

*Mikhail Khorkov*

ORCID: 0000-0001-6777-632X

Instytut Historii Nauki im. L. i A. Birkenmajerów Polskiej Akademii Nauk

## MANUSCRIPT OUT OF PLACE? A MEDIEVAL COMPOSITE MANUSCRIPT AS A CHALLENGE TO ITS CATALOGUING<sup>1</sup>

### Rękopis nie na swoim miejscu? Średniowieczny rękopis złożony jako wyzwanie dla jego katalogowania

**Summary:** The paper reconstructs history of formation and development of the structure of the manuscript Moscow, Russian State Library, Fonds 201, No. 35, which originated from the Erfurt Charterhouse in the fifteenth century. Judging from the content of the texts included in it, the manuscript consists of two parts, as all its descriptions confirm. However, the handwritten medieval catalogue of the library of the Carthusian monastery in Erfurt (Erfurt, Bistumsarchiv, Ms. Hist. 6) gives a different picture, namely, that the Moscow manuscript was gradually formed and in fact consists of three parts: one original part and two other parts added to it later. The content of the first part (tropology) corresponds to a large extent to the topic of the shelf-mark group “H” into which it was placed by the Carthusian librarian, whereas the texts of the second and third parts are thematically different. The paper attempts to explain the librarian’s reasoning for combining these three parts into one codex.

**Keywords:** Erfurt Carthusian monastery Salvatorberg, late medieval Carthusian libraries, fifteenth-century manuscript collections, Medieval manuscripts, John Hagen de Indagine, Jacob Volradi

**Słowa kluczowe:** Erfurt – klasztor kartuzów Salvatorberg, późnośredniowieczne biblioteki kartuzów, Rękopisy średniowieczne, Jan Hagen de Indagine, Jakub Volradi

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper is based on a talk given on 25 October 2023 at the International Research Colloquium “Manuscripta dicunt” at the L. & A. Birkenmajer Institute for the History of Science of the Polish Academy of Sciences in Warsaw. This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 847639 and from the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Poland.

Catalogues or inventory descriptions of collected manuscripts are very often faced with the problem of correlating the current structure of a manuscript and the history of how this manuscript came to be formed from the texts from which it ended up being composed. Very often, formal-structural, and genetic perspectives coincide in a consistent manner, and then the question of their correlation does not cause a significant problem. In some cases, however, the two approaches do not match up perfectly, leaving the researcher with the task of telling not one but two stories about the same manuscript. And these stories may differ, overlapping only partially. The codex Moscow, Russian State Library (RSL), Fonds 201, No. 35, which originated in the late fifteenth century in the library of the Carthusian monastery of Salvatorberg in Erfurt, can most likely be placed among such manuscripts with a doubly complex history<sup>2</sup>. All descriptions of this manuscript that are available today<sup>3</sup> clearly indicate that it consists of two main parts, both in terms of the content and titles of the texts it contains, and in terms of their origin and codicological integrity<sup>4</sup>. Such a conclusion results primarily from an analysis of its formal structure as it appears today to researchers studying the composition and content of the texts contained in this manuscript.

Here, at this point, it seems necessary to make a few essential reservations about what this article is actually devoted to. It does not seek to provide an exhaustive answer to all the questions raised by the study of this voluminous manuscript, which covers more than 330 folios and small fragments and includes dozens of texts, heterogeneous in content and origin, transcribed or copied by different hands in different places and at different times. It is obvious that the task of a possible comprehensive study of this manuscript, if someone had set it in terms of practical implementation, would be not so much the subject of a small article, like this one, as of a lengthy monograph, which, perhaps, someone would write at some point in the future. As of today, a magnificently detailed and fairly lengthy description of the manuscript is provided by the catalogue of Daria Barow-Vassilevitch and Marie-Luise Heckmann, to which it is recommended to

<sup>2</sup> Shorter versions of this study, which could not yet take into account important recent publications, were presented earlier in the form of brief German papers at two conferences: “Sammeln, kopieren, verbreiten. Zur Buchkultur der Kartäuser gestern und heute” (13-16 July 2017, Ittingen, Switzerland); “Deutsche Kultur in russischen Buch- und Handschriftenbeständen” (16-17 April 2018, Moscow, Russia).

<sup>3</sup> *Biblioteka Avraama Sergeeviča Norova*, t. 1, St. Petersburg 1868, p. 215 (VIII: Theologie, No. 25); *Opisanije i obzor sobranija rukopisej Avraama Sergeeviča Norova*, Fond 201, Moskva 1953, p. 43–46 (Nr. 35), available online on the website of the Russian State Library: <http://dlib.rsl.ru/viewer/01004724413#?page=1>; the third and most recent description: D. Barow-Vassilevitch, M.-L. Heckmann, *Abendländische Handschriften des Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit in den Beständen der Russischen Staatsbibliothek (Moskau)*, Wiesbaden 2016, p. 206–213.

<sup>4</sup> D. Barow-Vassilevitch, M.-L. Heckmann, *Abendländische Handschriften*, p. 206: “Die Hs. besteht aus zwei Teilen”.

refer for a great number of details, primarily of a specifically codicological nature<sup>5</sup>. It would be an unnecessary repetition to put them all in this article, given the existence of such an excellent catalogue, especially since the purpose of this study is not so much a revision as a small supplement to what has been achieved in the catalogue mentioned. However, this supplement, in the opinion of the author of this study, is very significant, allowing to look at both the manuscript itself and its description in the catalogue from a new perspective, from which no one has ever looked at this subject before.

Thus, not all the codicological and paleographical details comprehensively described in the catalogue can be considered relevant to support the hypothesis outlined in this study. However, this does not mean that they cannot be interesting in themselves and therefore deserve separate studies devoted to them. Indeed, some of them, which are important for the argumentation of this study, will certainly be mentioned below with references to the relevant pages of the catalogue or to the manuscript itself.

The first part of the manuscript contains mainly devotional, mystical and spiritual texts that can be described as quite typical for a Carthusian monastic library. Their availability in the library of the Erfurt Carthusians should therefore come as no surprise. The overwhelming majority of these texts are autographs of the Erfurt Carthusian John (Ioannes) de Indagine (c. 1415–1475), who was also known under the names Johannes Hagen and Johannes Brewer. From 1457 to 1460, he was a prior of the Carthusian monastery Salvatorberg in Erfurt. John de Indagine became famous as the author of numerous mystical works, spiritual interpretations of the Bible and treatises on monastic reform (about five hundred different texts in total) that have spread far beyond the Carthusian monasteries of Central and Eastern Germany<sup>6</sup>. In the first part of the Moscow manuscript, they are in clear majority:

- Ioannes de Indagine, *De passione Christi* (ff. 1r–48r);
- Ioannes de Indagine, *De passione Domini* (ff. 49r–63v);

<sup>5</sup> D. Barow-Vassilevitch, M.-L. Heckmann, *Abendländische Handschriften*, p. 206–213.

<sup>6</sup> J. Klapper, *Der Erfurter Kartäuser Johannes Hagen. Ein Reformtheologe des 15. Jahrhunderts*, t. 1: *Leben und Werk*, Leipzig 1960 (Erfurter Theologische Studien 9); H. Rütting, *Jean Hagen de Indagine*, [in:] *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique*, t. 8, Paris 1973, coll. 543–552; D. Mertens, *Hagen, Johannes*, [in:] *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Verfasserlexikon*, 2nd ed., Berlin–New York 1981, t. 3, coll. 388–398; E. Kleineidam, *Die Theologische Richtung der Erfurter Kartäuser am Ende des 15. Jahrhunderts. Versuch einer Einheit der Theologie*, [in:] *Miscellanea Erfordiana*, eds. E. Kleineidam, H. Schürmann, Leipzig 1962 (Erfurter Theologische Studien 12), p. 247–271; S.M. Metzger, *The Manuscripts of Writings by Ioannes Hagen de Indagine, O. Cart.*, “Bulletin de Philosophie Médiévale” 2008, t. 50, p. 175–256; S.M. Metzger, *The “Tractatus de mystica theologia” by Ioannes de Indagine, O. Cart. († 1475)*, [in:] *Contemplation and Philosophy. Scholastic and Mystical Modes of Medieval Philosophical Thought, A Tribute to Kent Emery, Jr.*, eds. R. Hofmeister Pich, A. Speer, Leiden 2018 (Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 125), p. 599–674.

- Michael de Massa, *Meditationes vitae Christi* (ff. 64r–88v);
- Thomas a Kempis, *De imitatione Christi* libri IV, liber II (ff. 89r–98r);
- Augustinus Hipponensis, Excerpts (ff. 98v–99v);
- Henricus Suso, *Horologium Sapientiae*, Excerpts (ff. 100r–105v);
- Pseudo-Isidorus Hispalensis, *De norma vivendi* (ff. 106r–108v);
- Thomas a Kempis, *De imitatione Christi* libri IV, liber III (IV) (ff. 108r–112v);
- Augustinus Hipponensis, *Manuale*, cap. 1–21 (ff. 116r–121v);
- Theodoricus de Apolda, *Vita s. Elyzabeth lantgravie*, Excerpt (ff. 122r–130r);
- Ioannes de Indagine, *Expositio hymnorum* (ff. 131r–138v);
- A Passion Play (ff. 139r–143v);
- Augustinus Favaroni, *Sermo de conceptione Virginis* (ff. 144r–147v);
- Benedictus XII., Papa, Bulla *Pastor bonus* (ff. 148r–150v);
- Ioannes de Indagine, *De missa conventuali, De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum* (ff. 151r–156r);
- Ioannes de Indagine, *De mystica theologia* (ff. 157r–158v);
- Ioannes de Indagine, *Sermo de Spiritu Sancto* (ff. 159r–168v);
- Ioannes de Indagine, *Sermo de nativitate beatae Mariae* (f. 170rv).

The second part of the Moscow manuscript differs significantly from its first part. It contains mainly philosophical commentaries on the logical and psychological writings of Aristotle, computistic writings and treatises on natural philosophy associated with the University of Leipzig and with authors from the so-called Dresden School (Peter of Dresden and others). No matter how strange the presence of these texts in the Erfurt Carthusian library in general and in the Moscow codex in particular may seem, it can easily be explained by the fact that they could have been brought to Erfurt by a graduate of the University of Leipzig who entered the Carthusian order. It is also possible that these texts were included in the Erfurt Carthusian library simply because of the extensive connections of the monks of the Salvatorberg monastery, which enabled them to obtain a variety of books from different sources, either by donation or purchase. Regardless of what links all these philosophical texts together and how they came to be included in the Erfurt Carthusian library, they are arranged in the Moscow manuscript as follows:

- Anonymus, *Commentarius in Aristotelem De anima*, fragment (f. 180v);
- Simon Favershamsensis, *Quaestiones super libros priorum Analyticorum Aristotelis* (ff. 181r–206v);
- Simon Favershamsensis, *Quaestiones libri Porphyrii* (ff. 207r–216r);
- Simon Favershamsensis, *Quaestiones super librum Praedicamentorum* (ff. 216r–230v);
- Jacobus de Hattem, *Computus chiometralis* (ff. 231r–243v);
- Ioannes a Polonia, *Computus manualis* (ff. 244r–248r);
- Petrus Dresdensis (Petrus Gerticz de Dresden), *Parvulus philosophiae naturalis cum glossis (Commentarius in physicam Aristotelis)* (ff. 249r–273v);

- Vincentius Varnholte de Spandau, *Commentarius in Parvulum philosophiae naturalis* (ff. 274r–329r).

The question of the extent to which the works collected in this part of the codex can reflect the standard curriculum of the faculty of philosophy of the late medieval University of Leipzig remains open. All the texts of this part were copied by one hand in Leipzig and Erfurt around 1450, as reported by the corresponding colophons, which also mention the name of the scribe. It was John (Johannes) Selmenitz, who studied philosophy at Leipzig<sup>7</sup>. One can well assume that these texts most likely reflect the general plan, and perhaps even the order of teaching such disciplines as grammar, logic (dialectics) and philosophy of nature. It is also quite possible that this collection expresses the individual preferences of the professor under whose guidance John Selmenitz studied. As far as is known, this professor was Master John (Johannes) Euderitz<sup>8</sup>. It seems that all the works of the second part of the codex, and especially the texts of Peter of Dresden and Vincent of Spandau, were undoubtedly used in the teaching of philosophy, as evidenced by the interlineal glosses and numerous marginalia containing commentaries on certain theories of Peripatetic logic and physics. Most likely, the works of the second part were not originally bound either as a whole or in parts either in Leipzig or later in Erfurt until they were included in a single codex, now known as RSL, Fonds 201, No. 35, which was bound at the end of the fifteenth century already for the Erfurt Carthusian library together with other texts that formed its first part. The late medieval binding is preserved. It most likely dates to the late fifteenth century. In addition to old and new shelf-marks on its outside and inside, it contains a small slip of paper pasted in at the beginning that has a short note of contents for the entire volume, listing the works included in it. This was written by the Carthusian librarian after the codex was bound, and then added with glue to the inside front cover<sup>9</sup>.

The two parts, which form the manuscript in terms of its content, seem so obvious that it appears almost impossible to add anything of substantial value to the already existing descriptions of the Moscow manuscript based on the assumption of its two-part division. And yet, despite the apparent simplicity and clarity of the two-part structure of the Moscow codex, the late medieval catalogue of the library of the Erfurt Charterhouse, preserved in the Diocesan Archives of Erfurt as MS Hist. 6, reveals a different, somewhat more complex story of the origin and composition of the manuscript RSL, Fonds 201, No. 35. Most unexpectedly, a closer look at the catalogue entries reveals that the Moscow codex actually has not two but three parts. The entries for each of the parts were catalogued by the

<sup>7</sup> D. Barow-Vassilevitch, M.-L. Heckmann, *Abendländische Handschriften*, p. 207.

<sup>8</sup> D. Barow-Vassilevitch, M.-L. Heckmann, *Abendländische Handschriften*, p. 207.

<sup>9</sup> D. Barow-Vassilevitch, M.-L. Heckmann, *Abendländische Handschriften*, p. 206.

same hand of the Carthusian librarian Jacob Volradi<sup>10</sup> in different shades of ink, which obviously means that they were made at different times. Thus, the first part was written in dark black ink, which is the darkest shade of all three inks used. This part contains the following texts (using titles taken from the medieval catalogue and comparing them with contemporary descriptions):

- *De passione Christi moraliter et spiritualiter, incipit “Egredimini filie”* (= Ioannes de Indagine, *De passione Christi*, ff. 1r–48r);
- *Item de passione Christi sermo aptus ad meditandum et predicandum, incipit “Justus periiit”* (= Ioannes de Indagine, *De passione Domini*, ff. 49r–63v);
- *Excerptum passionis Christi de libro, qui dicitur Vita Christi* (= Michael de Massa, *Meditationes vitae Christi*, ff. 64r–88v);
- *Secundus liber de ymitacione Christi* (= Thomas a Kempis, *De imitatione Christi* libri IV, liber II, ff. 89r–98r; most likely added to this part a little later: Augustinus Hipponensis, Excerpts, ff. 98v–99v; Henricus Suso, *Horologium Sapientiae*, Excerpts, ff. 100r–105v; Pseudo-Isidorus Hispalensis, *De norma vivendi*, ff. 106r–108v; Thomas a Kempis, *De imitatione Christi* libri IV, liber III [IV], ff. 108r–112v);
- *Manuale b. Augustini, ut aliqui scribunt, et incipit “Quoniam in medio laqueorum”* (= Augustinus Hipponensis, *Manuale*, ff. 116r–121v);
- *Historia b. Elizabet vidue* (= Theodoricus de Apolda, *Vita s. Elyzabeth lantgravie*, Excerpt, ff. 122r–130r; most likely added to this part a little later: Ioannes de Indagine, *Expositio hymnorum*, ff. 131r–138v; a Passion Play, ff. 139r–143v; Augustinus Favaroni, *Sermo de conceptione Virginis*, ff. 144r–147v);
- *De concordia mendicantium cum plebanis notabile de extravagante Benedicti pape* (= Benedictus XII., Papa, *Bulla Pastor bonus*, ff. 148r–150v)<sup>11</sup>.

In contrast, the ink colour shade of the second catalogue entry is noticeably lighter. The following titles are written in this ink:

<sup>10</sup> Only a few facts about the life and work of the Erfurt Carthusian librarian Jacob Volradi could be reconstructed on the basis of the manuscript catalogue he compiled (Erfurt, Bistumsarchiv, Ms. Hist. 6) and other extant manuscripts from the library of the Erfurt Charterhouse. Other details of his biography are unknown. See especially: A. Märker, *Das “Prohemium longum” des Erfurter Kartäuserkatalogs aus der Zeit um 1475. Edition und Untersuchung*, t. 1–2, Bern 2008 (Lateinische Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters 35), p. 332–351; G. Fournier, *Jakob Volradi à l’œuvre. L’art de la compilation dans le catalogue de bibliothèque de la chartreuse d’Erfurt à l’exemple de l’introduction générale aux trois voies anagogiques (D, E et F)*, [in:] *Die Kartause als Text-Raum mittelalterlicher Mystik-Rezeption: Wissensdiskurse, Schreibpraktiken, Überlieferungskonstellationen*, eds. G. Fournier, B. J. Nemes, Berlin 2023 (Vita regularis. Abhandlungen 82), p. 11–83.

<sup>11</sup> Erfurt, Bistumsarchiv, Ms. Hist. 6, ff. 116v–117r; *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz*, t. 2: *Bistum Mainz: Erfurt*, ed. P. Lehmann, München 1928 (reprint 1969), p. 426–427.

- *Regula beati Augustini*;
- *Confirmacio fratrum ordinis beati Francisci per Honorium*;
- *Missa; dubia curiosa circa missam, sed non soluta* (= Ioannes de Indagine, *De missa conventuali, De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum*, ff. 151r–156r);
- *De mistica theologia per Johannem Indaginis* (= Ioannes de Indagine, *De mystica theologia*, ff. 157r–158v)<sup>12</sup>.

Two of the texts that this part of the manuscript originally contained (*Regula beati Augustini* and *Confirmacio fratrum ordinis beati Francisci per Honorium*), which in addition to the medieval catalogue are also listed in the table of contents on the flyleaf of the codex, are no longer found in the Moscow codex. At least the composers of all modern catalogue descriptions, including the most recent, could not identify them<sup>13</sup>.

The third part was again written in darker ink. This part includes the titles of the remaining texts contained in the manuscript:

- *De modo intellegendi divina eloquia* (= Ioannes de Indagine, *Sermo de Spiritu Sancto*, ff. 159r–168v; Ioannes de Indagine, *Sermo de nativitate beatae Mariae*, f. 170rv);
- *Divisio libri decretalium cum declaracione terminorum, qui difficiles habentur in singulis libris earundem, et modo abbreviandi in iure* (= *Divisio decretalium, declaratio terminum et regulae iuris*, ff. 171v–180r)<sup>14</sup>;
- *Questiones circa librum priorum Aristotelis* (= Anonymus, *Commentarius in Aristotelem De anima*, fragment, f. 180v; Simon Favershamensis, *Quaestiones super libros priorum Analyticorum Aristotelis*, ff. 181r–206v);
- *Questiones circa librum Porphyrii, item predicamentorum* (= Simon Favershamensis, *Quaestiones libri Porphyrii*, ff. 207r–216r; Simon Favershamensis, *Quaestiones super librum Praedicamentorum*, ff. 216r–230v);
- *Computus cirometralis* (= Jacobus de Hattem, *Computus chirometralis*, ff. 231r–243v; Ioannes a Polonia, *Computus manualis*, ff. 244r–248r);
- *Parvulus naturalis cum commento* (= Petrus Dresdensis [Petrus Gerticz de Dresden], *Parvulus philosophiae naturalis cum glossis [Commentarius in physicam Aristotelis]*, ff. 249r – 273v; Vincentius Varnholte de Spandau, *Commentarius in Parvulum philosophiae naturalis*, ff. 274r–329r)<sup>15</sup>.

The evident differences in ink colour clearly and unambiguously indicate that all three catalogue entries were obviously made at different times, although we

<sup>12</sup> Erfurt, Bistumsarchiv, Ms. Hist. 6, f. 117r; *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge*, ed. P. Lehmann, p. 427.

<sup>13</sup> D. Barow-Vassilevitch, M.-L. Heckmann, *Abendländische Handschriften*, p. 210.

<sup>14</sup> D. Barow-Vassilevitch, M.-L. Heckmann, *Abendländische Handschriften*, p. 211.

<sup>15</sup> Erfurt, Bistumsarchiv, Ms. Hist. 6, f. 117r; *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge*, ed. P. Lehmann, p. 427.

cannot say when precisely and according to which time intervals this happened. In any case, it seems to be beyond any doubt that the final structure of the Moscow codex did not emerge overnight but developed slowly and was supplemented by new parts at least twice after the first catalogue entry. And if it was indeed the case, then the creator of this collection of texts should have been working with a more or less clear intention to bring the quite different texts into a kind of internally consistent unity, guided very probably not by the principle of content but by another logic, even if this logic was most certainly not strict but rather contingent, responding to a specific situation that arose in the work of the Erfurt Carthusian librarian.

As far as can be deduced from the medieval manuscript catalogue of the Erfurt Charterhouse library, the main task of the Carthusian librarian was to emulate the structure of the whole library as a building of sciences and arts, constructed according to clear and meticulous rules<sup>16</sup>. The catalogue of the library of the Erfurt Charterhouse clearly shows the details of this plan as well. All the books in the library were divided into shelf-mark groups, which were labelled with the letters of the Latin alphabet. Like the stones in the construction of medieval cathedrals, which were usually also marked with letters, numbers or special characters, every book and every single work under each shelf-mark group took their unique place in the architectonics of knowledge designed in the Erfurt Carthusian library: from the seven liberal arts in the lower parts of the knowledge building to mystical theology, the Bible and canon law at its top. The complete list of the shelf-mark groups is as follows:

- Shelf-mark group “A”: *Corpus iuris canonici*;
- Shelf-mark group “B”: *Bibliae textus cum concordantiis et directoriis suis*;
- Shelf-mark group “C”: *Commenta et expositiones Bibliae*;
- Shelf-mark group “D”: *Diversi libri pro theologia occulta divinissima, quae dicitur mystica. Apex mentis, synderesis, scintilla voluntatis*;
- Shelf-mark group “E”: *Via illuminativa, prima pars anagogiae, vis cognitiva, intellectus*;
- Shelf-mark group “F”: *Via purgativa, vis affectiva (portio superior et inferior)*;
- Shelf-mark group “G”: *Libri historiarum tam veteris quam novi testamenti*;
- Shelf-mark group “H”: *Deservit tropologiae et moralitatibus*;
- Shelf-mark group “I/J”: *Exempla, Revelationes*;
- Shelf-mark group “K”: [...] *Libros artis medicinae*;

<sup>16</sup> E. Kleineidam, *Die Theologische Richtung der Erfurter Kartäuser*, p. 256–257; J. De Ghelincx, *Les catalogues des bibliothèques médiévales chez les chartreux et un guide de lectures spirituelles*, “Revue d’Ascétique et de Mystique” 1949, t. 97, p. 284–298; A. Märker, *Das “Prohemium longum”*, p. 9–12, 358; M. Abram, G. Fournier, B. J. Nemes, *Making Mysticism. Theologia mystica als historische Kategorie der Wissensordnung in der Katalogisierungspraxis der Erfurter Kartause*, [in:] *Die Bibliothek. Denkräume und Wissensordnungen*, eds. A. Speer, L. Reuke, Berlin–Boston 2020 (Miscellanea Mediaevalia 41), p. 621–655.



- Shelf-mark group “L”: *Doctores (quasi vigiles architectores)*;
- Shelf-mark group “M”: *Vocabularia, Grammaticalia*;
- Shelf-mark group “N”: *Artes liberales, scientiae speculativae, scientia naturalium*;
- Shelf-mark group “O”: *Sermones*.

Despite all the classification efforts of the Carthusian librarian, the Moscow codex seems to fit very poorly into this library system. Thus, the old shelf-mark of this manuscript (“H 135”), the label of which is preserved on the back cover of the binding, allows it to be clearly assigned to the shelf-mark group “H” of the catalogue of the Erfurt Carthusian library that contains works on tropology and moral interpretation of the Bible. Of course, some examples of such works – as far as they correspond to a broader understanding of the topics of the shelf-mark group “H”<sup>17</sup> – can also be found in the Moscow manuscript. And yet the overwhelming majority of the texts contained in this manuscript can hardly be clearly attributed to the shelf-mark group “H” at all, especially if we take into account the description of the tropological method in the *Prohemium longum* to the Erfurt Carthusian catalogue<sup>18</sup> or the short introduction to the works of shelf-mark group “H” contained in the same catalogue and published in De Ghellinck’s comprehensive study<sup>19</sup>. For example, in the first of the texts, tropology is described as follows:

De tropologia. De tropologia hoc dixisse hic sufficiat, quod ad eam magis rerum quam vocum significatio pertinere videtur. In illa enim naturalis iusticia est, ex qua disciplina morum nostrorum, id est positiva iusticia nascitur. Contemplando, quid fecerit deus, quid nobis faciendum sit, agnoscimus. Omnis natura deum loquitur, omnis natura hominem docet, omnis natura rationem parit, et nichil in universitate infecundum est<sup>20</sup>.

What exactly does the author<sup>21</sup> of the *Prohemium longum* mean by these words? The answer to this question is complicated by the fact that the anonymous author reproduces in this case almost verbatim the definition of tropology found in Hugh of St. Victor’s *Didascalicon*, being in fact not so much an author as a compiler. On the whole, it may well be said that Hugh’s work was exemplary for the compiler of the *Prohemium longum*, to the extent that he regularly takes large excerpts from it, making them sections of his compilation without mentioning the source<sup>22</sup>. At least in the case of tropology this can be said with all certainty:

<sup>17</sup> J. De Ghellinck, *Les catalogues*, p. 295; A. Märker, *Das “Prohemium longum”*, p. 11.

<sup>18</sup> Erfurt, Bistumsarchiv, Ms. Hist. 6, f. 40v; A. Märker, *Das “Prohemium longum”*, p. 289.

<sup>19</sup> A. Märker, *Das “Prohemium longum”*, p. 11; J. De Ghellinck, *Les catalogues*, p. 295.

<sup>20</sup> Erfurt, Bistumsarchiv, Ms. Hist. 6, f. 40v; A. Märker, *Das “Prohemium longum”*, p. 289.

<sup>21</sup> According to A. Märker’s observation, the author of the *Prohemium longum* was not Jacob Volradi, but his anonymous assistant: A. Märker, *Das “Prohemium longum”*, p. 343–344.

<sup>22</sup> A. Märker, *Das “Prohemium longum”*, p. 25–27, 37–42, 358.

De tropologia, id est, moralitate. De tropologia nihil aliud in praesenti dicam, quam quod supra dictum est, excepto quod ad eam magis rerum quam vocum significatio pertinere videtur. In illa enim naturalis iustitia est, ex qua disciplina morum nostrorum, id est positiva iustitia nascitur. Contemplando, quid fecerit Deus, quid nobis faciendum sit, agnoscimus. Omnis natura deum loquitur, omnis natura hominem docet, omnis natura rationem parit et nihil in universitate infecundum est<sup>23</sup>.

And yet even if one follows this description and assumes that according to the tropological method “omnis natura deum loquitur, omnis natura hominem docet, omnis natura rationem parit, et nichil in universitate infecundum est”, the contents of the Moscow manuscript for the most part do not clearly correspond to the tropological sense of the interpretation of the texts, especially when they are not commentaries on the books of the Bible but Aristotle’s writings on logic and philosophy of nature, canonical documents and mystical theology. In other words, the Moscow manuscript contains texts that could very well be assigned to other, and indeed completely different, shelf-mark groups, namely shelf-mark groups “A” (canon law), “C” (Bible commentaries), “D” (mystical theology), “L” (teachers and masters, especially, ecclesiastical teachers and authorities), “N” (seven liberal arts, speculative sciences, sciences on nature), “O” (sermons). This seems so obvious that it could hardly have escaped the attention of the Carthusian librarian. And yet, in this case, the librarian clearly deviates from his own book classification principles. He probably did it consciously, and not because of his carelessness or inattention, which are hardly to be expected from the pedantic<sup>24</sup> Carthusian librarian Jacob Volradi<sup>25</sup>.

To understand his reasoning more clearly, let us take a closer look at the three parts of the Moscow manuscript identified earlier with the help of the manuscript catalogue. The only common feature they all have is that each part of the manuscript contains texts composed by the same author, namely by John de Indagine: *De passione Christi*, *De passione Domini*, *Expositio hymnorum* in the first part; *De missa conventuali*, *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum*, *De mystica theologia* (fragment in four leaves; highly likely some sort of

<sup>23</sup> Hugo de Sancto Victore, *Eruditionis didascalicae libri septem*, Liber VI, n. 5, [in:] *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina (PL)*, ed. J. P. Migne, t. 176, Parisii 1854, col. 805C; Hugo de Sancto Victore, *Didascalicon. De studio legendi*, eds., transl., comm. P. Pludra-Zuk, J. Soszyński, Warszawa 2017 (Bibliotheca Litterarum Medii Aevi, Artes – Opera 4), p. 228.

<sup>24</sup> A. Märker, *Das “Prohemium longum”*, p. 332, 338–339, 343–346, 350–351.

<sup>25</sup> A. Märker, *Das “Prohemium longum”*, p. 339: “Als das Lebenswerk Jakob Volradis können wir den Bibliothekskatalog der Erfurter Kartause betrachten. Der immense Umgang und die durchdachte systematische Anlage lassen seinen Verfasser als einen gebildeten Mönch mit breiten literarischen Kenntnissen erscheinen, der reiche Begabung an Geduld und Fleiß und ein Talent zum systematisierenden Ordnen besaß”.

preparatory work for one of two treatises on mystical theology written by John de Indagine<sup>26</sup>) in the second part; *Sermo de Spiritu Sancto*, *Sermo de nativitate beatae Mariae* in the third part.

Apparently, it is this fact that can sufficiently explain how the Carthusian librarian worked in assembling various individual texts of the Moscow manuscript, and what motivated his work to group them into a certain collection when he added other parts to the first, original, part of the codex. As a result, however, it has turned out that although the content of the first part of the Moscow manuscript corresponds to some extent to the subject matter of the shelf-mark group “H” of the medieval catalogue of the library of the Erfurt Charterhouse (biblical exegetics and homiletics with a focus on *sensus tropologicus*)<sup>27</sup>, the content of the second and third parts falls almost completely outside this subject matter.

But the Carthusian librarian probably did not see this as a major problem. As far as one can assume, he was guided in his decision to have the three parts of different origins bound into one volume by the fact that there are works by the same author, John de Indagine, in all three parts. Very probably they were just lying on top of a pile of manuscripts, waiting to be processed by a librarian, and the topmost ones fit quite well under the “tropology” group. So, as a result, they were bound together and placed in this group, irrespective of the presence of other manuscripts lying with them, but below them and attached to them as if by some misplaced carelessness. At least this can explain the strange fact why the fragment on mystical theology was not attached to the shelf-mark group “D” which is devoted exclusively to this subject, but to the shelf-mark group “H” where the main subject is still very far from mystical theology. Apparently to correct this utter clumsiness, the librarian adds in the margin to the catalogue entry of the fragment on mystical theology: “Vide eiusdem scripta de eadem supra D. 20”<sup>28</sup>. According to A. Märker’s observation<sup>29</sup>, supplying the Erfurt Carthusian catalogue with such references was one of the main tasks of the librarian Jacob Volradi. The third part, which contained texts on logic and natural philosophy, apparently did not end up in its own thematically intended shelf-mark group either. However, it seems very likely that it was included in the Moscow codex together with the first and second parts just because it began with a sermon composed by John de Indagine that was a perfect fit for the group “H”.

<sup>26</sup> Weimar, Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek, Ms. Q 50, ff. 1r–60v; Paderborn, Erzbischöfliche Akademische Bibliothek, Cod. 118, ff. 162vb–173rb. The second treatise has recently been critically edited: S.M. Metzger, *The “Tractatus de mistica theologia”*, p. 636–674.

<sup>27</sup> Erfurt, Bistumsarchiv, Ms. Hist. 6, f. 100r; *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge*, ed. P. Lehmann, p. 375.

<sup>28</sup> Erfurt, Bistumsarchiv, Ms. Hist. 6, f. 117r; *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge*, ed. P. Lehmann, p. 427.

<sup>29</sup> A. Märker, *Das “Prohemium longum”*, p. 350.

This also seems to highlight in a new light a problem with both the classification and methodology of research and interpretation of manuscripts such as the one examined in this study. This problem manifests itself in the fact that it is sometimes difficult to determine unequivocally whether a voluminous manuscript codex is collected or composited. Indeed, there can be no unambiguous answer in this case, especially if one considers the collected and composited codices in the vein of Max Weber's "ideal types" and reduces the complex problem of adequate taxonomic description to a simplified terminological dilemma. The possible addition of new types to this dilemma, such as the terms *allegata*, assembled, combined, integrated, fused, mixed, or mosaic codices, can only add methodological confusion to a problem that evidently has its origins, first, in the terminological substantialisation of the heuristic issues, leading to a bad "multiplication of entities", and, second, in the adoption of partially synonymous words as completely different terms that have nothing in common with each other in all possible cases. Thus, the problem turns out to be a pseudo-problem, for the solution of which it will suffice only to recall for what, in fact, this terminology was introduced, namely, for the purpose of describing manuscripts as appropriate and accurate as possible, and without this it has no independent meaning.

In the case of collecting different manuscripts into one codex, there is the intention of an author, scribe, editor, or librarian who collects for a certain purpose, the existence of which is reasonable to assume, even if it is not precisely known. Thus, as the manuscript RSL, Fonds 201, No. 35, shows, John Selmenitz clearly must have had such a purpose, and the state of his collection allows us to assume it unequivocally. At the same time, it is impossible to say anything reliably verifiable about what John de Indagine wanted to collect from his autographs, what his intention was, but such an intention he, as an author (or compiler), undoubtedly must have had. In fact, the composite book into which John de Indagine's writings were transformed by the activity of Jacob Volradi does not allow us to fully detail his author's intention, although it is known that John de Indagine collected notes and sketches on certain topics and then simply combined them into a single text through editing, sometimes repeatedly and with the participation of assistants. In other words, in the case of complex codices consisting of many heterogeneous parts, certain parts might have already been assembled by someone, before they were then bound into a single codex, when they were reassembled again as a composite book, or perhaps as *allegata*, or as a new collection serving new purposes.

The example of the manuscript RSL, Fonds 201, No. 35, discussed in this study only draws attention to the fact that it is also important to consider not only the final or intermediate structure of a codex, but also how the process of development of its structure took place over time, i.e. the genetic, dynamic and intentional aspects which can sometimes be traced codicologically. In cases where

supporting documents, such as medieval catalogues, are available to demonstrate this, it is also possible to see what principles medieval librarians might have followed in cataloguing and organising the library, especially where differences between the structure and compositional origin of the codex raised questions about its classification under one or another shelf-mark.

In particular, it was shown that the principle of authorship was in some cases much more important to the Erfurt Carthusian librarian than the principle of strict thematic classification according to relevant shelf-mark groups. And yet a definitive answer to the question of why the librarian's choice was this and not another way is unfortunately not to be found in the case of the Moscow manuscript. Perhaps it was just a coincidence, which of course cannot be completely ruled out in library work. Perhaps the somewhat unusual librarian's decision was determined by a pragmatic need, for example, lack of space on the library shelves (for the books of other shelf-mark groups), lack of time for more careful processing of newly arrived manuscripts, etc. Unfortunately, it is not known, and highly likely cannot be known, how it was actually the case. However, the special attention of the librarian Jacob Volradi to John de Indagine's writings seems quite clear here. It is evident not only in the general structure of the Erfurt Carthusian library<sup>30</sup> but occasionally also in the history of the origin, formation and organisation of certain manuscripts, as it was illustrated in this study by the example of one of the Erfurt Carthusian codices.

## Bibliography

### Manuscript sources

- Erfurt, Bistumsarchiv, Ms. Hist. 6.  
 Moscow, Russian State Library, Fonds 201, No. 35.  
 Paderborn, Erzbischöfliche Akademische Bibliothek, Cod. 118.  
 Weimar, Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek, Ms. Q 50.

### Printed sources

- Hugo de Sancto Victore, *Eruditionis didascalicae libri septem*, [in:] *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina (PL)*, ed. J. P. Migne, t. 176, Parisii 1854, coll. 741D–812B.  
 Hugo de Sancto Victore, *Didascalicon. De studio legendi*, eds., transl., comm. P. Pludra-Žuk, J. Soszyński, Warszawa 2017 (Bibliotheca Litterarum Medii Aevi, Artes – Opera 4).

### Studies

- Abram M., Fournier G., Nemes B. J., *Making Mysticism. Theologia mystica als historische Kategorie der Wissensordnung in der Katalogisierungspraxis der Erfurter Kartause*, [in:] *Die Bibliothek. Denkräume und Wissensordnungen*, eds. A. Speer, L. Reuke, Berlin–Boston 2020 (Miscellanea Mediaevalia 41), p. 621–655.

<sup>30</sup> Erfurt, Bistumsarchiv, Ms. Hist. 6, ff. 168r–170r; *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge*, ed. P. Lehmann, p. 581–593; A. Märker, *Das "Prohemium longum"*, p. 352.

- De Ghellinck J., *Les catalogues des bibliothèques médiévales chez les chartreux et un guide de lectures spirituelles*, "Revue d'Ascétique et de Mystique" 1949, t. 97, p. 284–298.
- Fournier G., *Jakob Volradi à l'œuvre. L'art de la compilation dans le catalogue de bibliothèque de la chartreuse d'Erfurt à l'exemple de l'introduction générale aux trois voies anagogiques (D, E et F)*, [in:] *Die Kartause als Text-Raum mittelalterlicher Mystik-Rezeption: Wissensdiskurse, Schreibpraktiken, Überlieferungskonstellationen*, eds. G. Fournier, B. J. Nemes, Berlin 2023 (Vita regularis. Abhandlungen 82), p. 11–83.
- Klapper J., *Der Erfurter Kartäuser Johannes Hagen. Ein Reformtheologe des 15 Jahrhunderts*, t. 1: *Leben und Werk*, Leipzig 1960 (Erfurter Theologische Studien 9).
- Kleineidam E., *Die Theologische Richtung der Erfurter Kartäuser am Ende des 15. Jahrhunderts. Versuch einer Einheit der Theologie*, [in:] *Miscellanea Erfordiana*, eds. E. Kleineidam, H. Schürmann, Leipzig 1962 (Erfurter Theologische Studien 12), p. 247–271.
- Märker A., *Das "Prohemium longum" des Erfurter Kartäuserkatalogs aus der Zeit um 1475. Edition und Untersuchung*, t. 1–2, Bern 2008 (Lateinische Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters 35).
- Mertens D., *Hagen, Johannes*, [in:] *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Verfasserlexikon*, 2nd ed., Berlin–New York 1981, t. 3, coll. 388–398.
- Metzger S.M., *The Manuscripts of Writings by Ioannes Hagen de Indagine, O. Cart.*, "Bulletin de Philosophie Médiévale" 2008, t. 50, p. 175–256.
- Metzger S.M., *The "Tractatus de mistica theologia" by Ioannes de Indagine, O. Cart. († 1475)*, [in:] *Contemplation and Philosophy. Scholastic and Mystical Modes of Medieval Philosophical Thought, A Tribute to Kent Emery, Jr.*, eds. R. Hofmeister Pich, A. Speer, Leiden 2018 (Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 125), p. 599–674.
- Rüthing H., *Jean Hagen de Indagine*, [in:] *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique*, t. 8, Paris 1973, coll. 543–552.

### Catalogues and inventories of manuscripts

- Barow-Vassilevitch D., Heckmann M.-L., *Abendländische Handschriften des Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit in den Beständen der russischen Staatsbibliothek (Moskau)*, Wiesbaden 2016.
- Biblioteka Avraama Sergeeviča Norova*, St. Petersburg 1868.
- Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz*, t. 2: *Bistum Mainz: Erfurt*, ed. P. Lehmann, München 1928 (reprint 1969).
- Opisanije i obzor sobranija rukopisej Avraama Sergeeviča Norova*, Fond 201, Moskva 1953.

### Internet resources

- Opisanije i obzor sobranija rukopisej Avraama Sergeeviča Norova*, Fond 201, Moskva 1953, <http://dlib.rsl.ru/viewer/01004724413#?page=1> [accessed 30.12.2023].

**Mikhail Khorkov** – historian of medieval philosophy, theology and science; he studied history and philosophy at universities in Moscow and Karlsruhe, and has gained positions as associate professor of history of philosophy at universities in Moscow, Cologne, Erfurt, Salzburg and a senior research fellow at the Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences (since September 2013). He was a fellow at the Institute for Human Sciences in Vienna (2006), Max-Weber-Kolleg in Erfurt (2016–2017), the Polish Institute of Advanced Studies (2017–2018) and the Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study in Uppsala (2019–2020). From May 2022, Prof. Khorkov is employed at the Old and Rare Book Studies Research Unit of the L. & A. Birkenmajer Institute for the History of Science of the Polish Academy of Sciences (until 2024 under the PASIFIC Programme). Research interests: late medieval Latin and German manuscripts, German and Dutch medieval mysticism, Carthusian studies.  
e-mail: [mikhail.khorkov@ihnpan.pl](mailto:mikhail.khorkov@ihnpan.pl)