

Omnibus ad quos praesentes litterae peruenerint salutem.

When complete, this List will serve both as an index to identified texts that are mentioned in documents printed in the Corpus of British medieval library catalogues and as a repertory of identification notes. As a by-product of their role in explaining medieval book-lists, these notes should also be serviceable as a quick finding-list for a wide range of medieval texts.

The types of document brought together in the Corpus and the editorial procedures of the series are set out in a prefatory note in volume 3. It is envisaged that there will be seventeen volumes with an index when the Corpus is complete, and a list of volumes will be found at the website. The present work anticipates completion by presenting the cumulative index information for identified texts as the series progresses. At the end of the main listing there is a note which indicates which volumes have been taken into account and gives the date of the current version. The electronic version is updated as volumes pass through the general editor's hands in that time. The information presented here has been derived in large measure from the individual volumes, but the building up of information in the indexing process has often clarified and improved identification notes, and further verification and revision are constantly taking place.

While organized as an index, this listing is quite unlike an ordinary index in that what it seeks to index must first be identified.

Identification before indexing

The identification of texts from entries in medieval book-lists is often enough a straightforward matter. The editors of documents in the Corpus will not have laboured long over 'Augustinus de ciuitate Dei', though an entry such as 'Ouidius magnus' needs to be explained by reference to the manuscript evidence for how Ovid was copied and read in the middle ages. Unfortunately many entries in our documents are much more obscure, and until something is identified with a reasonable degree of confidence it cannot be indexed. In such cases the information presented by the index must justify the decision to index an item under a particular author and title.

For example, the catalogue entry 'Anselmus de septem beatitudinibus' is indexed under Alexander of Canterbury, *Liber ex dictis beati Anselmi*, and identified as an extract from that work, chapter 5, which has an independent circulation. This is done on the basis of information derived from the manuscript transmission of the work. Such information, relevant though it is to the medieval reception of a text, may not be relevant to the establishment of a modern critical text, and in interpreting the documents presented in the Corpus editors may have had to do work that quite reasonably lay outside the investigations of the original editors of the texts in question. In this case the same work is also found entered as 'Anselmus de xiiii beatitudinibus' (BM1.222c), but that entry comes from a catalogue, from Dover priory in 1389, that habitually includes the incipit of the text referred to, and for that reason it can be securely identified as this chapter of Alexander's book. Without that incipit, this title would ordinarily have been indexed under the pseudo-Anselmian work *De XIII partibus beatitudinis*, an adaptation of chapters 47–71 of *Similitudines Anselmi*, widely circulated as a separate text. In cases such as these the index references given here need to include enough information from the original document to enable the user of the present List to judge the basis on which an index entry is constructed. Both of these texts circulate in Anselm's name and both derive from his style of teaching; although neither is now regarded as his work, cross-references will be found under Anselm's name in the List.

This example is not a particularly difficult one. The two texts are well known and most catalogue entries will have been indexed under one or other heading. Ambiguity unsupported by an incipit may mean that in a small proportion of examples an item has been indexed under the wrong heading, and with these there is a warning of the difficulty in the identification notes.

The notes on the original documents are an essential intermediary between the documents to be indexed and the construction of the index. Those notes will often concisely assert an identification based on the editor's knowledge. So, for example, a volume described in the 1202 catalogue from Rochester, 'Liber de predestinatione et libero arbitrio et Arator et alia' (B79.138), has been indexed under Augustine's *De predestinatione sanctorum*, the same author's *De libero arbitrio*, and Arator's *Historia apostolica*. This represents an informed editorial decision that this is a more likely combination of texts than, say, Anselm's *De concordia praescientiae et praedestinationis* and his *De libertate arbitrii* with Arator. Although many works deal with these themes separately or together, the catalogue is unlikely to have fused works of two different authors without giving their names. And the editor will in any case have taken account of the manuscript tradition of the works he has considered in seeking an identification. Another possibility that an electronic search of this List reveals is something reported from the early 16th-cent. Syon catalogue under the name of Honorius Augustodunensis with the title *De predestinatione et libero arbitrio* (SS1.232c), that is his work normally known in manuscripts simply as *De libero arbitrio*.

These two examples illustrate the sort of work that lies behind the index references printed here. Both are in the middle ground where the identification is far from obvious but not absolutely impossible. In such cases the index reference will quote from the original document. Of course, in very many cases there is little or no room for doubt about an identification, even if it is not as straightforward as 'Augustinus de ciuitate Dei'. Something such as 'Symbolum beati Augustini' can be confidently identified as Gregory of Elvira, *De fide catholica*, but in making that identification the editor has had to recognize the common medieval label for a work now known under a different title. Such information may emerge from a consideration of the manuscript transmission, but in many instances it is quickly apparent from this List itself. The titles quoted from the documents show that Isidore's *Sententiae* was more often known to its medieval readers as 'Isidorus de summo bono'; more than half of the catalogue entries indexed use the latter title.

It is an important aim of our project as a whole to learn how medieval readers used and understood their books. Differences in attribution or title between normal medieval practice and modern standard references are something we must learn to recognize and appreciate. The documents printed in the Corpus are a valuable part of the evidence for that, but they must be interpreted with the help of surviving manuscripts and early printed books.

There is a degree to which users must trust the editors of the Corpus to have made the correct identifications, or the index would be unreliable. The formation of this List while the work of the series is still in progress does allow for continuous correction and improvement as further documents provide new information on the meaning of particular entries; this can then feed back into identification notes in later volumes of the corpus. Here we have an advantage over an index compiled at the end of the project as a simple key to what had been printed from the first volume in 1990 onwards. Where we are conscious of uncertainty in an identification, that needs to be shown in the index reference. There are three methods of doing this. An obelus (†) indicates a simple uncertainty, where, for example, a catalogue entry might easily refer to two or three different works. The original entry is quoted in these circumstances, and the user who is familiar with the text under whose entry the reference has been found may well be able to understand what the uncertainty is from that information. A user who wants more explanation should consult the note on the original entry. In cases where the identification

offered seems a very long shot, I have used two obeli (††) against the index reference. For example, the entry ‘Liber Luciferi’ (B115. 30) in an early-12th-cent. list of school-books from Worcester has an index entry under Lucifer of Cagliari, though this seems highly improbable; it may be hoped that, before we are finished, a better identification will have been found. In some cases uncertainty may be more precisely a question of ambiguity in an entry. So an entry ‘Prosper’ will normally refer to Iulianus Pomerius, *De uita actiua et contemplatiua*, widely attributed to Prosper of Aquitaine in medieval copies; among school-books, however, the same one-word entry is more likely to be interpreted as Prosper’s own *Epigrammata*. Where the context in the original document does not point one way or the other, the entry is likely to have been indexed under both identifications, and in such cases the index reference is marked (§).

In cases of doubt or ambiguity the identification note on the original entry will make clear the editor’s thinking on the question. Where the number of possibilities is greater than two or three, an entry cannot be considered to have even an approximate identification and will not have been indexed. As I wrote in volume 3, guesses and speculation about what an opaque entry refers to may be of momentary interest when reading a document; divorced from the document itself and indexed among confident identifications, these can only be misleading and they are avoided in the notes. Such items are almost invariably anonymous, and there will be index entries for them in the volume where the original document was printed. Those indexes try to refer anonymous works to generic headings in the hope of making information more recoverable. These have not yet reached a good enough level of clarity to be incorporated in the present List, though it does include anonymous works whose identification is not in doubt. Where the entry names an author and yet still proves seriously unidentifiable, there will be an index entry here after the authentic and pseudonymous works of the author in question. An example is the unidentified ‘Eusebius episcopus super Ecclesiasticum’ (B26.1). Again it may be hoped that, before we are finished, an identification will have been found.

The process of building this List has itself been very instructive. It has brought together information that helps discriminate between two wholly different kinds of uncertainty. There are still dark places where we have not yet fully overcome the gap between how medieval librarians and readers would normally perceive or refer to a text and our modern expectations. In more than a few cases, however, the original document was concerned simply to identify a book as an object. The list printed for Bermondsey (though with serious reservations about its provenance) was the work of someone often content to write, ‘Alius liber qui sic incipit, *Herbarum quasdam*’ (B9.32), ‘Alius liber qui sic incipit, *Hodierne festiuitatis*’ (69), ‘Item unum nigrum librum qui incipit, *Tres sunt qui testimonium dant*’ (80), ‘Alius liber non ligatus qui sic incipit, *Quoniam in ante expositis libris*’ (87), ‘Alius liber qui sic incipit, *Mundi gloriam*’ (95); he at least provides a textual incipit, and among these entries 32 and 87 can be easily identified and indexed, the others cannot. Some documents can be very vague or opaque. Because the index quotes original entries in cases of doubt or where the entry deviates substantively from the standard modern title of a work, patterns emerge that help to enlighten us. Those medieval cataloguers, such as John Whitfield at Dover in 1389, who regularly give both title and incipit, are particularly helpful because they provide confirmation of what may have been an editor’s inferred identification for the same title in another document. Where any such editorial identification is involved, the existence of corroboration from another document is indicated by including the abbreviation ‘inc.’ for ‘incipit’ in the index reference for the entry that has provided it.

The composition of index entries

When the work has been done to identify what a document entry refers

to, this information is presented in a note on that entry, and these notes are collected here with index references. In most cases they are kept to a conventional form, so that there is consistency in the way the same text is identified throughout the Corpus. In my note on editorial procedures in volume 3 I expressed my hope that these conventions are sufficiently perspicuous not to require explanation. The main point is that an identification note consists of two components: first, the definition of what the work is, by author and title, or by title alone, or in some cases by fuller description, and secondly, separated by a colon, bibliographical references for the work.

The definition has required standardization of titles. For clarity's sake standard modern titles are preferred, and where there exists a definitive reference guide such as *Clavis patrum Latinorum* (*CPL*) its titles are adopted. All medieval titles that appear in our documents are quoted after the index references. The language of titles is usually that of the text itself but Greek is used only in cases where the book referred to by the original document was in Greek; Latin versions predominate and Latin is preferred. With some generic texts such as commentaries, an English word such as commentary or gloss is often preferred to avoid the random variation in the medieval catalogues.

In some categories of text, modern norms do not reflect medieval practice. So, for example, with patristic letter collections, individual letters as they are now collected in print were in many cases formerly regarded as treatises with titles of their own, such as 'Augustinus de uidendo Deo' (his *ep.* 147); these are preserved in the List in the form *Epistula de uidendo Deo*.

Examples of definitions that need to be fuller include translations. The List includes three Latin versions of John of Damascus's work written in Greek and usually titled *De fide orthodoxa*, by Burgundio of Pisa, Robert Grosseteste, and Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples. In most cases the translator is not specified and the editor has had to infer from context which is most likely. With some translations this level of discrimination has not been possible and several are brought together in a single note. For the use of the list, it is especially problematic with common texts for which more than one translation was in circulation, sometimes identifiable and sometimes not: with the works of Aristotle, for example, more often than not our catalogues do not allow this discrimination, but some entries will be identifiable as one version rather than another. In such cases one might have created separate notes for each version, but what to do with those not attributable? I have preferred to retain a single note for multiple versions, marking the few distinct versions as appropriate in brackets after the index references.

It is sometimes necessary to provide two-tier definition. What was known in the middle ages as 'Athanasius' is a group of texts that can each be given definitive titles; two medieval labels 'Bernardus in soliloquiis' or 'Bernardus de amore Dei' refer to the same pair of works by Bernard's disciple and biographer William of Saint-Thierry. Standard collections such as the *Logica uetus* or *Paruum uolumen* are sometimes described by the medieval catalogues as a single unit and sometimes by their components, but we have to identify them in both respects. Cross-references are used.

The bibliographical references that follow the colon are as concise as is compatible with explicating the identification. A standard guide such as *CPL* may be all that is needed. In most cases an edition is given and one or more reference works. These are not 'comprehensive', in the sense that because Bloomfield is cited for some works it would be cited for anything it contains. The only virtue in heaping up such references is that it helps bring together incomplete references to the same work, but it is hoped that the editing of the List has avoided the problem of treating a title drawn from one document with a Bloomfield reference and another from a second document with a Stegmüller reference as different works when they are one and the same. Fuller information may be added in specific cases, but there is no intention of providing a detailed bibliographical commentary. The purpose of these notes is to provide immediate assurance that we know what the text is with which we

have matched entries from our documents, and also to give a simple pointer for the user who wants to pursue the text itself.

The form of index references

Much has already been said above about the index references. These usually consist of two parts, a letter and number designating the documentary source and a running number within the document. So A1.1 is the first item in the first document from an Austin canons' house; it is a copy of Proverbs from Anglesey priory. Z27.5 is the fifth (and last) item from the last document from a Cistercian house, a copy of Robert of Cricklade, *De connubio Iacob*, from Waverley abbey. The letters are designed to have a mnemonic characteristic, and there is an alphanumeric list of documents so far indexed in the website. Index references are given in alphabetical sequence in the List, but references derived from separate volumes of the Corpus start on a fresh line. If the contents of a volume are itemized, these are lettered 123a, 123b, &c. These numbers may be preceded by the symbols such as † or ‡ already mentioned, and in such cases the original entry is quoted in brackets after the reference. Quotation marks indicate what is verbally derived from the document, but in some instances the point at issue, such as attribution, may be indicated more concisely. Where an entry refers to only part of a work, it is identified and indexed with reference to the complete text, but the part is indicated next to the individual index reference.

Another valuable source of information is the corroboration of an identification by cross-matching with the surviving book. This is indicated by an asterisk against the index reference. Although only a small proportion of the books referred to in our documents can be matched with the actual books, when it can be done it is important to indicate this. So the entry 'Liber qui uocatur Speculum in uno uolumine' at Reading can be matched with Bodl. MS Bodley 413; this confirms the identification of the text, which is indexed under its author or compiler, Adalbert of Metz, *Speculum Gregorii*, indexed as B71.*105 (anon.). The asterisk justifies the identification and alerts the user of the index to the possibility of fuller information from the extant book. Where the medieval catalogue has not described all the contents of the book, the note on the entry may have introduced this extra information, which is marked in the index reference with a superscript x. In some cases of this kind the identification note may tend towards a catalogue description of the actual manuscript, as at A17.*30, but it will do so only for indexable titles.

There is an index reference for Adalbert's *Speculum* P4.*2^x = H2.*1317. In this case the catalogue entry at P4.2 does not itemize the contents, but the book survives and provides the extra data; this book was transferred from the Premonstratensian house at Hagnaby around 1530 to the Royal Library at Westminster, where it appears again in the 1542 inventory H2.1317, where this item of the contents is specified. The equals sign prevents a single book from appearing as two in the index. It is most commonly used where there are several documents from a single library, though if there is extensive repetition between documents from one house they will not have been separately indexed; the index references given will lead into cross-references presented in the notes on the document.

One of the sources of the index is particularly difficult in this respect. *Registrum Anglie* is a union catalogue, and for any entry there it is necessary to specify in the index how many copies are covered. There are added uncertainties here in that one union reference may cover multiple copies at that location, or the compilers of *Registrum* may have merged more than one work under a single heading, but questions of that kind are mostly left in the notes on entries in the document itself. In some cases *Registrum* reports a copy of a work from a library for which we have other documentary evidence. Jerome's Commentary on Isaiah was reported in the *Registrum* in twenty-seven different libraries, from seven of which we have local documentary evidence; often the equals sign will not serve in a case such as this, because *Registrum* does not

record individual copies. A single reference to Christ Church refers to a text's being available there, but we may know from the Eastry catalogue BC4 that it was available in multiple copies, each separately indexed. Index references to *Registrum* will always try to refer in brackets to overlap with other documents, but they should be used with caution in any attempt to count the number of copies attested in the Corpus.

The difficulties presented by *Registrum Anglie* are compounded in the *Catalogus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum* by Henry of Kirkstead. Henry's aim was a bibliography, not a catalogue, and in that sense he has no business in the series or in this index. However, the format he adopted was modelled on *Registrum Angliae*; he included union references taken from *Registrum*, and he added union references for copies he had seen in the library of his own abbey, Bury St Edmunds, and elsewhere. Sometimes it is possible to match his reference with the copy from which he worked and which bears the marks of his use. For these reasons it is necessary to include his work in the index. But entries framed from bibliographical sources—Jerome, Gennadius, and Isidore were well quarried, leading to the inclusion of works that have left no real trace since late antiquity—can be confusing. Some such sources were much closer to his own time—Vincent of Beauvais, Ranulf Higden, and a fourteenth-century catalogue of Dominican authors—and all these are of considerable interest for cultural history. They have generally been included, but the symbol <> is used to show that the reference is empty in the sense that no copy of the author, or the work, lies directly behind it. This symbol is always used where Kirkstead's sources are the only reason for the inclusion of a particular author or title; where a work is included for other reasons, the symbol <> is only used where there is very poor attestation, for fear that two or three speculative references might be construed as indicating that there were copies certainly in England. For example, Kirkstead's reference to Columella, alongside reference to a printed copy at Syon in the early 16th cent., might be misconstrued as evidence for medieval circulation and is therefore marked <>. Or where Kirkstead refers to 'Boethius de diffinitionibus', there is nothing doubtful about the text meant (it was the work of Marius Victorinus), so † is not appropriate; but the only other attestation in the List is a speculative guess at an opaque entry from Peterborough, and the reference to Kirkstead is marked <> so that it does not lend support to the implied availability of this text in England.

Other documents present different complexities. Several of our most complete catalogues have their own indexes, and in two cases these reflect changes in the content of the libraries. Both at St Augustine's Canterbury at the end of the 15th cent. and at Syon in the early 16th cent., we find works entered in the original indexes that do not have a place in the current state of the catalogue. The indexes have preserved a clue to texts later deaccessioned, and they deserve to be represented in our index now. Such items are marked with a superscript i.

Finally, both notes on identifications and index references ought to take account of the difference between medieval manuscript books and printed books of the late 15th and early 16th cent. At its simplest this principle means that, where a document describes a collection of mostly printed books, the index references contain a paraph sign (B55.¶61). In some cases the actual book from the library has survived, and the asterisk can be combined with the paraph (H2.¶*516). Again a book may contain texts not referred to in the catalogue, and the superscript x can be used with extra items. Where a catalogue provides the information to establish the exact printing, the actual book referred to in the catalogue need not have survived, since other copies will provide the information.

Where a text is recorded here in an early printed book, the identification note on the original document will usually provide information on the editions in existence when the document was drawn up. This information is rarely carried into the note here unless there is no modern edition. In those circum-

stances the *editio princeps* is often the preferred reference, but it will sometimes make sense to include the edition represented by the catalogue. Under these circumstances the symbols ¶* will be attached to the abbreviation pr. in the bibliographical notice. Occasionally our documents will provide evidence for printed editions of which no copy has survived (B55.¶120, ¶121).

The regular user who learns to recognize the references for particular documents will notice patterns. An obvious one is the number of works recorded from SS1 (the early 16th-cent. Syon catalogue) and H2 (the 1542 Westminster inventory) that are not found in other sources: this is a reflection of their late date relative to other documents used. More interesting is the overlap of references to one or both of these with two smaller 16th-cent. documents, the post-Dissolution list from Monk Bretton (B55) and the record of Prior More's book-purchases 1518–31 (B117). At a future date it may be possible to achieve a database structure that would allow the user to select documents of a particular period or type and produce a selective index that would make such patterns more conspicuous.

The arrangement of the List as a whole

The List is alphabetically arranged. Authors account for the majority of main entries, with their works for the most part listed alphabetically. Author entries are often subdivided, so that after their authentic works there are sub-headings for pseudonymous works and for works attributed to the author in a catalogue entry that are not commonly found with that author's name. There is always a preference for placing the entry under the true author of a work, with cross-references from pseudonymous attributions. In some cases the true author is unknown, and a text such as *De XII abusiuis saeculi* is under Augustine ps. with a cross-reference from Cyprian ps. Anonymous works are entered by title in the principal alphabetical sequence. In all cases the alphabetical arrangement is by keywords, ignoring connectives such as 'of' or 'de' in authors' names, and ignoring definite articles in vernacular titles.

The chief exception to the alphabetical arrangement of titles within an entry is biblical commentaries, which are arranged in their biblical sequence. Translations of a work into more than one language are listed alphabetically by language under the original or Latin title, but successive translations from one language into another by different translators are listed in chronological order; an example already cited is the three translations of John of Damascus by Burgundio of Pisa (†1193), Robert Grosseteste (†1253), and Jacques Lefèvre (†1536).

Apart from the need to standardize and stabilize titles, the main difficulty in arrangement has been deciding the forms of authors' names. I have tried to be pragmatic, but the difficulties are immense. In a list of authors that covers two thousand years and many countries and languages, there is no applicable standard. While the great majority of the authors involved wrote in Latin, it is not the case that all have agreed Latin names, and it is certain that, for those who wrote in the vernacular, Latinization of the author's name would be wholly artificial. This means that a multilingual arrangement is inevitable, though some priority has been given to English usage. This seemed inevitable: even if the matrix language were Latin, a choice would have to be made between Gullielmus, Willelmus, and variants, and the user would have to work out what it was; William is instead the keyword. Even where writers have definite Latin names, the span of time covered means that we have a variety of naming styles in use. Roman authors are entered under their Latin names but alphabetized according to modern English convention, so P. Vergilius Maro is under U/V, Q. Horatius Flaccus under H, L. Annaeus Seneca under S, and D. Iunius Iuuenalis under I/J. M. Tullius Cicero is entered under C, because modern English calls him Cicero where it used to be English practice to call him Tully. With later Latin authors such as Boethius or Juvencus, the familiar name has been used. In the case of Jerome, he is entered as such with a cross-reference from Hieronymus; but others of the latter name, such as Hierony-

mus Donatus and Girolamo Savonarola remain under H. Common baptismal names may be used in different languages—Iacobus, James, Jacques, Jakob, and Diego; Aegidius, Giles, Gilles, and Egidio—but all are indexed in one sequence under the English form, with cross-references from other forms. This helps to insure that no one is entered twice, far apart in alphabetical sequence, by accident of language, and saves the user from having to guess what language may have been adopted for the lemma. Writers with multiple elements to the name add to the difficulty. First forename and surname are treated as the keywords, so that Giovanni Ludovico Vivaldi and Juan Luis Vivés are alphabetized under John V without regard to their middle names; Petrus Iohannis Olivi is entered under Peter O, ignoring his patronymic; but Augustinus Datus Senensis (Agostino Dati of Siena) and Leonardus Brunus Aretinus (Leonardo Bruni of Arezzo) are alphabetized in accordance with their surnames and not their place of origin. Where exceptions are made, it is done to privilege familiarity over consistency: Angelus Politianus rather than Angelo Ambrosini, Antoninus Florentinus rather than Antonino Pierozzi, Erasmus rather than Desiderius. Through the middle ages Latinization was common but very often ad hoc and unstable, and I have simply followed instinct. In the 15th and 16th cent. it became commonplace for writers to adopt and use Latin names, sometimes only for purposes of writing, sometimes also in daily life. With many of these I have found it convenient to add the appropriate vernacular form in brackets. Greek authors appear only in the familiar Latin form, but Arabic authors are given a transliterated form of their Arabic names after the conventional Latin spellings.