ON EDITING THE LETTERS OF PETER THE VENERABLE

by

GILES CONSTABLE

The two recent articles of Professor Hartmut Hoffmann on the letters of Peter the Venerable¹) raise some important questions concerning not only my edition of this text²) but also the editing of medieval texts in general. He rejects as uncritical any tendency to rely on a principal manuscript and advocates the eclectic method of reconstructing ‘the original text’, as he puts it³), on the basis of variant readings from the manuscripts and conjectural emendations⁴). The punctuation should be modernized by the editor to accord with the rules of his own language, and the spelling should be revised, especially the medieval diphthongs, which Professor Hoff-

¹) Hartmut Hoffmann, ‘Zu den Briefen des Petrus Venerabilis,’ Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken 49 (1969) 399–441 and ‘Nachtrag zu den Briefen des Petrus Venerabilis,’ ibid. 50 (1970) 447–449. Since the pagination of these articles does not overlap, they will be cited here simply by page-number. I am indebted to several friends and colleagues (quorum numerum et nomina tu sis, Domine) for help and advice with this article, which has been immeasurably improved by their criticism.

²) The Letters of Peter the Venerable (Harvard Historical Studies 78, Cambridge, Mass. 1967). References to the text of the letters will be by number only, with superscript for the variants.

³) Hoffmann, p. 402. On these alternatives, see Ludwig Bieler, The Grammarians's Craft: An Introduction to Textual Criticism, 3rd ed. (Classical Folia, n.p., n.d.) 18–19, who commented that the practice of selecting and following a codex optimus ‘has been hailed in certain quarters, especially among neophilologists, as more scientific than the eclectic method with its fallacies and its subjectivism.’ The principle of the best manuscript, when properly selected and used, has even been accepted by classicists: cf. L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature (Oxford 1968) 145–146.

⁴) In addition to suggesting many emendations of his own, some of which will be studied below, Professor Hoffmann believes that greater attention should have been paid to the ‘variants’ in the Bibliotheca Cluniacensis and Patrologia latina and in the edition by Dom Quentin of Letters 158a and 158b. These are included in my edition only when a text is found in a single manuscript. None of them have any manuscript authority and most of them are efforts to correct misprints and misreadings.
mann finds ‘ugly’). These are indeed the traditional standards for editing medieval texts, against which my edition was to some extent a reaction, since it was designed to present a text, including even inconsistencies and errors, which might have been written in the Middle Ages rather than one made to conform to rules drawn up by classical philologists. The eclectic and emending editor runs the risk of forcing a text into an anachronistic mold of thought and style. The danger is especially great for a work which was revised or corrected by the author or during his lifetime and of which, therefore, there is no single authentic version.

With regard to the letters of Peter the Venerable, the problem is twofold, since there are at least two versions of both the text and the collection. The traditions are represented, on the one hand, by manuscripts A and B (Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, 381 and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Latin 2582) and, on the other, by manuscript S (Le Puy, Cathédrale, unnumbered) and the first edition C, printed at Paris in 1522, almost certainly from a lost manuscript from Cluny). The collection in A consists of 110 letters, including one dogmatic treatise, not divided into books and all apparently written before 1142. C contains 84 more letters, written between 1143 and 1152, and two more dogmatic treatises, making a total of 196, divided into six books). That A presents a distinct version of the text as well as of the collection, which Professor Hoffmann seemed inclined to question in his first article, is no longer in doubt after his second article, which takes into consideration the evidence of manuscript B. The real question is the relation of the two versions of the text and which, if either, should serve as the basis of the edition. On this Professor Hoffmann has proposed some arguments which, while not solving the problem, have helped to carry it beyond the point I left it in 1967.

At that time I assumed that, since A contained a smaller and earlier version of the letter-collection than C, it also had the first version of the

---

5) Hoffmann, p. 415. There are some interesting remarks on diphthongs by William of Conches, arguing that they should always be written out even when pronounced as one letter, in Édouard Jeuneau, 'Deux rédactions des gloses de Guillaume de Conches sur Priscien,' Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale 27 (1960) 242.

6) For references on these and other manuscripts mentioned here, see the introduction to Letters 2, 45–80. For the sake of simplicity, the versions will be referred to here simply as A (which includes 25 letters more than B) and C (which includes 30 letters more than S).

7) These figures vary slightly depending on the precise division and numbering of the letters.
text; and I therefore followed A for the letters it includes and derived the remainder from C, adjusting the orthography to norms established from A and taking care not to confuse the versions of the text found in the different collections. Professor Hoffmann challenges this assumption and argues on stylistic grounds that the C-version of the text is earlier and better and that A contains 'a lightly revised version of the letter-collection' which is 'in many places not so much revised as corrupted'. This judgment is based entirely on stylistic criteria rather than on the text-history of the collection. 'One can make the right judgments' concerning variant readings, he says at one point, 'only if one pays attention to style-parallels' (p. 415). Stylistic evidence for the chronological order of differing versions of a text is notoriously ambiguous, however, and that presented by Professor Hoffmann is no exception. The versions of Letters 126 and 127 in A, for example, which differ considerably from those in C, impress him as 'obviously more polished and therefore later' and 'through its more cultivated style as a later reworking' (pp. 406–407); but neither his opinion that the texts in A are more polished nor his assumption that more polished texts are necessarily later is as obvious as he seems to suppose (see Appendix A).

His other arguments for the priority of the version in C derive from the more consistent form of the addresses in A than in C and from the independent copies of Letters 38, 48, and 150, apparently deriving from the form in which they were sent. These prove that the texts were revised

---

8) Hoffmann, p. 410. In his second article he appears to modify this judgment.
9) My concern for the formation and character of the collection is regarded as 'a fetish' (p. 400). His own lack of interest in the collection is illustrated, later on the same page, by his overlooking the reference in Letters 2, 16 to the only passage concerning the letters in the 'first' introductory letter and also the explicit reference to the letters in the 'second' introductory letter, which he says 'hat mit den Briefen des Petrus Venerabilis vielleicht gar nichts zu tun.'
10) Hoffmann, p. 408, where he cites the difference of word-order in the addresses of five letters in the C-version and the addition of two words to the address of Letter 53.
11) Hoffmann, pp. 404–405. On the independent copies of Letters 38 and 150, see Letters 2, 73. The copy of Letter 48 in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz (früher Preussische Staatsbibliothek), Theol. lat. fol. 530, ff. 78r–80r, came to my attention after my edition was published through the article of H. Rüthing, 'Ein Brief des Kardinals Matthäus von Albano an die Grande Chartreuse,' Revue bénédictine 78 (1968) 145–151, who dates it ca. 1500 from the Charterhouse at Freiburg im Br.. Letter 150 is not in A and therefore is not discussed here.
before they were incorporated into the collection. The copy of Letter 38 (T) has twenty independent readings, found in no other manuscript, in addition to five readings agreeing with CS against A, two with C against AS, and one with S against AC

12). The copy of Letter 48 (F) has twenty-three independent readings, including a significantly different conclusion

13), in addition to two readings agreeing with CS against A, two with AS against C, and three with AC against S

14). F therefore agrees with A as often as it agrees with C or S, and the two times it agrees with CS against A (ae in place of et and mare in place of mari) prove nothing. The five agreements of T with CS against A in Letter 38, however – the addition of Et at the beginning of a sentence, the substitutions of sed maxime for maximeque and of sancto for sancti, and two differences in word order – support the view that the text in CS is closer than that in A to the letter as it was sent, although the cross-agreements of both T and F with A, C, and S alone show that the matter is not a simple one and that the question of the priority of either version is still open

15).

A special problem concerning the relation between the versions of the text is presented by the variant readings, introduced by vel or alias, in A, C, and S (see Appendix B). Professor Hoffmann bases upon them an elaborate hypothesis that manuscripts of both the A- and the CS-versions were corrected at Cluny after the death of Peter the Venerable from a source or sources representing an unknown and independent version of the text. The archetype of CS, he suggests, was compared with a copy of the first version and the predecessor of A with an exemplar of the second version. ‘In the few places where both A and C offer a variant,’ he says, ‘the same encroachment must have entered twice into the manuscript

12) Professor Hoffmann overlooks the ST and one of the CT agreements, and also the fact that CS is on its own against different versions in A and T in variant 38. Variant 37, however, which he includes, is only in S.

13) F (f. 80r) has quod continuo erit, si nos obis mestitiam deposuisse innotuerit in place of the quod continuo fiet, si vos mestitiam deposuisse, quam citius nobis innotuerit in ACS.

14) CSF: variants 1 and 2; ASF: variants 4 and 5; ACF: variants 3, 6, and 7.

15) The agreements between the independent copies and CS against A are, as Professor Hoffmann says, probably errors in A if it represents a stage of the text between the letters as they were sent and CS, since it is unlikely, though not impossible, that sed maxime would have been written in Letter 38 as sent, changed to maximeque in the ancestor of A, and then changed back to sed maxime in the ancestor of CS. It may be an authentic revision, however, if the A- is later than the C-version.
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tradition, so that the entries in A and C do not go back to a common source’ (p. 414). This hypothesis is not only artificial, as he himself admits, but also unnecessary. The two most significant points about the variants are (1) that only two overlap between the A- and the CS-traditions16) and (2) that all but two involve only a letter or a syllable and could easily have been made by a scribe or editor. The practice of including ‘variants’ in medieval manuscripts was less unusual than Professor Hoffmann seems to think, and alias and uel were often used to cloak errors and misreadings as well as to introduce real variants17). Thus while the confusions between excipiam and suscipiam and between rigore and frigore may go back to a common source of A and C, the remainder appear to be the result of independent efforts to emend or correct the text18). Both the lemma and the variant as a rule make sense, and the variants do not always present superior readings, as Professor Hoffmann asserts. Each one has to be assessed individually, in terms of its text-history as well as its sense. It is impossible consistently to prefer the variants even by Professor Hoffmann’s own rules, since at one point A and C present alternative variants. His assertion, therefore, that all the variants should have been put in the text and the lemmas in the apparatus is characteristic of his doctrinaire attitude in favor of emending the text18a).

None of this evidence from textual comparison, independent copies, and variants, therefore, interesting as it is, offers a fully satisfactory solution

16) The coincidence in C of the variants in S confirms that they derive from a common source, perhaps at an early stage in the text-history, since hospitium is found in the independent copy of Letter 150 (see n. 11 above) and as a variant for habitaculum in C and S. The agreement of S, however, with the lemmas in C 1–5 and 14 shows either that the scribe of S failed to copy all the variants in his source or that C and S are partially independent, as their disagreement in A 9 likewise suggests.


18) That they were not the result of comparison with a manuscript of the other version is shown not only by their relatively small number but also by the agreement of C with the variant in A 3–6 and 9–10 and with the lemma in A 7–8 and of A with the variant in C 3–5, 7–8, and 11 and with the lemma in C 6, 9–10, and 12–13.

18a) My own view now would be to adopt the variants in A 2–6 and 9–10 and the lemma in A 1 and 7–8. In my edition I adopted the variants only in A 2–4.
to the question of the relationship of the manuscripts and versions of the text. The stemma seems to be something like this:

```
small collection (ca. 1142)
  
A (ca. 1165)  B (15th C.)  
    |        |        
   /        /        
 large collection (after 1152)   C  
   
   1522 edition
   
S (1420)
```

It is possible that there were some intermediaries between the archetype of the small collection and A, which would account for some peculiarities in its text. A more serious problem, however, is to explain how A can contain both the shorter and earlier collection and, as Professor Hoffmann maintains, the later version of the text. Why Peter the Venerable or his secretary Peter of Poitiers should have revised the text of the short collection, and had it copied, while leaving the text of the long collection unchanged, is a mystery. Why, also, this and not the long version of the collection was sent to Anchin to be copied, apparently after the death of Peter the Venerable, is hard to explain. These problems, which Professor Hoffmann does not discuss, present fewer difficulties if A in fact contains the earlier version of the text, as I originally assumed.

Another puzzle in the stemma is posed by B, to which I paid comparatively little attention (perhaps too little) in my edition owing to the corruption of its text and apparent contamination from a manuscript of the CS-version

---

19) This stemma is indebted to several scholars and should be compared with that of Dr. James Fearns for the *Contra Petrobrusianos* reproduced in Appendix C.

20) My suggestion in Letters 2, 55 that the librarian at Cluny was reluctant to let the full collection out of his charge is not very convincing. Could there be a clue in the note in A, f. 26r, that, *Primam epistolam ad domnum Bernardum abbatem Claraeuallis quae hic scribi debuisset, require in fine epistolarn, ante sermonem de laude dominici sepulchri*? I was originally inclined to view this as meaning that the scribe deliberately copied this long letter at the end of the collection, but it has been pointed out that the use of *debuisset* rather than *debet* suggests that the omission was accidental. Is it possible that this letter was not in its proper place when the collection reached Anchin? Or even that it was sent separately and the scribe knew of its place only from the index?
Professor Hoffmann devotes his entire second article to B, listing some hundred variants which its evidence might have raised from the apparatus into the text. Of these, over half are matters of spelling and word-order. They also include some readings found only in B and a few genuine variants, such as *insolita*/*inaudita* (27°) and *coenobia/monasterio* (64°), which show that A and B are partially independent and that an agreement between B and CS does not necessarily prove, as Professor Hoffmann says, that A is in error (p. 448). A full collation of B in my edition would certainly have been in some respects desirable, but it could not have been limited to agreements with CS and would have required a full listing of variants, thus greatly swelling the apparatus without, in my view, adding proportionately to the accuracy and clarity of the text. For while B helps to show up a number of apparent errors in A, for the most part it supports A against CS and thus establishes both the reliability of the text and independence of the version in A.

This may be demonstrated by the example of Letter 58, for which Professor Hoffmann lists five variants where B agrees with CS against A. In his first article, he lists eight further alleged errors in my text of this letter. B agrees with A against CS on sixty-five variants, however, including all those involving the alleged errors. Of these, three are matters of spelling and word-division, but the others are of interest both for the text of the

---

21) My remarks in Letters 2, 60–61 are not disputed by Professor Hoffmann, who says that, 'Constable hat zwar recht, wenn er diese Überlieferung fehlerhaft nennt – denn es wimmelt darin von Entstellungen' (p. 447).
22) All the corrections for Letters 5, 9, 15, 22, 34, 38, 44–5, 57–8, 62, 71, 75, 77, and 80–81 concern spelling and word-order.
23) To those specified by Professor Hoffmann should be added 54° and 70°, where C in fact agrees with A against CS on sixty-five variants, however, including all those involving the alleged errors. Of these, three are matters of spelling and word-division, but the others are of interest both for the text of the
24) Hoffmann, p. 449. One of these affects spelling, two word-order, and two words (*Ysaac/Ysayam, sed/et*) which may have been revised. To these should be added variant 44, where A is clearly wrong and CS is already used in the text.
25) One of these, *unanimen*, is a misprint in Letters, since it is spelled *unanimen* in A and *unanime* in CS, though it appears as *unanimen* in B. *Quo aduixit*, which Professor Hoffmann proposes to emend to *quoad uixit*, is more puzzling. It appears as *quoaduixit* in A, *quo ad vixit* in C, and and *quo aduixit* in S. *Quoad uixit* is a familiar idiom, but Peter's use of *aduixit* elsewhere, as in Letters 1, 164 (*toto quo aduixit aequo*) and 391 (*quamdiu aduixit*) raises at least the possibility that he was using *quo* here in the sense of 'as long as.'
letter and for Professor Hoffmann's methods of emendation. (1) The reading *scismatico sapore* in the phrase *nec scismatico sapore . . . catholico antidoto exhaurire*, which he rejects in favor of *scismaticum saporem*, is found in all the sources and is justified both grammatically and stylistically, since *exhaurire* takes an ablative as well as an accusative. *Quem* and *potuimus* are understood from the previous phrase, and it means 'whom we were unable to empty of the smell of schism'. (2) The omission in A (and B) of *atque Normannorum* after *Cenomannorum in the phrase per ultimos Andegauorum ac Cenomannorum fines*, describing Peter's route from Aquitaine to Paris in 1133, is considered a simple error, presumably of homoioteleuton, by Professor Hoffmann, who overlooked, however, that CS, while including *atque Normannorum*, omit *ac*, thus adding another stage to the text-history of A and B. This is not impossible, but it is equally or more likely that the differences resulted from textual revision. Whether or not Peter in fact went through Normandy has no bearing, as Professor Hoffmann seems to think, on the question of the differing versions of the text. (3) The reading *diuinae* which Professor Hoffmann emends to *diuina* in the sentence *Si de saecularis litteraturae scientia gratia tarnen diuinae aliquid conferre placuit promptum et perspicacem inueni* is also found in all the sources and is clearly a substantive for *diuinae litteraturae* (understood from the preceding *saecularis litteraturae*), governed by *gratia*. (4) The passage in variant 35 was presumably omitted by an error of homoioteleuton in the ancestor of A and B and belongs in the text. (5) Professor Hoffmann's proposal to replace *uiros*, which he calls impossible, by *nostros* in the sentence *Veniat tarnen et ille, alienigena quidem natione, sed vir virtutis laude merito inter uiores ponendus, Ethai uidelicet Getheus* makes nonsense of Peter's argument. Having cited Ruth as a witness to devotion to duty, he admits that a woman may be inadmissible as evidence and therefore cites Ethai the Gethite, an alien but a man among men. *Inter uiores*, furthermore, has Biblical parallels. In conclusion, therefore, of Professor Hoffmann's five proposed textual emendations, only one is convincing.

What light the differences between the A- and CS-versions of Letter 58 throw on the question of the revision of the text is hard to determine. The difference between *Andegauorum ac Cenomannorum fines* (AB) and *Andegauorum, Cenomannorum, atque Normannorum fines* (CS) seems to me to represent a revision from AB to CS rather than the reverse. Variants 28–29 also seem to support the priority of the version in A. Peter here

---

26) One for the *atque Normannorum* to drop out and another for the *ac* to be added.
describes himself as *confectus multiplex curarum distensione* (AB), *confectus multiplex distensione* (S), and *confectus multiplex dissensione* (C). These differences are most easily explained if the AB-version was first and if *curarum* dropped out in the common ancestor (the large collection) of S, which retained *distensione*, and C, where *distensione* was changed to *dissensione*.

Aside from the question of priority, however, the very existence of two distinct versions of the text compels the editor to choose one tradition in order to avoid producing a *recensio mixta* incorporating readings from different versions. To present a single version, of which there is only one reliable manuscript, is not the same as relying on principle on a single manuscript, as Professor Hoffmann implies. The editors not only of legal texts, which he considers an exception, but also of other types of works are increasingly aware of the danger of applying the stemmatic method to living texts, of which there is no single authentic version, and especially to letters, which are among the most living of living texts. From Antiquity through the Middle Ages, as Pasquali said, letters were revised by their writers (not always for the better!) and were therefore 'particularly favorable to the formation and conservation of author's variants'. Letters in the twelfth century are known to have been revised not only when they were gathered into collections but also when the collections were rearranged and expanded. It is not always possible to say whether such changes were

---

27) Hoffmann, p. 401, citing the editorial rules published by Stephan Kuttner in *Institute of Research and Study in Medieval Canon Law: Bulletin for 1959,* Traditio 15 (1959) 452–464, which established that, 'Once the choice of the basic MS or MSS has been definitely made, the editor will not depart from its or their readings without cogent reasons' and warned specifically against the danger of 'producing a *recensio mixta* or a conjectural reconstruction of the text' (p. 452). Cf. also the *Corpus consuetudinum monasticarum* 1 (Siegburg 1963) lxxxvii: *Lectiones variantes eligendae vel definitice electae . . . non de uno ad alterum codicum transire permittantur, sed codicem sequantur principalem.*


29) In addition to the works cited in Letters 2, 43 n. 182, see W. Wattenbach, 'Die Briefe des Canonicus Guido von Bazoches, Cantors zu Chalons im zwölften Jahrhundert', Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin 1890, 163; Frank Barlow, The Letters of Arnulf of Lisioux (Camden Third Series 61, London 1939) ixii; R. W. Southern, 'St. Anselm and Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster', Mediaeval and Renaissance
made by the author himself, by his secretaries or scribes, or even sometimes by the recipients\(^{30}\), but they are interesting and important and must be treated with respect by editors. Even the slips and errors of a writer are to be preserved in so personal a form of literature as letters\(^{31}\).

In editing the letters of Peter the Venerable, therefore, the object should be not to reconstruct an original text in the basis of variants and emendations but rather to present an authentic version with evidence of the revision in the apparatus. The difficulty is to choose the version, having regard for both the text and the collection. The choice is essentially between A and C, each of which has advantages and disadvantages. In favor of A are its early date and careful preparation, which present a useful standard of contemporary orthography and punctuation. Even Professor Hoffmann, in spite of his prejudice against using a principal manuscript, admits that relying on A would be less reprehensible if it really had 'the qualities for which the editor praises it' (p. 410), that is, an accurate and reliable text. In fact, as has been seen, the text in A is at least as good as that in C and S combined and better than that in either C or S alone. The disadvantage of A, therefore, is not its text but the incompleteness of its collection. C, on the other hand, includes the full collection but has a less reliable text, except for letters also in S, and with a sixteenth-century orthography and punctuation. In many ways the most obvious course would be to follow C, as Professor Hoffmann advocates, with corrections from A and S and normalized spelling and punctuation; but this would deform the text and confuse the versions. In my edition, therefore, I tried to combine the advantages of the two traditions without doing violence to the versions of the text contained in each. Like all compromises, this solution is open to criticism; but it should be criticized in terms of the real difficulties presented by the manuscripts rather than of abstract principles of editorial method.


\(^{30}\) Leclercq, ibid. 26, for instance, suggests that Bernard's letters to Peter were revised at Cluny before they were included in Peter's collection.

\(^{31}\) Cf. Les éditions de correspondances: Colloque 20 Avril 1968 (Paris 1969) 64, 69 ('Qu'il s'agisse d'un texte moderne ou d'un texte ancien, il me semble que l'éditeur ne doit prendre aucune liberté avec le texte. Si une faute d'orthographe apparaît, par oubli ou par fatigue, cette faute doit même être reproduite.'), and 70–71. These remarks apply primarily to modern letters, which survive in originals, but they are not without significance for medieval letters, especially those which survive in a form close to, if not from the hand of, the author.
Many of Professor Hoffmann’s long list of proposed corrections and emendations (pp. 416–432) arise from his failure to understand the nature of the problem. Having himself never inspected the manuscripts, and basing himself entirely upon material in my edition, he oversimplifies the issue and opts for a mixed text based predominantly on C but incorporating emendations and variant readings from other sources. About forty per cent of his list are preferred variants from CS and the Bibliotheca Cluniacensis; twenty-five per cent are matters of spelling, word-division, and punctuation, including many repetitions and trivialities; twenty per cent are conjectural emendations, of which those for Letter 58 have already been examined; ten per cent are corrections of slips and misprints; and five per cent deal with place-names, which will be considered below. Those which I accept without question, including all the slips and misprints, are listed in Appendix D, which might be expanded after further study and consideration. Many of Professor Hoffmann’s corrigenda, however, are either unnecessary emendations, mistakes on his part, or matters of opinion, where the alternative is already presented in the apparatus. Though it can be argued that my edition follows A too closely – as it doubtless does at times –, its readings should be rejected only when there is no chance of contemporary revision or correction. Stylistic idiosyncracies should likewise be carefully preserved. There is no need, for instance, to change super either to semper, as Professor Hoffmann says, or to nuper, as another reader has suggested, in the phrase de obitu super dilecti nostri domini regis Anglorum (Letter 15). All three readings are possible, but only super appears in the sources. Peter may likewise have omitted dominus in addressing a strange bishop in Letter 31, as he did in Letters 89 and 105. And so on.

The suggested changes in place-names offer an instructive example of Professor Hoffmann’s method of editing, which threatens to bury the variety of the original under an artificially-imposed uniformity. For in spite of the frequent use of abbreviations, of which the expansions are uncertain, the names of places are written out in the manuscripts sufficiently frequently to show that various forms were used. A glance through the headings shows that Peter referred to himself both as Cluniacensium abbas and as Cluniacensis abbas and was addressed as Cluniacensium abbati, Cluniacensis

32) Cf. the many compounds with super used by William of St. James at Liège in his Liber de benedictione Dei, ed. N. M. Häring, Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age 39 (1972) 139; also Letters, 1, 220 (supercaelestia).
aecclesiae abbati, and Cluniacensi abbati or domino34). That the adjectival form was used as a substantive in the singular, referring to Cluny, is shown by Cluniacensem in Letter 191, which is written out in C and S and suggests that the Cluniacensis abbati in the headings to Letters 148 (written out in C) and 165 (written out in S) may be acceptable35). The Cluniacum in Letter 41, for which Professor Hoffmann proposes to substitute Cluniaci, as in C, is written out in A and S (thus assuring its correctness by Professor Hoffmann's own standards). To replace Trecensi by Trecensem in Letter 69 would both violate the sources and change the meaning. The form Grannopolis rather than Gratianopolis for Grenoble is written out in A and B for Letter 66, where Professor Hoffmann proposes Gratianopolis for Grannopolis, and in C for Letter 189, where he proposes Gratianopolitano for Gratianopolis/Grannopolis36). These examples show that special care must be exercised with the forms of place-names, as with personal names, especially when correcting the alleged errors of others.

Before concluding, however, it would be unjust not to acknowledge the accuracy of a number of Professor Hoffmann's corrections. 'We all make slips from human frailty', wrote Dom David Knowles, 'and most of us also from real carelessness, and we expect indulgence within reason'37). Other errors may be attributed to ignorance and sometimes, doubtless, to laziness38).

34) A letter from Henry V, preserved in a twelfth-century copy, was addressed Vener[abili] conuentui Cluniacenti et eius abbati Petro: André Wilmart, 'Deux pièces relatives à l'abdication de Pons abbé de Cluny en 1122', Revue bénédictine 44 (1932) 353.


36) Even if Grannopolis originated, as has been suggested, out of a scribal confusion of grä with gran rather than gratia, it appears as a form of Gratianopolis in the most recent edition of Orbis latinus, ed. J. G. T. Graesse, F. Benedict, and H. Plechl (Braunschweig 1971) 164 and should be preserved, if only as an etymological step towards the modern Grenoble.


38) Hence my occasional reliance on Gams, which is criticized by Professor Hoffmann on p. 434, together with my use of the English translation of Caesarius of Heisterbach and failure to cite Schmale's edition of Adalbertus Samaritanus. This last point is characteristic of Professor Hoffmann's overhasty criticisms, since the text I cite is different from that of Adalbertus (as a comparison with the parallel passage in Schmale's edition shows) and repre-
In addition to the points listed in Appendix D, at least seven of Professor Hoffmann's corrections to the notes and appendices on pp. 434-441 are clearly right: *Autisiodori* in Letter 61 means 'at Auxerre' and thus adds an entry to Peter's itinerary, as does the reference to his visit to St. Denis in the *Vita Sugerii II*; the protomartyr of the Apostles was James and his feast was on 25 July (Letter 123); the reference to the death of Innocent II dates Letter 137 after 1143; *tironem* in Letter 186 refers to a tyro and not to the abbey of Tiron; the reference to the death of Innocent II dates Letter 137 after 1143; the reference to the death of Innocent II dates Letter 137 after 1143; the reference to Peter's being on his way back from Rome dates Letter 189 in March/April 1152; and Pentecost in 1152 fell on 8 June (Letter 193). These points represent real errors and oversights on my part, though it is doubtful whether they require the two pages which Professor Hoffmann devotes to them. His remaining points, relating to Letters 5, 83, 94, 129, 136, 162, 164, 191, and the reference *sine rege et principe* in Letters 21 and 173, while not without interest and merit, are essentially matters of opinion and interpretation, such as whether there were one or two peace-meetings in 1152/4, concerning which my disagreement with Professor Hoffmann's previously-published views may have added some animus to the tone of his articles.

The purpose of the present article is not to argue about minutiae but to explain the principles upon which my edition was based and to question those put forward by Professor Hoffmann. These reflect his conviction that, 'Good editions are less the work of brilliant loners than the fruit of long tradition and discipline' and that the necessary training for textual studies must be acquired 'in those institutes which have long been occupied with editing medieval sources' (p. 440). The traditional principles worked out by classical philologists in the nineteenth century, however, have proved to be less satisfactory for some sorts of medieval texts than for others, and particularly for texts which have been corrected and revised by the author. Variant readings in texts like these cannot simply be classified as right or wrong on philological (or even text-historical) grounds and placed accordingly in the text or the apparatus, as Professor Hoffmann assumes, without the danger of conflating the versions and producing a text which the

sents the form of the *ars dictaminis* as it was first known north of the Alps (and might, therefore have been known to Peter the Venerable), whereas there is no evidence that the text of Adalbertus circulated in France.

30 This foolish mistake was pointed out to me orally by the late Fr. Damien Van den Eynde, whose courteous and constructive tone in his article on 'Les principaux voyages de Pierre le Vénérable,' *Benedictina* 15 (1968) 58–110, in which he proposes a number of revisions to my work, contrasts markedly with that of Professor Hoffmann.
author perhaps should have written but in fact never wrote. All writers make mistakes, but these, like their style, grammar, orthography, and punctuation are an essential and authentic part of their works. 'The editor should prefer to make his readers think', wrote Professor Bieler, 'rather than to save them trouble'⁴⁰). Professor Hoffmann may well attribute my willingness to present the letters of Peter the Venerable 'warts and all' to a wishy-washy cultural relativism and a lack of philological training, but he can hardly question an editor's responsibility to respect the form as well as the content of his text and to present clearly all alternatives possibly arising from the author's own revisions and corrections.

Appendix A

Letters 126 and 127

The most striking differences between the versions of the text in A and C are found in Letters 126 and 127, which were written by two of Peter the Venerable's companions on a retreat in the woods near Cluny to his friend and secretary Peter of Poitiers. The complete texts are printed here in parallel columns, with the differences in italics, as they appear in the sources except for the expansion of abbreviations and normalization of capitalization and the marks of punctuation (but not their position). The comparison is of interest on three counts.

(1) Accuracy. A is clearly more accurate than C, which has several demonstrable errors, including (in Letter 126) at for atque, haec for hoc (three times), ministri for minister, religiosi for religiosa, and creditus for orationi deditus and (in Letter 127) transmissis for transmissas, spectamus for expectamus, and nouos for ueros. On all of these S agrees with A against C. The priores after poetae, although found in both C and S, may also be an erroneous intrusion into the text. In contrast, the only demonstrable error in A seems to be the omission of praemonstrares, which is required by the series of triads (senescere/canescere/claudicare, praesignares/praecantares/praemonstrares, religionis/orationis/lectionis). The third of these triads also guarantees the accuracy of the reading orationi deditus in A. The reading creditus in C may have arisen from a confusion of an abbreviation for orationi (o', ori') written close to deditus.

(2) Priority. Professor Hoffmann cites some fragments from these letters on pp. 406–407 in order to show that the A-version is more polished and cultivated and therefore later. I remain unconvinced by his arguments

⁴⁰) Bieler, Grammarian's Craft 41.
on this point, and also with regard to the citation in Letter 126 of the conclusion of Letter 123. That A has the same wording in both letters (i.e. the citation in Letter 126 is correct), while C has a different wording, still indicates to me that A was the first version and C the revision. The form of the conclusion in C seems to fit together better with the following phrase by including a specific reference to the lord [abbot], whereas the following phrase in A, where the conclusion is addressed directly to Peter the Venerable and refers to him simply as ubiscum, has to be fuller. Likewise for Letter 127, in spite of the single passage involving the word tarditas studied by Professor Hoffmann, the difference in length is more easily explained as additions to the text of C than as omission from A, though it may conceivably be the result of blue-pencilling, perhaps by Peter of Poitiers, of the young Gilbert’s somewhat flowery prose.

(3) Superiority. It is a matter of individual opinion which Version is stylistically superior, and there is no clear proof that either version is the more polished. If the text in A is more polished, however, as Professor Hoffmann maintains, and the stylistic improvements can reasonably be attributed to Peter the Venerable or his chancery, it hardly seems to be an argument against printing the A-version.

41) Leclercq, in Studi medievali 3rd S., 12 (1971) 49 n. 134 remarks on the transfer from vos to tu in Letter 126 and compares it to that in Peter’s Letter 138. This point was not affected by the revisions, but it stresses the need for a careful study of stylistic peculiarities.

Letter 126

C

Epistola Roberti, viri eruditi atque scholastici, et phisicae magistri.

Venerando fratri et charissimo socio P. frater Robertus, quod sequitur.

Praeteritae nuper dominicae vespertino crepusculo, cum post eos qui digni habitii sunt primo videre quae mittuntur, primo audire quae in aereum dicuntur: primum mihi contingeret legere literas vestras quas antea non audieram: gauisus sum. Erat enim in

A

Epistola Roberti uiri scholastici et in phisica magistri.

Venerando fratri et carissimo socio Petro, frater Robertus, quod sequitur.

Praeteritae nuper dominicae uespetino crepusculo, cum post eos qui digni habitii sunt primo uidere quae mittuntur, primo audire quae in aereum dicuntur, michi contingeret legere litteras uestras, quas antea non audieram, gauisus sum. Erat enim in eis,
C  


A  

Epistola Gisleberti, nobilis et litterati iuuenis.

Venerando et charissimo patri, domino Petro sancti Ioannis, Frater G. salutem.

Post illas dominorum meorum, quos si dici liceat fratres et socios habere merui: nitore prefulgentis eloquii splendidissimas epistolas: reuerentiae vestrae transmissas: et nos hanc nostram linguae pauperrimae pauperculum chartulam, solius tantum salutationis vestrae diuitem baiulam: mittimus. Spero quod satis facile praesumptuosa rusticitati stili nondum satis exculti, ueniam dabitis. Hoc unde magis timage, tutum esse rogo: ne videlicet ista literarum tarditas, de tarditate seu tepiditate minus in me feruentis dilectionis: quin potius ex

Ecce non quia minus diligo, sed propera ista quae dixi, tardius scribo.

Igitur post illa quae patri communi singulariter in epistola vestra mandasti: patris filios, fratres et socios vestros salutastis, magnifice illo heremitarum nomine sublimiter honorastis. Agnosco me praefati patris filium, agnosco me etiam fratris quamuis senioris, et cuius potius videar esse filius, fratrem adolescentulum. Vnde nec diffiteor socium: et ideo inter salutatos agnosco me utique salutatum. Sed nunquid sic dicere possum, quod et heremitan me fore cognoscam? Reuera sicut scribitis siluas incolimus: et sepe plus sunt nobis familiaria frondea tecta arborum, quam lapidea seu latericia domorum. Nondum tamen illo modo heremitico facti sumus sicut passus solitarius in tecto. Illum enim non tantum circumfusa nemorum densitas, quantum ipsa longe remota mortalium societas, solitarius fa-
Appendix B

The Variants

The list of variants given by Professor Hoffmann on pp. 410–411 is incomplete, inaccurate, and inconsistent with regard to putting the lemma first or second. In the following list, the variant is put first, in the form it appears, and the lemma second, with an indication of whether the variant is written between the lines (‘above’) or in the margin (‘beside’), except for the three cases (A 2, C 17, and S 5) where the variant follows the lemma in the text. The readings found in the other sources are indicated in parentheses. The numbers refer to the letters in my edition, and the superscript numbers to the variants there.

A

1. 913 (f. 16r B) uel ex[cipiam] above suscipiam (S) (cf. C 1)
2. 20124 (f. 21r A) frigore uel rigore (S) (cf. C 2)
3. 271 (f. 25r A) uel [parien]di (CS) above parienti
4. 3430 (f. 29r B) uel [qu]a[m] (CS) above quem
5. 377 (f. 39r B) uel scribatur (C) above dicatur (not in S)
6. 439 (f. 34v A) uel [diu]tius (CS) above diutinus
7. 5359 (f. 44v A) uel apis above ouis (C) (not in S)
8. 548 (f. 47r B) uel [incoep]to above inceoptui (C) (not in S)
9. 673 (f. 53r B) uel desecta (C) above defecta (S)
10. 1247 (f. 64r A) uel ad[iungere] (CS) above coniungere

B

C

1. 913 (f. LXXXIXr) alias excipiam beside suscipiam (S) (cf. A 1)
2. 20124 (f. XCIIP) alias frigore beside rigore (S) (cf. A 2)
3. 28285 (f. CIIv) alias reduxit (A) beside adduxit (S)
4. 28300 (f. CIIIr) alias superfluam (A) beside superfluum (S)
5. 28440 (f. CVIr) alias earum (A) beside eorum (S)
6. 355 (f. CXIVr) alias possent beside possunt (A) (cf. S 1)
7. 479 (f. CXXIIv) alias attentum (A) beside intentum (cf. S 2)
8. 536 (f. CXXVv) alias sanctis (A) beside sciens (not in S)
9. 5344 (f. CXXIXv) alias miro beside mero (A) (not in S)
10. 5383 (f. CXXXr) alias cuius beside cui (A) (not in S)
11. 569 (f. CXXXIIr) alias nulla (A) beside non ulla (not in S)
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12. 62\(5\) (f. CXXXV\(r\)) alias sublimatur beside subleuatur (A) (cf. S3)
13. 67\(5\) (f. CXXXVI\(r\)) alias statuerunt beside posuerunt (A) (cf. S4)
14. 115\(5\) (f. CLXV\(r\)) alias posset beside possit (S) (not in A)
15. 144\(4\) (f. CLXXVIII\(v\)) alias remittentur beside dimittentur (not in AS)
16. 145\(5\) (f. CLXXIX\(r\)) alias placeat beside placuit (cf. S5) (not in A)
17. 150\(2\) (f. CLXXXIV) habitaculum vel hospitium (cf. S6) (not in A)

The first variant in S listed by Professor Hoffmann (potest illa written above ea in Letter 14) is really a correction, not a variant, since the ea is expunctuated and the potest illa is not preceded by uel. It has been pointed out to me, however, that the doublet factum sit/contigerit in the third sentence of Letter 191, though separated by several words and not marked as a variant, may have resulted from a scribal effort at emendation.

Appendix C

The text-history of the Contra Petrobrusianos is of importance here both because of its close relation to that of the letter-collection (of which it formed a part) and because of the use made of it by Professor Hoffmann, who cited the recent edition by Dr. James Fearns. 'If Constable hoped that the new edition of the tractate . . . would support his thesis, he has been disappointed' (p. 403). Leaving aside my hypothetical hopes and disappointments, Professor Hoffmann's use of Dr. Fearns's work can only be described as disingenuous, because the citation expressing doubt on the question of the revisions and describing them as 'all fairly insignificant' expressly refers to revisions in the text, not in the chapter-headings. Directly above, Dr. Fearns wrote that, 'There are indications that the Contra Petrobrusianos was also

[i.e. like the letters] touched up at some points, but the amount of revision was certainly very small. The most obvious signs, the alterations in several of the chapter-headings, have been mentioned' (p. xvii), referring to his previous statement that, 'There are also a number of chapter-headings in which DL [= A] appear to have preserved the original version, whereas P [= C] and B have an improved, and presumably later, title in common' (p. xv). This view is reflected in his stemma (p. xvi):

```
   x (First Collection)
     
D                  y (Second Collection)
     
(= A)             B
     
C
```

This stemma shows some interesting correspondences with that proposed above for the letter-collection, which was derived from different evidence. Above all, it confirms that there were two distinct collections containing different versions of the text, and it lends some support to the view that A represents the first version of the text as well as of the collection.

Appendix D

**Addenda et corrigenda**

The additions and corrections are cited here by page-number and then either by line- or note-number (in parentheses). This list includes, but is not restricted to, the points made by Professor Hoffmann and is indebted to many scholars.

**Volume I**

14 (last line) cf. Psal. 113.5–6
16 (19) cf. Gal. 6.14
27 (3 f.b.) Philip. 1.8
37 (18) Exod. 10.21–22; cf. I Tim. 6.16
41 (n. ff) Ioan. 19.38–40
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45 (9 f.b.) audiente] audente
46 (4–6) Iob 25.5–6
46 (7–8) Iob 1.1
48 (14) eum] cum
76 (23) cunctos] cinctos
108 (9) omnibus] omnibus
129 (25) Philip. 3.19
146 (8 f.b.) mari] mare
154 (25) implorari] imploravi
158 (7 f.b.) Luc. 7.37–38
159 (10) omit uelle
162 (22) Virgil, Aeneid, I, 301; VI, 19 (‘alarum remigiüs’)
163 (8 f.b.) Dan. 3.13 f.
163 (3 f.b.) Psal. 118.32; Bened., Reg., Prol. 49
164 (6) Ion. 3.5 f.
164 (6) Psal. 50
164 (7) Luc. 7.37–38
164 (11 f.b.) Luc. 10.38–42
164 (8 f.b.) Matt. 10.16
165 (3) Matt. 10.19
168 (14) Maria] maria
174 (4) pontificii] pontificii
174 (3 f.b.) Quem] Quam
182 (7–8 f.b.) Psal. 65.5
182 (6–7 f.b.) Rom. 9.18
182 (n. x) xxvii|xxxvii
183 (9–10) I Cor. 5.8
183 (19) unam] unanimum
184 (16) et 36] Vnde in eadem regula scriptum est: Secundus humilitatis
gradus est, si quis propriam non amans voluntatem, desideria sua non
delectetur implore, sed
185 (8) :.
186 (n. x)] II Pet. 2.8.
187 (20) cf. Cant. 7.4
188 (4–9) cf. Geoffrey of St. Thierry, Serm. 28 (Rheims, Bibli. mun., 581, f. 118°)43)

43) The passage Et uelut intra . . . uox dei loquentis auditur appears in a similar, though not identical form, in both Geoffrey’s sermon and Peter’s letter. The source is unknown, but the sentiments resemble those expressed in several works, especially the Moralia, of Gregory the Great.
506 (20) aequus] equus
202 (19) sincerem] sinerem
202 (6 f.b.) iterum] iturum
213 (5) Ioan. 10.11 (2nd Sunday after Easter)
222 (24) superabamus] sperabamus
235 (28–29) Sallust, Catil., I (‘ueluti . . . transigere’)
241 (1) eadam] eadem
304 (3–4 f.b.) cf. Gregory the Great, In Ezech., I, v, 7 (PL, LXXVI, 823 CD)
305 (14–15) Luc. 11.21
307 (11) Iob 1.1
307 (16 f.b.) Matt. 25.1–13
308 (12 f.b.) poenae] pene
316 (18) Aureliacensis] Aurelianensis
324 (8–9) Virgil, Georgica, IV, 61–62 (‘frondea tecta’).
324 (6–7 f.b.) Statius, Thebais, I, 1 and 184 (‘fraterna ex acie’)
326 (20) aliquantulum] aliquantulam
338 (6) ad] ab
339 (29) quod] quid
341 (6) mortis] morte.
347 (6–7 f.b.) Matt. 11.12
349 (3 f.b.) in] ut
350 (12) se] de
355 (10 f.b.) uerbi] uerba
357 (16) dampnatus] dominatus
370 (last line) recaepi] recipi
378 (20) Bobus] bobus
388 (5) Virgil, Aeneid, III, 39 (‘Eloquar an sileam’)
389 (14) Exod. 16.3
391 (11–12 f.b.) Hebr. 10.31
393 (21–22) Matt. 5.26
396 (11) Isai. 4.6
396 (23) Otto, Sprichwörter, 21–22
397 (16) I Pet. 2.9.
397 (20) Rom. 12.4,5
403 (2) archem] arcem
405 (22) qua] quia
409 (18) Et] Est
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414 (6) Isai. 1.21
414 (6) iudicii] iudicii
415 (17) Iob 40.28
419 (8 f. b.) Taceo] Teneo
428 (6) contempto] contemplo
433 (16) Ist] Isti
435 (7 f. b.) Tironem] tironem
441 (10 f. b.) quam] quae
446 (17) Sic] Si
446 (18) I Reg. 15.33
446 (18) frustra] frusta
447 (2) frusta] frusta
449 (3) uimen] uimen
450 (4–5) Thren. 3.55

Volume II

10 (3) the twelfth
51 (4–5 f. b.) The De nouiciis instruendis was probably written towards the end of the twelfth century, according to Jean Leclercq, 'Deux opuscules sur la formation des jeunes moines', Revue d'ascétique et de mystique, 33 (1957) 389–390.
66 (19) east
86 (2) words
98 (n. to p. 6, 1. 24) The abbey may have been Bonnevaux (dio. Poitiers).
130 (14) 36 – I] 1.2
160 (4 f. b.) 1142] 1143
182 (13 f. b.) June] July
211 (n. to p. 402) Peter Vivian may have been the prior of Ternay who appears on a charter of ca. 1148 in Cluny, V, 446, no. 4093.
221 (n. to p. 434, 1. 2) Herbins was the priory of St. Nicholas at Arbin, in the diocese of Chambéry: see Cottineau, Répertoire, I,132.
222 (1–2) omitted whom ... Tiron
230 (3 f. b.) 9] 8
262 Add a reference to Peter at Cluny on 9 January 1144 in O. Morel, Inventaire sommaire des Archives communales de Brénod (Ain) (Bourg, 1932) between pp. 32–33.
264 (7–8) Périgueux] Pérignieux
269 (10) omitted Tiron (Letter 186)
298 (10) 1140] 1141
344–348 In the charter of 1144 cited above from Morel, Inventaire, between pp. 32–33, there are references to a cellarer named Aimo, an almoner named Geoffrey, and a chamberlain named William (possibly the same as the Prior William) and additional references to Armannus as sacristan, Hugh the cellarier, and Hugh the claustral prior.

345 on Durannus, see also Marcigny, p. 102, no. 171 bis (1144)

345 on Enguizo, see also Cluny, V, 527–528 and 545, nos. 4177 (1154?) and 4200 (1160).


348 on Wicardus, see also Cluny, V, 282, no. 3928 (1117)