



Publié sur *La Vie des Classiques* (<https://96.ip-213-32-20.eu>)

[Accueil](#) > More manuscripts of the “notae” in the margins of Cassiodorus, “*Expositio Psalmorum*”

---

## MORE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE “NOTAE” IN THE MARGINS OF CASSIODORUS, “EXPOSITIO PSALMORUM”

I gave some examples in [a previous post](#) of the unpublished “notae”, symbols indicating what type of comment was involved, in the margin of Cassiodorus’ *Expositio Psalmorum*, his commentary on the Psalms. The notae are listed and explained at the top; and I gave some manuscript images.

After doing so, a few more online manuscripts came to hand.

First and best of these is in Munich, at the BSB, a manuscript of the 2nd quarter of the 9th century, with the shelfmark Clm 14077. It’s online [here](#). This manuscript does not just give the notae and the meaning; it also gives an example after each. This is unusual, and must indicate creative work by the copyist. Here is folio 1r:



# INCEPINT TATIO NOTARUM

**I**UERSAS NO  
tar more maio  
rum certis locis  
estimauimus affi

gendas. has cum explana  
tionibus suis subter adun  
ximur; Utque quid lector  
uoluerit inquirere. p[er] similitu  
dinem earum sine aliqua diffi  
cultate debet inuenire.

pap

**HOC IN IDIOMATIS IDEST KO  
PRIIS LOCUTIONIB; LEGIS DIUINE.**

**E**xurge d[omi]ne saluum me fac d[omi]n[us]  
meus. Non quod d[omi]n[us] dormiens  
aut recubans excitatur; sed  
scripturis diuinitus test[is]. ad  
exprimendam causam p[ro]p[ri]o  
logiam ex n[ost]ra consuetudine  
aliquid de d[omi]no dicere.

p

**HOC IN DOGMATIB; VALDE  
NECESSARIIS.**

**N**equando rapiat ut leo anima  
mea, leoni confestur diabu  
lus. Leoni frequenter comparat[ur].

& xpr[ist]us. Ille quod adferit tu rapit.  
iste quod deripit ad salutem,  
**HOC IN DEFINITIONIBUS.**

**N**eq; in furor & uocorripiasine,  
Ira & furor iudicis contrarium  
damnatio n[ost]ra effectus est.  
Id est motus animi concitatus  
ad poenam puocari inferenda.  
sed ira longa indignatio est.  
furor repentina mentis accen  
sio; Hec ut allegorice trans  
lati uerbu[m] edicta sunt.

sche

**HOC IN SCHEMATIBUS.**

**C**ustodi med[us]ne ut pupilla oculi  
sub umbra alarum tuarum.  
p[er] schema ikon. quae latine d[icitur]  
imaginatio, pupille se oculi  
d[omi]n[us] comparauit, pupilla est  
enim in medio posita p[er]spicua  
par oculi quae corporum colores  
uaria qualitate discernimus.  
Dicta a paruitate sui pupilla  
quasi pusilla.

et

**HOC IN ETIMOLOGIIS.**

**P**lut sup[er] peccatores & reliqua  
usq; pan[em] calicis eorum.  
Id est mensura quae polluitur.

Nice, isn't it? But it also demonstrates how these sorts of indices, meta-textual elements, are vulnerable to interference in transmission.

The next one is a more conventional manuscript, this time in Paris, at the BNF. The shelfmark is Paris latinus 2194. It's 10th century, once belonged to Colbert, and is online [here](#). Sadly we have only a monochrome image, but it is a very clear one!

Note at the top the shelfmark's of past owners. It was "Cod. Colb. 447" - manuscript 447, when it was owned by Colbert. Then it was "Regius 3642", that is manuscript 3642 in the Royal library. At the revolution the old royal library became the core of the new Bibliothèque Nationale Française, and "2194" was written lower down. Manuscripts move around like bumblebees sometimes, and they reflect the times through which they passed.



# VERSAS NOTAS MOREMA

## ORVM CERTIS LOCIS

ESTIMAMUS AFFICENDAS HAS CUM  
EXPLANATIONIBUS SUI SUBTER  
ADIUNXIMUS UT QUICQUID LECTOR  
VOLUERIT INQUIRE PER SIMILI  
TUDINES EARUM SINE ALIQUA  
DIFFICULTATE DEBEAT INVENIRE;

Hoc in diomatibus. id est propriis lo  
cutionibus legis diuine. γ

Hoc in dogmatibus; ualde necessariis;

Hoc in definitionibus. γ

Hoc in sententiis. γ.

Hoc in methodo logicis. γ

Hoc in interpretatione nominum;

Hoc in arte rhetorica

Hoc in theopoeia;

Hoc in syllogismis;

Hoc in arithmetica;

Hoc in geometria.

Hoc in musica.

Hoc in astronomia.

INCIPIT PREFATIO EXPOSITIO  
NUM IN PSALTERIO

epulsis aliquando inuenerunt  
urbis sollicitudine dignitatem  
& curis secularibus nexio sape  
se condit cum psalterii cae  
summarum mella gustassem;

Id quod solent desiderantes efficere auidus  
me persecutor immergi uel dicta saluta  
ria suauiter. Inhibere enim post amarissimas  
actiones. sed familiaris in chaeribus occur  
rit. Obscuritas quae uisus est inget ce  
pionis & uelata parabolis. Haec indic  
tis uitalibus noxia dissimulatione prae  
teritur dum saepe illud repperiri solet & am  
biguum. quod magni sacramenta gestat  
arcanum. Tunc ad augustum facundissi  
mi patris confugio pinacissimam lectionem.  
In qua tanta erat copia congesta dictorum  
ut & uideri uix possit relectum quod ha  
bunde uidetur & positum. Credo cum ni  
mis auidus populos ecclesiasticis dapibus &  
plere cupit. Necessario fluenter tam mag  
ne praedicationis emanauit quo circa  
memor in firmata. iace magis ipsius quo  
rundam psalmorum libris propositum di  
uina macta largiente inuoluit uadosos.  
Conpendiosa breuitate deduxi uno codice  
tam diffusa completens quae ille in decadas  
quindecim mirabiliter expleuit. sed ut qui  
dam de omero ait. Tale est de eius sensu ali  
quid subripere. quale herculi clauum de  
manu tollere. Est enim litterarum omnium  
magister egregius. & quod in ueritate parum  
est caustissimus disputator decurrit;

Quippe tamquam fons purissimus. nulla feci  
pollutus sed in integritate fidei perseverans  
nescit hereticis dare unde se possint aliqua  
colludatione defendere. Totus catholicus  
totus orator doctus inuenitur. & in ecclesia



2194.

microfilm hides the actual symbols in the margin for the most part!

Also available online [here](#) is BNF Paris lat. 2195, this time in colour. This manuscript was written in the first quarter of the 9th century, and was once the property of the abbey of St Martial at Limoges, according to the catalogue.





projects make a far better job of it than the old microfilmmers. Perhaps the reputation of the institution is on the line. A microfilm might be seen by one or two scholars, who had been overcharged for it, and nobody cared if the quality was any good. Indeed the BNF certainly tried to sell me some quite useless microfilms once; and I had to threaten to involve Visa before they refunded my money. But the world can see these digital copies; and there is national prestige at stake. The end result is good for everyone, however.

This leaf has clearly been damaged. I would guess that the manuscript had lost its cover, at some point during its history, and the top right got wet and rotted. But it is still with us!

It is really very remarkable to be able to compare something like this so easily from my study. We are so fortunate. These are days of wonders!

---