## Description and Transcription V Lichfield, Cathedral Library MS 1a (Boethius in the Lichfield Gospels) <br> Anna Packman (University of Birmingham)



Lichfield Cathedral, MS 1a, fol. 3v © Chapter of Lichfield Cathedral (2010).

This section of text (folio 3 v , MS lines 1-20) is an extract from the third book of Boethius' commentary on Aristotle's Categories. It is the only pre-Conquest witness to this logical treatise in an English collection and indicates very early medieval engagement with Aristotelian philosophy. This tenth-century manuscript fragment survives because it was bound as one of the flyleaves to the magnificient eighthcentury gospel book, known as the St. Chad Gospels (Lichfield MS 1). The scholarship on this manuscript fragment,
as with the other flyleaves, has been confined to brief bibliographical comment and classification. ${ }^{1}$

The script is Carolingian minuscule and possibly of French provenance. It has been conjectured that the Boethian flyleaves, which are not Insular, may have been incorporated into the Lichfield Gospels (MS 1) in a binding of the twelfth century or later. ${ }^{2}$

The quality of the vellum is poor and this is particularly evident on the recto side of the folio, where dark hair follicles are visible on the membrane. The ruling of the lines is marked by pricking in the margin. A significant portion of the text has been lost due to ink discolouration.

The first (and main) scribe writes using an informal hand and the text is heavily abbreviated. There is very limited spacing between words and occasional use of the punctus (MS I.2, I.3, I.10, I.15, I.16, I.17, I.19, I.21). Likewise, majuscule script is used only sporadically, ' $E$ ' (MS I.6) and 'Q' (MS I.10, I.11). There are a couple of corrections by a second scribe, writing in a darker ink (MS I.5-6, II.12-3, I.22). The main scribe uses the earlier uncial form of an ' $a$ ', with a bowl to the left of a curved line that descends from left to right. In contrast, the second scribe uses a later form of ' $a$ ' where the line does not curve from above the bowl of the letter. For the ' $f$ ' form, the second scribe has an additional curved stroke to that used by the hand of the main scribe.

It seems likely that this folio is a fragment of a classroom or practice exercise; 'calorem' is misspelled 'colorem' twice (MS I.5, I.6) and there is an instance of dittography where the scribe repeats 'emitare' (MS I.5, I.6). The first scribe appears to note this mistake by marking a hooked ascender on the first and last letter of the second 'emitare' (MS I.6). Further, the second scribe encloses the first instance of 'emitare' within a dotted text box, also drawing attention to the error.

[^0]
## Transcription

sed $s(e) c(u n) d(u) m$ id $q(u o d)$ ad hoc e(sse)) $p$ [ote]st frigus u(ero) calorq(ue) et
dulcedo uel amari
-tudo non sec(un)d(u)m quod possit e(ss)e sed s(e)c(un)d(u)m id q(uo)d ia(m) sit
$\mathrm{c}(\mathrm{on})$ siderat(ur). sed q(uod) du
 uocabamus. hac q(uo)q(ue)
$n(o n)$ longa
questio [si]c eni(m) inueniem(us) $q(u o) d$ passio $a b$ affectionib(us) discrepar[e]
uideat(ur)
5 Si qua eni(m) corpora ita calefacta s(in)t ut ex se q(uo)q(ue) ipsa alique(m)
colore(m) emita-
[r]e emitare ualeant illa ad colore(m) effecta nuncupant[ur] si qua
u(ero) [tan]tum ca[l]orem momento susceperint passiones dicim(us) ab eff[e]
cti[bus] segregem(us) ut $\mathrm{h}[\mathrm{ic}]$ sit integru(m) passionu(m) affect[io]nu(m)q(ue) et
habitu[s aug]
-mentu[m] [ut] am[p]lificata passio in affectione(m) transeat $\mathrm{au} / \mathrm{g} \backslash m e n t a t a \mathrm{a}[\mathrm{f}]$

10 -fect[io] inhabit(um) permutetur. Quartu(m) u(ero) gen(us) qualit[a]tis e(st)
form[a]
[e]t circa aliq(ui)d [con]stans figura Quarta e(st) species qualitatis qu(a)e
$s(e) c(u n) d(u) m$
[unamquam] \q(ue)/ for[mam figuram]q(ue) p(er)spicit(ur) e(st) au(tem) figura uel
triangulu(m) uel qua
[-dratum] fo[rma autem ipsiu]s trianguli uel quatrati qu(a)eda(m) qualitas unde
[eti]a(m) f[ormos]o[s homine]s dicim(us) figura eni(m) queda(m) uel pulchrior (ue)!
medioc[ris]
15 [uel alio quodammo]do constituta. qualitas formaq(ue) nominat(ur). Has
au(tem) e(ss)e q[ualitates nullu]s dubitet siq(ui)de(m) ea figura d(icitu)r figuratus. et
a forma
<br>for//matas. [ampliu]s q(uo)q(ue) [tria]ngulu(m) etia(m) a triangulatione
nominatu(m) et qua
-tratum a [quadr]atu[ra] si ill(a)e s(un)t qualitates $\mathrm{s}(\mathrm{e}) \mathrm{c}(\mathrm{un}) \mathrm{d}(\mathrm{u}) \mathrm{m}$ quas quale aliquid
nominet(ur) [non est] q[ui] dub[it]et forma(m) figura(m)q(ue) e(ss)e qualitates.
q(uonia)m qu(a)e his par
20 [tici]pan[t ex ipsi]s qualia nominat(ur) sed q(uonia)m in c(on)tinue quantitatis
speci[e]b(us)

## Key:

() parentheses: expanded abbreviations
[ ] square brackets: portion of text lost through physical damage to the manuscript
/ \ slashes: scribal insertion on the line or below the line
\ / slashes: scribal insertion above the line
> <br> // double slashes: scribal insertion in the margin
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