. 38–40. Poem 51, a twenty-nine-line Anacreontic dimeter addressed to Archbishop Robert, is an illustrative example of the confusion in the editions of *HN*. The poem's authorial form is not easy to determine. Much confusion, medieval and modern, has ensued from the layout in manuscripts, lost and extant. The crux is that two columns were used to convey how the poem divides into verses. In the process of transmission, new layouts, also in one column, emerged, with

lies observable in poems lacking rubrics were clearly transmission noise. Explanatory rubrics were also omitted deliberately, such that their number reduced at various steps in the transmission. The most likely scenario is that Dudo's authorial text attached rubrics to all prefatory poems in the first three books and to all poems in the fourth.

A survey of Dudo's sources shows that on furnishing poems with explanatory rubrics he complied with previous models. One of his most important literary paragons was Heiric of Auxerre, whose metrical *Vita sancti Germani* has comparable rubrics.<sup>94</sup> This also applies to their placement. They accompany the prefatory poems of each book.<sup>95</sup> The first explanatory rubric in *HN* reads "Adlocutio ad Librum ΜΩΝΟΚΩΛΩ ΜΩΝΩΤΡΟΦΩ DECVRSA". It unmistakably echoes Heiric's "Allocutio ad Librum ΔΥΚΟΛΩ ΔΙΣΤΡΟΦΩ DECVRSA".<sup>96</sup> Dudo drew on Heiric.

The authorial status of explanatory rubrics means that *HN*'s didactic aspect was Dudo's deliberate design. He was seeking readers in the classroom — something he stated quite explicitly. The verse "Address to the Book" ("Allocutio ad Librum"), *HN*'s opening poem, which Dudo might have composed only when he was back in Saint-Quentin, posed the rhetorical question, What fate would fall on his work? Will it "proceed at full speed to the Norman academies/or still remain in confinement to our Frankish

the result that the order of verses became confused. Royal 13 B. xiv and Antwerp, 17.2 preserve the two-column layout. CCCC 276 and Cotton Nero D. viii derive their form from a two-column presentation but make errors in the layout of the verses. Rouen, 1173/Y11 and SBB-PK, Phill. 1854 confuse the order of the first twelve verses. None of the printed editions gives the poem in its correct form; Lair wants the third verse, "Rhetorico sapore", completely. Interestingly, he observed that his text is based on the Cotton Nero manuscript, although it appears closer to MSS Royal and Antwerp; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 214 and *ibid.*, n. A. DUCHESNE, *Historiae Normannorum scriptores antiqui*, p. 108, and LIFSHTZ, *Dudo (Latin)*, Capitulum 28, give the poem as in the Berlin manuscript. I will discuss this poem in a forthcoming paper.

<sup>94</sup> CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, pp. xiii, xxi–xxiii.

<sup>95</sup> Heiric's explanatory rubrics accompany his "Invocatio", "Allocutio ad Librum", and the prefaces to Books II to VI; MGH, *Poetae*, 3, pp. 432, 436, 451, 461, 474, 488 and 499 respectively. All the others describe the metre in Greek except the first one, which is in Latin.

<sup>96</sup> Rouen, 1173/Y11, fol. 2<sup>r</sup> and MGH, *Poetae*, 3, p. 436 respectively.

high-schools”<sup>97</sup> He assumed that his readers would be schooled in the seven liberal arts. The “Apostrophe to the Reader” (*Apostropha ad lectorem*) of Book IV opens as follows: “Reader, with prayers profuse I supplicate thee,/Skilled in the sevenfold art, and competent”.<sup>98</sup> Another feature that associates *HN* with schools is its vocabulary, massive and complex. As a late proponent of the “hermeunetic” style, Dudo had a penchant for rare words.<sup>99</sup> His clauses are laden with extraneous adjectives and exotic nouns; synonyms, antitheses and various forms of repetition abound.<sup>100</sup> Works written in hermeunetic style were used as textbooks for the study of complex vocabulary and grammar.<sup>101</sup> Dudo’s textual style probably reflects his own education. On account of its various educational features, *HN* has been characterized as an “encyclopedia, a reference book

<sup>97</sup> “Aut pergas Northmannica nunc gymnasia praepes/Aut scholis clausus Franciscis jam moruleris”; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 120, translation CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, p. 7. It should be noted that Dudo’s choice of words “gymnasia” and “schola” here probably do not denote any difference in the status of the schools but were simply examples of his varied vocabulary. Dudo avoided repetition of the same words for stylistic reasons and was always keen to demonstrate his wide vocabulary, using a great variety of synonyms; CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, p. xxxi. For a different reading, see BACHIRACI, “Writing History”, p. 66, n. 43.

<sup>98</sup> “Profusis precibus, lector, supplex tibi dico/Artis septifluae gnare, capaxque bene”; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 269, translation CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, p. 144.

<sup>99</sup> M. LAPIDGE, “The hermeunetic style in tenth-century Anglo-Latin literature”, in *Anglo-Saxon England*, 4 (1975), pp. 67–111, at 71. The style flourished in the ninth and tenth centuries. In Northern Francia, Fleury and Laon were the main centres. Martianus Capella, an important model for Dudo, was an important influence; *ibid.*, p. 69.

<sup>100</sup> L. B. MORTENSEN, “Stylistic choice in a reborn genre. The national histories of Widukind of Corvey and Dudo of St. Quentin”, in *Dudone di San Quintino*, ed. by P. GATTI, A. DEGL’INNOCENTI, Trento, 1995, pp. 77–102, at 89; CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, p. xxxi.

<sup>101</sup> LAPIDGE, “Hermeunetic style”, pp. 72–76. A regular feature was the use of Greek words, as in *HN*. In some manuscripts, e.g. CCCC 276, fol. 95<sup>v</sup>, they are accompanied by interlinear translations or transliterations into the Latin alphabet, with probably a primarily didactic function. The treatment of Greek words is not uniform; sometimes the Latinized forms replace the Greek words; e.g. CCCC 276, fol. 89<sup>v</sup> as against Royal 13 B. xiv, fol. 34<sup>v</sup>, which preserves the Greek spelling.

of synonyms, of prosody, metres, rhetorical devices, geography, and even theology — a comprehensive school-book”.<sup>102</sup>

### Adalbero

Dudo's target audiences were twofold. His primary audience was an educated, scholarly elite. In Normandy, Archbishop Robert was a central figure in such networks and in an excellent position to promote *HN*. The didactic aspect of the work was directed to school use. The Norman lay elite was a secondary target audience. In most cases illiterate, they must have received the history through mediation, perhaps orally, in vernacular translation. As regards its long-term success, endorsement by learned elites was naturally crucial; circulation within lay audiences, illiterate or semi-literate, would have amounted to a minor issue at best. To ensure that his work would be received and circulated, Dudo did not confine its publication to the duchy. Bishop Adalbero of Laon was to be a central agent in this.

Dudo's relocation to Saint-Quentin was certainly a factor in his decision to dedicate *HN* to Adalbero. It should be added that while his aforementioned Norman patrons might have received presentation copies furnished with dedicatory letters addressed to them, none of our manuscripts evidence that.<sup>103</sup> There is no evidence that Adalbero rewarded Dudo in some way, although of course he may have done so. More importantly, in Saint-Quentin Dudo had the opportunity to publish *HN* in a new framework. He could reach audiences unavailable to him before his relocation from Normandy. *HN* was not meant for Norman audiences exclusively. It could fully achieve its goal in providing the Norman with

<sup>102</sup> MORTENSEN, “Stylistic choice”, p. 100. The didactic functions of *HN* have been recently attested by many scholars, such as POHL, *Dudo of St Quentin's Historia Normannorum*, and CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*. GELTING, “Courtly viking”, p. 18 notes that “Dudo's work would be ideally suited to imbue the schoolboys with loyalty to the exalted lineage of their virtuous dukes”.

<sup>103</sup> The dedicatory letter to Adalbero is found in nine of the fourteen extant manuscripts, including two of the three oldest preserved copies, the Rouen and Berlin manuscripts. Each of the six manuscripts that carry the poems, (and in that respect, preserve Dudo's original more faithfully) also have the dedicatory letter to Adalbero; HUISMAN, “Notes”, p. 123.

a glorious past and redefining his status as belonging to a noble nation only if that narrative came to be accepted elsewhere. This was Dudo's own opinion. In the preface to Book IV, he asserted that the work was intended also for readers from other nations. "Him [Richard I] the kindly, him the modest,/will the written page proclaim/[...]/Let the other kingdoms wonder/At his deeds and holy sayings:/In reflection, deed, and speaking/No one greater has shone forth."<sup>104</sup> Foreign patrons and publication outside Normandy were, then, a requisite.

Dudo's publication strategy in Normandy helps us understand better why he dedicated the work to Adalbero. The personal profile of Adalbero strikes all the same chords as that of Archbishop Robert. He was the most powerful ecclesiastical magnate in northern Francia and had the ear of the French king. Adalbero was a spectacular patron of the arts. Laon cathedral was home to a leading school. A poet himself, Adalbero could appreciate Dudo's complex verses.<sup>105</sup> In short, he was an ideal patron to help disseminate *HN*. According to Dudo, Adalbero's endorsement would confirm the veracity of *HN*.<sup>106</sup> The poetic aspect of the work would have appealed to Adalbero and, in general, to readers for whom the preservation of the memory of the Normans' ancestors was not of personal importance but who were involved, in one way or another, in teaching. Dudo's dedicatory letter to Adalbero should, indeed, be read from that perspective. It employs complicated mathematical and musical metaphors, to demonstrate that the

<sup>104</sup> Poem 53, lines 35–36, "Hunc benignum, hunc modestum/Concrepabit pagina", and lines 45–48, "Regna, facta, sancta dicta,/quin stupent et caetera:/Cogitatu, facto, dicto/Nemo major splenduit"; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 215, translation CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, p. 91. Between these two passages, in lines 37–44, Dudo names Normandy, Francia and Burgundy as the witnesses of Richard I's greatness: "Hunc pium, justumque sanctum,/Et probatum et maximum./Almitatis hujus actus/Testis est Northmannia,/Largitatis atque hujus/Testis est et Francia:/Fortitudinemque ejus/Comprobat Burgundia"; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 215. These were the regions in which the duke was most active during his reign, but the passage can also be read as an indication of where Dudo thought his work would primarily find its audiences.

<sup>105</sup> Dudo seems to allude to this in the dedicatory letter: "te, qui versaris in sacrorum praeceptis eloquiorum"; *ibid.*, p. 119.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 120: "tuae majestati mittere disposui, ut falsa amputarentur, et si quid veritatis in illo haberetur, tua auctoritate confirmarentur".

dialogue between the author and his dedicatee was one between men of letters.<sup>107</sup> Dudo also sought to appeal to Adalbero more directly. He affirmed that the work would consolidate and spread Adalbero's fame.<sup>108</sup>

However, judging by the extant manuscripts, *HN* was not a success in Francia. There survives a single relatively early copy with a probable origin in Francia: Douai, Bibliothèque Marceline Desbordes-Valmore, 880. The volume is a compilation written in Anchin c. 1150. The copy of *HN*, on fols 89<sup>r</sup>–114<sup>v</sup>, remains incomplete. Breaking off abruptly in the middle of Book III, the text wants more than the final half. Most of the poems are likewise omitted.<sup>109</sup> The absence of evidence to the contrary implies that Adalbero's contribution to publication proved to be rather less than was desired. One implication is that Dudo is unlikely to have been connected to him and that he chose his dedicatee at the time of publication. By consigning the work to Adalbero, Dudo did not seek to replace his Norman patrons with a French one; nothing suggests that Dudo would somehow undermine his frequent address to them within the work. The dedication to Adalbero was simply to extend Dudo's publishing circle to reach audiences in Francia.<sup>110</sup>

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 117–18. These metaphors are based on Boethius' *De institutione arithmetica* and Martianus Capella's *De nuptiis Philosophiae et Mercuriae*; CHRISTIANSEN, *History of the Normans*, p. 178 nn. 16, 18 and 19. Shopkow notes that Dudo's usage of these metaphors — which are based, according to her, on either Boethius' *De arithmetica* or *De musica* — is “so confusing [...] that he either did not understand the material well or was copying”, and concludes that Dudo's education in these matters was superficial; SUORKOW, “Carolingian world”, p. 25.

<sup>108</sup> It may be added that Dudo uses the word “patronus” for Adalbero in the context of the request that he correct the text. Patronage as conceived here embraces a literary contribution by way of emendation and a share of fame that would follow. “Talem et hujuscemodi honorem corde revolve, et mente delibero decere tantum patronum ut quae in hoc codice suis tenebris obscura videntur, per te ad lucem referantur, quia non penuriosi et ingloriosi nomen compositoris, sed egregii correctoris laus acquiratur”; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 118.

<sup>109</sup> POHL, *Dudo of St Quentin's Historia Normannorum*, pp. 26–27, 262.

<sup>110</sup> Cf. BRINKMANN, “Dudos dedikationen”, pp. 96–100.

While his mission was to define the Norman past in written form and to make it public,<sup>111</sup> Dudo's intended audiences went beyond Norman courtly circles. His style of expression was calibrated to appeal to broader readerships, teachers and other churchmen not only in Normandy but also in Francia. To realize such aspirations, he approached the highest ecclesiastical figures close to him. The earliest dissemination bespeaks some success in Normandy. Religious institutions supported by local elites and under the influence of Archbishop Robert took to copying the work. Attempts to woo Adalbero in order to gain a foothold in Francia were less successful. Likewise, *HN* failed to make it to the classroom. The didactic and poetic matter of the work was regarded as superfluous at various steps in the transmission, to which the omission of the poems and explanatory rubrics is testimony.

<sup>111</sup> The prose preface of Book IV reflects on these themes. Dudo is very conscious of his responsibility in publishing ("propalare") on Richard I's life. "Quocirca benignissimi ducis Richardi vitam aggrediamur, hebete licet stylo [...] Donetur nobis etiam ejus meritis vitam illius reverenter propalare; qui summa reverentia, summumque decus Ecclesiae exstitit"; *HN*, ed. LAIR, p. 218.

## Tables

Table 1: The poems and explanatory rubrics in *HN*

| Poem no. | <i>HN</i> , ed Lair, starting page | Christiansen no. | Meter (Christiansen) | Explanatory rubric begins on fol. |                      |                     |                      |                          |                          |                                | Poem | Book |
|----------|------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|------|------|
|          |                                    |                  |                      | CCCC MS 276                       | BL MS Royal 13 B xiv | Antwerp MPM MS 17.2 | Rouen BM MS 1173/Y11 | Berlin SB MS Phill. 1854 | BL MS Cotton Nero D viii |                                |      |      |
| 1        | 120                                | i                | 1                    | 57r                               | 2v                   | 3v                  | 2r                   | 4r                       | -                        | <i>Allocutio ad Librum</i>     | I    |      |
| 2        | 122                                | ii               | 3                    | 57r                               | 3r                   | 4r                  | 2v                   | 5r                       | -                        | To Richard II                  |      |      |
| 3        | 122                                | iii              | 1                    |                                   |                      |                     |                      |                          |                          | <i>Trepidatio et dissuasio</i> |      |      |
| 4        | 123                                | iv               | 22                   | 57v                               | -                    | 4v                  | -                    | -                        | -                        | To Archbishop Robert           |      |      |
| 5        | 125                                | v                | 1                    |                                   |                      |                     |                      |                          |                          | To Count Rolf                  |      |      |
| 6        | 126                                | vi               | 11                   | 58v                               | 4r                   | 5r                  | -                    | -                        | -                        | To Archbishop Robert           |      |      |
| 7        | 126                                | vii              | 7                    | 58v                               | 4r                   | 5v                  | -                    | -                        | -                        | To Archbishop Robert           |      |      |
| 8        | 127                                | viii             | 16                   | 59r                               | 4v                   | 5v                  | -                    | -                        | -                        | To Archbishop Robert           |      |      |
| 9        | 128                                | ix               | 22                   |                                   |                      |                     |                      |                          |                          | <i>Oratio</i>                  |      |      |
| 10       | 130                                | x                | 1                    |                                   |                      |                     |                      |                          |                          |                                |      |      |
| 11       | 135                                | xi               | 1                    |                                   |                      |                     |                      |                          |                          |                                |      |      |
| 12       | 137                                | xii              | 1                    |                                   |                      |                     |                      |                          |                          |                                |      |      |
| 13       | 138                                | xiii             | 22                   | 63v                               | 7v                   | 11r                 | 7r                   | 13r                      | 79r                      | <i>Praefatio</i>               | II   |      |
| 14       | 140                                | xiii<br>(cont.)  |                      | 64v                               | 8r                   | 11v                 | -                    | -                        | -                        | <i>Oratio</i>                  |      |      |
| 15       | 144                                | xiv              | 1                    |                                   |                      |                     |                      |                          |                          |                                |      |      |
| 16       | 145                                | xv               | 1                    |                                   |                      |                     |                      |                          |                          |                                |      |      |
| 17       | 148                                | xvi              | 1                    |                                   |                      | *                   |                      |                          |                          |                                |      |      |
| 18       | 149                                | xvii             | 1                    |                                   |                      |                     |                      |                          |                          |                                |      |      |
| 19       | 151                                | xviii            | 1                    |                                   |                      |                     |                      |                          |                          |                                |      |      |
| 20       | 153                                | xix              | 1                    |                                   |                      |                     |                      |                          |                          |                                |      |      |
| 21       | 163                                | xx               | 1                    |                                   |                      |                     |                      |                          |                          |                                |      |      |
| 22       | 163                                | xxi              | 1                    |                                   |                      |                     |                      |                          |                          |                                |      |      |
| 23       | 169                                | xxii             | 1                    |                                   |                      |                     |                      |                          |                          |                                |      |      |
| 24       | 175                                | xxiii            | 1                    |                                   |                      |                     |                      |                          |                          |                                |      |      |

|    |     |               |    |      |     |     |   |   |   |                               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|----|-----|---------------|----|------|-----|-----|---|---|---|-------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 25 | 176 | xxiv          | 9  | 78v  | 21v | 27r | - | - | - | <i>Praefatio tertii libri</i> | III |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 26 | 178 | xxv           | 33 | 79r  | 22v | 27v | - | - | - | <i>Oratio</i>                 |     | III |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 27 | 180 | xxvi          | 1  |      |     |     |   |   |   |                               |     |     | III |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 28 | 182 | xxvii         | 1  |      |     |     |   |   |   |                               |     |     |     | III |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 29 | 184 | xxviii        | 1  |      |     |     |   |   |   |                               |     |     |     |     | III |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 30 | 186 | xxix          | 1  |      |     |     |   |   |   |                               |     |     |     |     |     | III |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 31 | 188 | xxx           | 1  |      |     |     |   |   |   |                               |     |     |     |     |     |     | III |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 32 | 190 | xxxi          | 1  |      |     |     |   |   |   |                               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | III |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 33 | 191 | xxxii         | 1  |      |     |     |   |   |   |                               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | III |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 34 | 194 | xxxiii        | 1  |      |     |     |   |   |   |                               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | III |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 35 | 199 | xxxiv         | 1  |      |     |     |   |   |   |                               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | III |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 36 | 200 | xxxv          | 1  |      |     |     |   |   |   |                               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | III |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 37 | 202 | xxxvi         | 1  |      |     |     |   |   |   |                               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | III |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 38 | 206 | xxxvii        | 1  |      |     |     |   |   |   |                               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | III |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 39 | 209 | xxxviii       | 1  |      |     |     |   |   |   |                               | III |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 40 | 210 | xxxix         | 22 | 93v  | 40r | 42r | - | - | - | Exhortation of the Muses      |     | IV  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 41 | 210 | xl            | 9  | 93v  | 40r | 42v | - | - | - | Clio                          |     |     | IV  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 42 | 211 | xli           | 3  | 93v  | 40r | 42v | - | - | - | Euterpe                       |     |     |     | IV  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 43 | 211 | xlii          | 9  | 93v  | 40v | 42v | - | - | - | Melpomenes                    |     |     |     |     | IV  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 44 | 211 | xliii         | 4  | 93v  | 40v | 42v | - | - | - | Thalia                        |     |     |     |     |     | IV  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 45 | 212 | xliv          | 2  | 94r  | 41r | 42v | - | - | - | Polyhymnia                    |     |     |     |     |     |     | IV  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 46 | 212 | xlvi          | 7  | 94r  | 41r | 43r | - | - | - | Erato                         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | IV  |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 47 | 212 | xlvi          | 14 | 94r  | 41r | 43r | - | - | - | Terpsichore                   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | IV  |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 48 | 213 | xlvi          | 15 | 94r  | 41r | 43r | - | - | - | Urania                        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | IV  |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 49 | 213 | xlvi          | 5  | 94r  | 41v | 43r | - | - | - | Calliope                      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | IV  |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 50 | 213 | xlix          | 8  | 94v  | 41v | 43v | - | - | - | Muses in unison               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | IV  |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 51 | 214 | l             | 19 |      |     |     |   |   |   | To Archbishop Robert          |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | IV  |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 52 | 214 | li            | 23 |      |     |     |   |   |   | <i>Item praefatio</i>         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | IV  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 53 | 214 | li<br>(cont.) |    |      |     |     |   |   |   | <i>Hic loquitur ad librum</i> | IV  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 54 | 215 | lii           | 24 |      |     |     |   |   |   | <i>Oratio</i>                 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | IV |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 55 | 215 | liii          | 22 |      |     |     |   |   |   | To Archbishop Robert          |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    | IV |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 56 | 219 | liv           | 1  |      |     |     |   |   |   |                               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    | IV |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 57 | 219 | lv            | 14 |      |     |     |   |   |   |                               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    | IV |    |    |    |    |    |
| 58 | 221 | lvi           | 26 |      |     |     |   |   |   |                               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    | IV |    |    |    |    |
| 59 | 222 | lvii          | 17 | 98v  | 46r | 47r | - | - | - |                               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | IV |    |    |    |
| 60 | 224 | lviii         | 10 | 99r  | 47r | 47v | - | - | - |                               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    | IV |    |    |
| 61 | 228 | lix           | 12 | 101r | 49v | 49v | - | - | - |                               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | IV |    |
| 62 | 229 | lx            | 16 | 101v | 50v | 50r | - | - | - |                               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | IV |
| 63 | 231 | lxi           | 18 | 102v | 52v | 51r | - | - | - |                               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 64 | 232 | lxii          | 6  | 103r | 53v | 52r | - | - | - |                               |     | IV  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 65 | 234 | lxiii         | 9  | 104r | 55r | 52v | - | - | - |                               |     |     | IV  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 66 | 238 | lxiv          | 32 | 106r | 59v |     | - | - | - |                               |     |     |     | IV  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |

|    |     |          |    |      |      |  |   |   |      |                               |
|----|-----|----------|----|------|------|--|---|---|------|-------------------------------|
| 67 | 242 | lxv      | 3  | 107v | 63v  |  | - | - | **   |                               |
| 68 | 245 | lxvi     | 34 | 109r | 66v  |  | - | - | -    |                               |
| 69 | 247 | lxvii    | 11 | 110r | 68r  |  | - | - | -    |                               |
| 70 | 253 | lxviii   | 14 | 113r | 74v  |  | - | - | -    |                               |
| 71 | 255 | lxix     | 4  | 113v | 75v  |  | - | - | -    |                               |
| 72 | 258 | lxx      | 28 | 115r | 78r  |  | - | - | -    |                               |
| 73 | 258 | lxxi     | 25 | 115v | 78r  |  | - | - | -    |                               |
| 74 | 259 | lxxii    | 17 | 115v | 78v  |  | - | - | -    |                               |
| 75 | 260 | lxxiii   | 27 | 116r | 79r  |  | - | - | -    |                               |
| 76 | 263 | lxxiv    | 1  |      |      |  |   |   |      | <i>Apostropha ad Ricardum</i> |
| 77 | 264 | lxxv     | 5  | 118r | 83v  |  | - | - | -    |                               |
| 78 | 266 | lxxvi    | 21 | 119r | 85r  |  | - | - | -    |                               |
| 79 | 268 | lxxvii   | 30 | 120r | 86v  |  | - | - | -    |                               |
| 80 | 269 | lxxviii  | 22 | 120v | -    |  | - | - | -    | <i>Apostropha ad lectorem</i> |
| 81 | 270 | lxxix    | 13 | 121r | 89r  |  | - | - | -    |                               |
| 82 | 272 | lxxx     | 29 | 122r | 90v  |  | - | - | -    |                               |
| 83 | 274 | lxxxi    | 31 | 122v | 91r  |  | - | - | -    |                               |
| 84 | 275 | lxxxii   | 1  | 123v | 92v  |  | - | - | -    |                               |
| 85 | 276 | lxxxiii  | 20 | 123v | 92v  |  | - | - | -    |                               |
| 86 | 280 | lxxxiv   | 1  | 125v | 95v  |  | - | - | 127r |                               |
| 87 | 288 | lxxxv    | 1  | 130r | -    |  | - | - | 130v |                               |
| 88 | 292 | lxxxvi   | 25 | 132r | 103v |  | - | - | 132r | To Archbishop Robert          |
| 89 | 296 | lxxxvii  | 11 | 133v | 106r |  | - | - | 133v |                               |
| 90 | 299 | lxxxviii | 1  |      |      |  |   |   |      |                               |
| 91 | 300 | lxxxix   | 22 |      |      |  |   |   |      |                               |

IV

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | Wants leaves / text  |
| - | Wants explanatory rubrics present in other manuscripts, carries the poem |
|   | Carries the poem, no explanatory rubrics in any manuscript               |

|    |  |
|----|--|
| *  | Wants one leaf   |
| ** | Skips over c. one page length of text, has only the seven last lines of the poem |

**Table 2: Poems and explanatory rubrics per meter**

| Meter<br>(Christiansen) | Poems | Explanatory<br>rubrics |
|-------------------------|-------|------------------------|
| 1                       | 35    | 4                      |
| 2                       | 1     | 1                      |
| 3                       | 3     | 3                      |
| 4                       | 2     | 2                      |
| 5                       | 2     | 2                      |
| 6                       | 1     | 1                      |
| 7                       | 2     | 2                      |
| 8                       | 1     | 1                      |
| 9                       | 4     | 4                      |
| 10                      | 1     | 1                      |
| 11                      | 3     | 3                      |
| 12                      | 1     | 1                      |
| 13                      | 1     | 1                      |
| 14                      | 3     | 2                      |
| 15                      | 1     | 1                      |
| 16                      | 2     | 2                      |
| 17                      | 2     | 2                      |
| 18                      | 1     | 1                      |
| 19                      | 1     | 0                      |
| 20                      | 1     | 1                      |
| 21                      | 1     | 1                      |
| 22                      | 7     | 4                      |
| 23                      | 1     | 0                      |
| 24                      | 1     | 0                      |
| 25                      | 2     | 2                      |
| 26                      | 1     | 0                      |
| 27                      | 1     | 1                      |
| 28                      | 1     | 1                      |
| 29                      | 1     | 1                      |
| 30                      | 1     | 1                      |
| 31                      | 1     | 1                      |
| 32                      | 1     | 1                      |
| 33                      | 1     | 1                      |
| 34                      | 1     | 1                      |

**Table 3: Poems and explanatory rubrics per book**

| Book | Poems | Explanatory<br>rubrics |
|------|-------|------------------------|
| I    | 12    | 6                      |
| II   | 12    | 2                      |
| III  | 15    | 2                      |
| IV   | 52    | 41                     |

**Table 4: Variety of meters per book**

| Book  | Amount<br>of meters |
|-------|---------------------|
| I     | 6                   |
| II    | 2                   |
| III   | 3                   |
| IV    | 33                  |
| I-III | 8                   |