Abstract

Alexander Neckam (Nequam, Neckham; also known as Alexander of St Albans; 1157–1217) was a teacher and Augustinian canon, leading St Mary’s Abbey in Cirencester as abbot from 1213 to 1217, where he took part in royal and papal operations. His extensive writings are typically studied according to genre (grammatical treatises, commentaries, sermons, poetry) and assumed to be directed to two separate audiences, scholastic and monastic. This dissertation shows that Alexander’s works form a more coherent whole by considering them within the historical circumstances of his career and the intellectual context of the Augustinian order.

While past scholarship has assumed that Alexander only became a regular canon c.1197 at Cirencester, he more likely had already joined the Augustinians in Oxford, where he moved c.1190 and was associated with the Priory of St Frideswide (now Christ Church). The order’s influence shaped Alexander’s largest body of writings: his commentaries on the biblical wisdom books, often thought of as encyclopedias but better understood using his own label of *meditationes*. These reify the idea of meditation as a natural step in the progression of learning, as promoted by figures such as Hugh of St Victor. Alexander viewed this as a means of caring for souls, promoting female figures as universal models of holy living and seeking closer cooperation between religious orders.

Alexander’s fellow canon Walter de Melida directed a campaign to preserve and promulgate these writings. Walter’s work is reconstructed here from cartularies, letters, and palaeographical analysis of manuscripts. His efforts were outwardly focused, using books to pursue closer relationships with Cirencester’s neighbours.
Sol meldunensis, the miscellany in Cambridge, University Library, Gg.6.42, is here identified as having been created by Geoffrey Brito, who as Alexander’s nephew and a canon at Cirencester personally benefited from the preservation of the abbot’s memory. He presented the collection to Geoffrey, abbot of Malmesbury from 1246 to 1260, and the two houses exchanged the book with successive additions, continuing a literary relationship dating to the time of Robert of Cricklade and William of Malmesbury, and providing a fitting monument to the abbot.
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Chapter 1

Alexander Neckam: Teacher, Canon, Abbot

Alexander Neckam does not fit neatly into the categories typically assigned to authors of the past – it is both too much and too little to say that he was a theologian, philosopher, or poet. The best label that has stuck has been that of ‘polymath’. This captures the range of his interests, but it has also set up readers for disappointment who approach Alexander expecting a thirteenth-century Leonardo da Vinci, only to be faced with prose that can sometimes appear slow-moving and immoderate in its embellishment. The author’s intentions and historical context show that this is a deliberate feature to give readers the space to grow in health and understanding. Alexander’s writings and other surviving documents reveal an Augustinian canon who was indefatigably optimistic, tolerant, and open-minded, seeking to write books meeting both the intellectual and practical needs of his audiences – who responded in kind by preserving and repurposing his work.

There are several famous anecdotes of Alexander’s life – his birth at St Albans on the same September night as Richard I in 1157, his mother Hodierna becoming the king’s wet nurse and receiving a state pension; the reply he received to his application to the school at St Albans, ‘if you are good, you may come; if you are bad (nequam), by no means’;² the pact he made with a friend to join a religious order, which the other did

---


§ Quiddam iocosum.


Non multum curo.

not keep; his refusal to accept the feast of the Immaculate Conception until he was forced to cancel his lectures for years on end after repeatedly falling ill on the day at his students’ prayers.³ He held powerful positions as an administrator, likely participating in the events surrounding Magna Carta as the abbot of Cirencester⁴ and travelling to Rome to attend the Fourth Lateran Council. He died while visiting the bishop of Worcester at Kempsey in 1217, and is thought to be buried at Worcester Cathedral under a time-worn effigy.⁵ He wrote incessantly from an early age, and it is these writings that made him famous. It remains to be seen how Alexander’s works integrate with his life and the communities in which he lived.

1.1 Alexander’s reception in modern scholarship

The earliest biography and listing of Alexander’s works was compiled by the sixteenth-century antiquarian John Leland, who opines, ‘Alexander Necham demands a truly honourable place among the writers of his age’.⁶ Even for Leland, with his tendency to idolize every English author he describes, this is high praise. Given Alexander’s fame, it is curious that his most significant works are now almost wholly unknown. This is largely due to the accidents of the history of modern scholarship; a lack of modern editions has left his books largely inaccessible due to a lack of modern editions. One might compare his fate to that of his contemporary and fellow St-Albanite Matthew Paris, the Benedictine historiographer (c.1150–59). His work survives in only a handful of copies, and he seems to have written with little more than local usage in mind.⁷ Yet after the dissolution of the English monasteries, the most significant Matthew Paris manuscripts came into the hands of Matthew Parker (1504–75), archbishop of Canterbury and bibliophile, who published some of their contents beginning in 1567.⁸ Most of Matthew’s writings were subsequently published in the widely distributed Rolls Series.⁹ The broad availability of editions of Matthew’s works transformed them


⁴ Abbots are not named in the document of 1215, but that of Cirencester appears in the reissue of 1225: J.C. Holt, Magna Carta, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 427, doi:10.1017/CBO978110744596.

⁵ J. Kestell Floyer, ‘On a Mutilated Effigy in the Cloisters of Worcester Cathedral Said to Represent Alexander Neckam’, Associated Architectural Societies Reports and Papers 24 (1897): 88–96, http://hdl.handle.net/2027/njp.32101075887172: in correspondence of January 2016, Chris Guy, cathedral archaeologist, notes that the effigy has also been suggested to represent John Fordham, prior of Worcester until his death in 1438, but judges that it is at least contemporary with an adjoining wall built in the early fourteenth century.


from almost totally unknown books into some of the most significant literary works of medieval England. Alexander was much better known than Matthew Paris in his own day, but he has not had such good luck in modern publication. None of his works reached the printing press until the nineteenth-century enthusiasm for folklore resulted in the publication of his *Nouus Esopus* and *Nouus Auianus* (versifications of Aesop and Avianus) in 1825, as part of a collection of other material relating to the history of fables, and they were both published again before the end of the nineteenth century. Interest in Alexander for his own merits did not surface until Thomas Wright’s publication of *De naturis rerum*, a commentary on Ecclesiastes, alongside *Laus sapientie diuine*. Wright was generally interested in the remains of Anglo-Latin literature and conducted much of the pioneering work in the field, though he worked quickly and inevitably left many gaps. In the case of *De naturis rerum*, he published only the first two of the work’s five books as a ‘manual of scientific knowledge of the time’, arguing that the last three books form ‘simply a commentary on the book of Ecclesiasticus [sic], which has no direct connexion with that which precedes’. His choice of manuscripts was fortunate for *De naturis rerum* (basing the text on Oxford, Magdalen College, MS 139, now thought to be from Cirencester itself), though he uses only one for *Laus sapientie diuine* (London, British Library, Royal MS 8 E. 1x), which is late and structures the work incorrectly. This made Alexander accessible to a wider readership for the first time, but also resulted in a skewed view of these works in most scholarship of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The reaction of contemporary reviewers to Wright’s edition of *De naturis rerum* is predictable. The *Times* called it ‘a bunch of antiquarian sea-weed … a medley of crystal and rubbish’. The *Dublin Review* took issue with Wright’s framing of the work, arguing, ‘Neckam’s object was not science, but devotion; and the facts of natural history are with him but the points of his meditation, or the texts of his sermon.’ ‘Want of sympathy with the author is a sore drawback in an editor; and Mr. Wright has none with Neckam, none with his peculiar learning, none with his moralities, which to him seem “far-fetched”.’ Overall, the book was seen as a worthwhile if unusual addition to the Rolls Series. Despite its faults, the edition did more than any previous effort to promote the modern study of Alexander’s works. It prompted a number of articles


13 Wright, *De naturis rerum*, xiv: also ‘Ecclesiasticus’ at lxvii.

14 Wright, *De naturis rerum*, lxvi–lxvii.


observing aspects of Alexander’s contribution to the history of science, interesting for their presentation of the material in the context of another discipline, though few offer new findings in terms of Alexander or his writings, and many are misled by Wright in understanding the work’s purpose. Because of this publication of De naturis rerum, and especially because he was the first European writer to describe the magnetic compass in detail, Alexander is now most widely known as an early scientist.

Scholarly attention in the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth was otherwise directed towards Alexander’s teaching works: De utensilibus, Corrogationes Promethei, and Sacerdos ad altare. Initial steps were also taken to update and correct the catalogues of his writings made by the early-modern bibliographers, removing spurious attributions by matching identifications with surviving manuscripts. R.W. Hunt made a leap forward in the knowledge of Alexander’s life and works, first with a short but


widely cited overview of the writers of the period, and later in his doctoral thesis, *Alexander Neckam*, completed under Frederick M. Powicke. Unfortunately, though it is said to have become the most commonly consulted thesis in the Bodleian Library, he never published any portion of it. This, somewhat paradoxically, had a chilling effect on scholarship: the existence of the thesis was widely known and its publication expected at any time, preventing most scholars from producing any in-depth research on the subject. The book was finally published posthumously in 1984 as *The Schools and the Cloisters*, having been lightly revised by Margaret Gibson. Hunt’s work defined Alexander for the twentieth century, but the character of academic publishing inhibited the spread of what he had discovered and discouraged others from addressing further questions.

Between 1936 and 1984, Alexander was recognized for his importance in several minor fields of study. His use of Hebrew was noted. Some attention was given to Alexander’s poetry. The importance of his teaching to grammar and the liberal arts in general was recognized. Abortive attempts were made to understand Alexander’s commentaries on the wisdom books. Without dissemination of Hunt’s research, it was difficult to contextualize these findings.

The reasons for Hunt’s delay to make his findings public are somewhat mysterious. R.W. Southern writes that Hunt was indifferent towards the work, and distracted by other tasks. The preface to the published version of the book by Beryl Smalley implies that Hunt was simply a perfectionist, explaining that his work was recognized. Abortive attempts were made to address further questions.

---

26 Her approach is summarized through a quotation of Mark 2:21: Hunt, *Foreword to the published version of the book by Beryl Smalley implies that Hunt was simply a perfectionist, explaining that his work was recognized. Abortive attempts were made to under Alexander’s commentaries on the wisdom books. Without dissemination of Hunt’s research, it was difficult to contextualize these findings.

The reasons for Hunt’s delay to make his findings public are somewhat mysterious. R.W. Southern writes that Hunt was indifferent towards the work, and distracted by other tasks. The preface to the published version of the book by Beryl Smalley implies that Hunt was simply a perfectionist, explaining that his work was recognized. Abortive attempts were made to address further questions.

---

at the Bodleian prevented him from taking the matter of publication seriously. Smalley does not mention that Hunt had indeed made plans to publish the book. What the preface describes as ‘the author’s copy of his thesis’ is a lightly edited and annotated copy prepared for a proposal to Oxford University Press. While the version submitted in 1936 was entitled Alexander Neckam, this copy has Alexander Nequam on the title page, and has slightly different pagination; it is contained in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hunt 102, a box that also includes an annotated copy of Wright’s De naturis rerum. Hunt 101 and Hunt 103 similarly contain miscellaneous notes from research on Alexander. Loose in the front cover of the typescript is a letter from Smalley herself, dated 13 July 1960 at St Hilda’s College, Oxford:

Dear Richard,

Print this just as it is with the strictly necessary additions and revisions! It reads well as it is. I only suggest preparing or adding an account of A.N.’s significance. He strikes me now, fresh from looking at Châtillon’s Libri exceptionum, as marking the very end of the Victorine tradition with the whole trunk bursting open and scattering its contents over the railway station. Does any scholar of the turn of the century sum up so many divergent trends as A.N.? He’s both secular scholar and monk or rather canon. The next generation would produce an encyclopaedia as such, not all mixed up with a commentary. He seems to have been the last of the great non-specialists except for Grosseteste and even he’s less all-round because he kept no equivalent of the monastic commentaries.

Smalley goes on to make a few ‘small points’ on areas of improvement, proposing only minor modifications to the text. Hers is essentially the scheme that was eventually carried out, but only after more than twenty years had passed. Along with this is a letter from the Clarendon Press, dated 26 July 1960, accepting the book for publication. ‘As we agreed last week, I am now returning your typescript, on the understanding that you are going to truncate it somewhere about page 200 and let us have it back as quickly as you can for publication.’ The remainder of the note lists the publisher’s terms. This requests the removal of the second part of the thesis, which consists of extracts concerning Alexander’s life and from his writings; this is the primary difference between the 1936 and 1984 versions. Much of this material is integrated into the footnotes of the final publication, The Schools and the Cloister. The result, as reviewers note, is a curious amalgam of the cutting edge of the 1930s and citations of more recent work.

Now that it is at last available for general consumption, Hunt’s book has brought about a relative explosion of scholarship on Alexander. This has resulted, most usefully, in editions of several more of his works, making most of his minor writings available. The canon of his works continues to be placed on

---

33 Hunt, Schools, vii–viii.
There have been studies of his pedagogical works and his approach to language, and these have been applied fruitfully to research on other subjects; to his contributions to theology and logic; his verse; and especially his mythology. Research on Alexander's core work in his biblical commentaries
is scarce. The interpretation of *De naturis rerum* continues to be shaped primarily by Wright's edition of the first two books included in this publication: his framing has meant that it has been widely studied within the encyclopedic tradition. Most of this scholarship ignores the work's context within Alexander's other works (unsurprisingly, given their inaccessible state), though its relationship to the *Solitium fidelis anime, Laus sapientie divinae*, and *Suppletio defectuum* has been investigated. Nothing of substance has been written on the commentary on Proverbs, though it has been used in assessing Alexander's approach to law. The commentary on the Song of Songs has fared slightly better, with scholarship showing its context within the traditional exegesis of that book, and it is now understood to be the same as *Laus beatissime virginis*, which Hunt had thought to have been a separate lost work by Alexander. Almost nothing since Hunt has been written concerning the commentaries on either the Athanasian Creed or the Psalter. Great progress has been made in relating Alexander's work to that of his contemporaries, but Hunt's conclusions have neither been verified nor challenged. Most importantly, there has been no attempt to relate Alexander's work to his background as a member of the Augustinian order.

Hunt was also the first to study the manuscripts containing Alexander's works thoroughly, but he did not have the time to provide more than an overview of their character. There is something oddly coherent about them, when they are considered as a group: Wright observed in his edition of *De naturis rerum* that...
there was a consistent pattern of framed marginal headings in the manuscripts he examined. This suggested
to him that the headings were included in an original or very early copy,\textsuperscript{47} which can now be seen to reflect
the practices of Cirencester scribes, arguing for a common origin for the books. Hunt himself guessed
that part of Oxford, Jesus College, MS 94 preserves the author’s handwriting, a suggestion later amplified
by Michael Gullick,\textsuperscript{48} but a similar hand in other Cirencester manuscripts has been judged to be that of
another copyist.\textsuperscript{49} To date, nobody has attempted to see what this might imply for the composition of
Alexander’s works.

Scholarship on Alexander Neckam has revealed the biographical details of his life, established what he
wrote, and begun to demonstrate his place in European intellectual traditions. Yet our understanding of
his role as a historical figure and of his writings remains disjointed. We do not know the contents of all his
works in detail, how they relate to other medieval writings, or how his contemporaries used them. Nor do
we fully understand Alexander’s potential role within the communities in which he lived. As can be seen
from this review of scholarship, Hunt’s book \textit{The Schools and the Cloister} compartmentalizes Alexander
and his writings: first into scholastic and monastic contexts, and secondly within a string of activities,
identifying him as a grammarian, versifier and stylist, scientist, preacher, commentator, and theologian.\textsuperscript{50}
The question remains: what was the relationship of this multifaceted writer to the historical Alexander
Neckam – the teacher, Augustinian canon, and abbot?

1.2 The present study

This dissertation considers Alexander as a canon and abbot in the Augustinian order, using the only
artefacts we have from his lifetime – the manuscripts that preserve his writings. The dissertation also takes
advantage of new diplomatic evidence published since Hunt’s thesis, especially the Cirencester cartulary.\textsuperscript{51}
I argue that the Augustinians were much more influential in Alexander’s thought than has been thought
previously, as he most likely became a canon around a decade earlier than previously thought, at Oxford
rather than Cirencester, showing the unified progression of his career. The Augustinian mindset illuminates
the decisions Alexander made in writing, showing that the slow-paced nature of his commentaries on the
wisdom books was a deliberate decision, influenced by the scholastic approach to meditation espoused
by the Victorines. The character of the manuscripts containing these works is also explained through
Alexander’s context at Oxford and Cirencester, showing that he worked collaboratively with his peers to
create and distribute his works. After his death, the fate of Alexander’s writing was closely tied to that of the

\textsuperscript{47} Wright, \textit{De naturis rerum}, lxxvii.
\textsuperscript{49} Thomson, \textit{Speculum speculationum}, xx.
\textsuperscript{50} For an example of the influence of Hunt’s model, see James McEvoy, \textit{Robert Grosseteste}, Great Medieval Thinkers (Oxford: Oxford
University Press, 2000), 8–11.
\textsuperscript{51} C.D. Ross and Mary Devine, eds., \textit{The Cartulary of Cirencester Abbey, Gloucestershire}, 3 vols (London: Oxford University Press,
community of Cirencester.

The separation of Alexander’s works into those addressing distinct scholastic and monastic audiences both arises from and enforces a deduction that he began his cloistered career at St Mary’s Abbey in Cirencester. Hunt assumed that the publication of a congratulatory letter of Peter of Blois corresponded directly to the point at which Alexander became an Augustinian and moved to Cirencester. This is not supported by either diplomatic or literary evidence. It is more likely that Alexander joined the Augustinians at St Frideswide’s in Oxford after he moved there around 1190. His thought and career is in many ways patterned after that of Robert of Cricklade, who began as a canon at Cirencester and promoted St Frideswide as a figure of learning. This allows for a more realistic chronology for the writing of the works in question, and highlights the middle way between secular and monastic mindsets that the Augustinians pursued.

The influence of the Augustinians is most visible in Alexander’s largest body of writings: his commentaries on the biblical wisdom books. These works do not fit neatly into any of the modern categories that scholars have attempted to apply to them. As a result, they are often criticized as slow in progress and extravagant in their prose. Closer analysis suggests this was a deliberate choice intended to give readers space for reflection. Combining his experience as a scholar and preacher, and the reading available to him at Cirencester, Alexander created books that would meet the practical needs of the Augustinians for pastoral care not through the creation of new reference works or systematic enquiries, but through what he calls meditaciones. These practised the ideas of meditation articulated by figures such as Hugh of St Victor as the next logical step in reading and understanding, which were explored by several other writers associated with the Augustinians in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The books are also deeply personal: a colophon to his Tractatus super Mulieremfortem refers to it as ‘speculum animi mei’ or ‘mirror of my soul’. These works are presented as salve for the cloistered, but there is also evidence that they were written with ambitions for influencing the canons’ work in wider society. Alexander promoted female figures as models for holy living, marriage as a holy condition, and cooperation between religious orders. He brought scholarship to bear upon the Augustinian order’s widely recognized attention to pastoral care, a matter of increasing prominence prior to the Fourth Lateran Council.

Alexander’s commentaries were the focus of a campaign to preserve and promulgate his works, together with his sermons. Alexander himself was keenly interested in the publishing process, as can be shown, most notably, through his comments in De utensilibus and Sacerdos ad altare. In what follows I pursue the evidence for book production in the manuscripts from Cirencester, beginning with the hand in Oxford, Jesus College, MS 94 that was identified by Hunt and Gullick as belonging to Alexander; I identify more instances of this script and show that Alexander’s work was highly collaborative. This shows not only that Alexander continued to revise his works over an extended period of time, but also that the text of some works as now preserved was probably completed after his death. Master Walter de Melida emerges as the key figure in this effort, who as a canon at Cirencester contributed his skills as a scribe, textual critic, and administrator, and appears to have functioned as a literary executor of sorts for Alexander.

Long after his death, the dissemination of Alexander’s writings continued to function as a means of
promoting Cirencester’s interests and its relationships with neighbouring houses. This is visible in the letters associated with Walter de Melida, and especially apparent in the miscellany of Alexander’s works in Cambridge, University Library, Gg.6.42, presented to Geoffrey, abbot of Malmesbury from 1246 to 1260. It is typically referred to as the Alexander Neckam ‘florilegium’, properly only designating the first part of the manuscript; the volume should instead be taken as a congruent whole, which I have designated Sol meldunensis from its incipit. I identify the manuscript as the compilation of Alexander’s nephew, Geoffrey Brito, who had personal reasons to preserve his uncle’s memory. Charters in the Cirencester cartulary providing his benefices specifically cite the honouring of the former abbot as their motivation. The book served as a means of exchange between the two houses; it continued a literary relationship dating to the time of Robert of Cricklade and William of Malmesbury, and provided a fitting monument to Alexander’s unreserved optimism and desire for enlightenment.
Chapter 2

The Augustinian Canons in Alexander’s Career and Writings

One of the most difficult problems of the history of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries is understanding the relationship between educational institutions and cloistered communities. It was commonplace until recently to assume that one could make a clean division between the two. This view is encouraged in some ways by medieval writers themselves, as in Serlo of Wilton’s poem, ‘Linquo coax ranis’, condemning the conceit of the scholastic philosophers in Paris.¹ It has never been disputed that religious orders in the twelfth century were keenly interested in recruiting from the schools, as vividly shown in the preaching of Bernard of Clairvaux.² But even where religious communities existed in close proximity to schools in the twelfth century, it was often assumed that they wanted nothing to do with one another. These assumptions have governed the twentieth-century scholarship on Alexander Neckam, and shaped the interpretation of what he wrote.

More recent scholarship is increasingly showing that monastics were keenly interested both in reading the latest work from the schools and in contributing to it. The Augustinian or Austin regular canons in particular, who called themselves ‘cloistered’ but were not monks in a strict sense,³ formed a middle way between complete rejection of the world and full life within it. A re-examination of Alexander’s career shows that one cannot separate his scholastic and cloistered work. It is usually thought that, following a

teaching career at Dunstable, the Benedictine school at St Albans, and Oxford, Alexander experienced a conversion experience of sorts, joining the Augustinian canons and moving to Cirencester around 1197 and embarking on writings of a much more ambitious character. There is no hard evidence for this. The available documentation makes better sense if it is instead assumed that Alexander first joined the Augustinian canons at St Frideswide’s Abbey in Oxford when he moved there around 1190. This would suggest that more of his writing took place before he moved to Cirencester, and provide a less precise but more realistic chronology for his works. The Augustinian order emerges not as something of an afterthought in Alexander’s life, but the unifying factor of his career and writings.

2.1 Dating Alexander’s writings by genre

While Hunt attributed the majority of Alexander’s works to his time at Cirencester, this is largely founded on the dichotomy he established between Alexander’s ‘scholastic’ and ‘monastic’ writings, with the assumption that the latter could only have been produced at Cirencester. The result places the publication of only six of his works before Alexander’s move to Cirencester, where he is first certainly documented in 1203, and at least fourteen (including his most complex and lengthy writings) to the final period of his life, when he would also have been most occupied with administrative duties. The evidence more likely suggests that he first became a canon at St Frideswide’s in Oxford.

2.1.1 Hunt’s chronology of Alexander’s work

There are only a handful of absolute chronological indicators in Alexander’s writings; one must use these in combination with cross references between his works to determine the period in which they were written. R.W. Hunt was the first critic to assess all of Alexander Neckam’s works, and in his book The Schools and the Cloister he struck upon what seems to modern readers an obvious distinction between the works: many of his works are clearly designed for teaching purposes, whereas others exhibit a highly discursive style that is typically associated with monastic writers. He presents the following ‘approximate chronological groups’ for dating Alexander’s works:

i. Early Writings, c.1177–c.1190

   c.1177+  *De utensilibus*
   Commentary on Martianus Capella
   *Nouus Auianus*
   *Nouus Esopus*

ii. Oxford Period, c.1190–c.1197

4 Hunt, Schools, chap. 2.
5 Hunt, Schools, 125–26.
c.1190+ Commentary on the Athanasian Creed
   Questiones
   Sermons

iii. Canon of Cirencester, c.1197–1213

   c.1197+ Laus beatissime virginis
      Solatium fidelis anime
      Corrogationes Promethei
      Corrogationes Promethei versified
      Gloss on the Psalter
   PRE-1205 De naturis rerum et in Ecclesiasten
   1199–1210 Sacerdos ad altare
   PRE-1213 Commentary on Proverbs
      Commentary on the Song of Songs
      Speculum speculationum
   c.1213 Laus sapientie divina

iv. Abbot of Cirencester, 1213–1217

   1213+ Corrogationes noui Promethei
      Super mulierem fortem
   1216–17 Suppletio defectuum

v. Undated: De commendatione uini, hymns, minor verses, Meditatio de Magdalena, Exhortatio ad religiosos

vi. Undated and lost: De nuptiis Mercurii, Epistola ad discipulum, Passio sancti Albani

This arrangement neatly sums up Hunt’s argument concerning Alexander: that he began as a student in Paris, and spent much of his career (from c.1177 to c.1197) as a teacher, presumably a secular cleric, at Dunstable, St Alban’s, and Oxford. After a complete change in mindset from ‘scholastic’ to ‘monastic’, he was finally able to retire to Cirencester to focus on writing for around sixteen years of his life, until his career as an author was largely consumed by administrative duties for the last four years of his life as an abbot. The scheme is tidy apart from a few obvious errors – Exhortatio ad religiosos is not a work by Alexander Neckam, but Serlo of Wilton⁶ – but unrealistic once one considers the sheer bulk of the material being assigned to Cirencester. It presents a writer who had supposedly only produced a handful of short works in the prime of his youth but nonetheless became famous for these, and then suddenly flourished, though he had never previously written a fully original long-form work.

⁶ Printed in Öberg, Serlon de Wilton, 159–62.
The date of Alexander’s conversion is much less secure than Hunt presents it, and it is just as likely that he became an Augustinian canon at Oxford rather than Cirencester. Hunt’s date of 1197 for both Alexander’s conversion and his move to Cirencester hinges on a letter of Peter of Blois congratulating Alexander on having taken up vows, but it cannot be dated as precisely as he believed. All other evidence suggests that Alexander was already an experienced canon by around 1200; the abbey cartulary shows that he was given responsibility in the affairs of the abbey long before becoming its abbot. Moreover, a span that might be as short as ten years is far too little time to produce works of such length and originality as Alexander’s commentaries on Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs, as well as Speculum speculacionum; nor could Alexander have completed the vast amount of research that Corrogationes Promethei would have required in that time. He must therefore have started drafting these books well in advance – and if his later work can indeed be distinguished by its monastic character, as Hunt argues, he must have become a canon well before 1197.

2.1.2 The chronology of Alexander’s works as an Augustinian

The key problem with Hunt’s argument for the chronology of Alexander’s works hence his involvement in the Augustinian order is the assumption that the work of the schools and the cloisters could not mix. He believes that if Alexander was referring to himself as having joined an abbey, as he does in his gloss on the Psalter this must also mean that he had stopped teaching.\(^7\) In every other respect, this gloss is a direct product of the schools, and the chronology becomes more plausible if one allows that Alexander’s ‘scholastic’ works might have been composed while he was a canon, and that he could have begun to write his ‘monastic’ works while he was still teaching.

Beyond the interpretation of Alexander’s biography, several objective corrections can be made to Hunt’s list based on additional cross references of which he was unaware. None of Alexander’s works up to his gloss on the Psalter is securely datable; Hunt presents them as earlier writings due to their lack of cross references to his other books, and their occasionally derivative character. Hunt took attributions to ‘master Alexander of St Albans’ as a sign of an early date, though this needs to be treated with the usual caution, especially since it appears in some copies of De naturis rerum, demonstrably finished at Cirencester.\(^8\) Omitting Alexander’s sermons and minor verses, which were presumably written throughout his life, the approximate dates for his writings can be revised as follows, providing only the dates of their completion:

i. Teacher at Dunstable and St Albans, c.1182–c.1190\(^9\)

\(^{c.1182+}\) De utensilibus\(^{10}\)

\(^7\) Hunt, Schools, 27.
\(^8\) See below, Appendix A: Alexander’s Works.
\(^9\) While Hunt, Schools, 3–4 suggests that Alexander was in Paris from c.1175–82, worked at Dunstable for around a year, and arrived at St Albans in 1183, a closer reading of Matthew Paris (cited above, chap. 1, note 2) suggests a later date; Arthur F. Leach, The Schools of Medieval England (London: Methuen, 1915), 117, http://archive.org/details/schoolsofmedieva00leacuoft estimates 1185.
\(^{10}\) Hunt, Teaching and Learning Latin in Thirteenth-Century England, 1:178 prints the standard accessus to the work, which specifies this title, also used in several manuscripts; the form De nominibus utensilium seems to have been popularized only because it appears in the manuscript used for the first edition, Wright, ’The treatise De utensilibus of Alexander Neckam’, 1:96.
Nouus Esopus
Nouus Auianus

ii. Teacher at Oxford and canon of St Frideswide’s, c.1190–c.1200

1190+ *Super Martianum*¹²
Expositio simboli Athanasii episcopi¹³
Questiones¹⁴

1193+ *Glose super psalterium*¹⁵

iii. Canon of Cirencester, c.1200–1213

**Pre-1205** *Corrogationes Promethei*¹⁶
Corrogationes Promethei metricæ
Solatium fidelis anime⁷
Expositio super cantica canticorum in laudem gloriose ac perpetue uirginis Marie (commentary on the Song of Songs)¹⁸
De naturis rerum et super Ecclesiasten¹⁹
De commendatione uini²⁰

**Pre-1213** *Meditatio de Magdalena*²¹
Tractatus super Mulierem fortem²²
Tractatus super parabolas Salomonis (incomplete)²³

---

¹ Appears to include some borrowings from *Nouus Esopus*: Klein, 'Nouus Auianus', 105.
² This work is closest in style to Alexander’s commentaries on the Athanasian Creed and the Psalter, but may have been written at an earlier date.
⁴ The sole manuscript, Lambeth, Palace Library, 421, fol. 124va, refers to the author as ‘Alexandrum de sancto Albano’.
⁵ Reference to his abbacy in Oxford, Jesus College, 94 a later addition, and earliest manuscripts are attributed to ‘Magister Alexander Nequam’; refers to the Third Crusade: Hunt, *Schools*, 26–27.
⁶ Refers to teaching in the past tense: Hunt, *Schools*, 24–25; might fall anywhere in the chronology before *De naturis rerum*, but gives the impression of being closer to his time of his own education, with occasional references to his own master: Hunt, *Schools*, 6n30.
⁸ Refers to work at Oxford in the past tense: McDonough, ‘The *Laus Beatissime Virginis* and the Canon of Alexander Neckam’ shows that these are the same works; reference to *Solatium fidelis anime*, Hunt, *Schools*, 25.
⁹ Hunt, *Schools*, 26 notes a story at 1.27 written before the fall of Rouen on 24 June 1204; but Wedge, ‘Alexander Neckam’s *De naturis rerum*, 99–100 suggests that the book might nonetheless have been completed at a later date; 1.2 refers to *Super cantica, Solatium fidelis anime*, and *Corrogationes Promethei*, Wright, *De naturis rerum*, 16.
¹⁰ The structure of *Solvirdunensis* as well as a letter from Peter of Blois, Elizabeth Revell, ed., *The Later Letters of Peter of Blois, Auctores Britannici Medii Aevi* 13 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), no. 31, suggests that *De commendatione uini* was dedicated to Thomas Carbonel, abbot of Gloucester from 1179 until 1205: discussed in more detail below, ‘Poems on wine (fols 223r–232r)’.
¹¹ There is no specific evidence that either this or *Super mulierem fortem* were written after *De naturis rerum*.
¹² Refers to *Meditatio de Magdalena* (Oxford, Jesus College, 94, fol. 79ra), and *Super cantica* (fol. 99vb).
¹³ Title refers to Alexander as abbot, but this is likely a later addition. Datable to after 1199, with a reference to the death of Richard I: Oxford, Jesus College, 94, fol. 58ra. It seems likely that Alexander was still working on both this and *Speculum speculationum* at his death.
Genre continues to play a role in the reconstruction of this chronology, and where precise dates cannot be provided, works of a similar character have been grouped for convenience. (For example, there is no reason to believe that the prose and metrical versions of Corrogationes Promethei were written at the same time.) This is most evident in the distinction between Alexander’s work at Oxford and his earlier writings. De utensilibus, Nouus Esopus, and Nouus Auianus are all designed to teach Latin and poetic style; Super Martianum, Expositio simboli, and Super psalterium appear to support lectures, while Questiones is typical of scholastic question-literature. The year of Alexander’s move to Cirencester is still unknown: 1200 is a rounded date, based on his earliest mention in the cartulary. It is intended to leave open the possibility that the works written before 1205 might have been drafted at St Frideswide’s. Laus is likely based on his lectures on the Song of Songs. One might guess that it would have taken around a decade to complete Super cantica, the two versions of Corrogationes Promethei, De naturis rerum, and De commendatione uini.

Even Alexander’s Commentum super Martianum cannot be entirely ruled out as a product of Alexander’s time as an Augustinian, since in his commentary on the Song of Songs he refers to the canons’ interest in the work. The Augustinian order allowed Alexander to apply his scholastic training directly to present knowledge in new ways.

### 2.2 Alexander’s role in Oxford

Although the most straightforward reading of Alexander’s work suggests that he was an Augustinian at Oxford, Hunt assumed that he did not become a canon until moving to Cirencester. This reflects the historiography of the early twentieth century: most of the research on medieval Oxford from the early

---

24 Title refers to Alexander as a canon: refers to Super mulierem fortun at 12.10, Thomson, Speculum speculationum, 23; and Super parabolas, 3.8.1.1, Thomson, Speculum speculationum, 344; Thomson, Speculum speculationum, ix gives 1201 as a terminus post quem, based on a quotation of a decretal of Innocent III.


26 Refers to the death of William de Montibus in 1213: Hunt, Schools, 27; Rigg, History of Anglo-Latin Literature, 116 gives date of 1213–15; one manuscript refers to Alexander as a canon, but the text seems to have been finished after his journey to Rome: Wedge, ‘Alexander Neckam’s De naturis rerum’, 19–22.

27 Refers to Laus sapientie divina: McDonough, Alexandri Neckam Sacerdos ad altare, ix.

28 Refers to the death of King John in October 1216: McDonough, Suppletio defectuum, xi.

29 Super cantica 6.24, cited in Hunt, Schools, 8193.


31 Hunt, Schools, 9–12.
twentieth century discouraged any notion that religious communities had any interest in being involved in its schools. Herbert Salter conducted particularly extensive research on the Augustinians in Oxford,\(^\text{32}\) and came to the conclusion that their influence was limited to that of landlords; if anything, he argued, they had a negative effect on the university. The evidence for his view comes mainly from fourteenth- and fifteenth-century sources: there is comparatively little documentation for the Augustinians in the twelfth century, and more recent research has suggested that the canons took a much more active role.\(^\text{33}\)

Alexander describes his teaching at Oxford as ‘reading publicly in theology’.\(^\text{34}\) It is now natural to think that anyone known to have moved to Oxford would have done so primarily to participate in its educational system. Around 1190, this was not necessarily the case. At this time, Lincoln or Northampton had as much potential as a future university centre. It was not the schools that would attract a cleric to Oxford, but its ecclesiastical courts;\(^\text{35}\) these are now thought to have given Oxford an advantage over its rivals, especially in the study of canon law.\(^\text{36}\) Reflecting later in life, it is Paris, St Albans (representing both his birthplace and one of his first teaching posts), and the abbey at Cirencester that Alexander names as most intellectually stimulating.\(^\text{37}\) He could likely have found better positions at other schools in the late twelfth century, and it seems just as likely that he went there specifically to investigate and eventually join the Augustinians. Life as a teacher offered little prospect of the stability provided by religious orders.\(^\text{38}\) Having made a pact with one of his fellow students to become a religious (presumably dating to his time at Paris, from around 1177 until 1182),\(^\text{39}\) there would have been no reason to delay until he was over forty.\(^\text{40}\)


\(^{39}\) Ferruolo, *The Origins of the University*, 195 suggests that Alexander might instead have travelled to Paris twice, first studying the liberal arts in the 1170s under Adam of Balsam and second in preparation for the *magisterium*.

\(^{40}\) Super cantica 8.15 (Oxford, Magdalen College, 149, fol. 179vb): ‘At tu cuius faciem ruga senilis arat. cuius genua labant... mens tot inuoluit se curis ad radicem arboris iam posita est securis... et tu sompnis audes indulgere securis? Militauimus et tu sompnis audes indulgere securis?’
Hunt's suggestion that Alexander became a canon in 1197 is based solely on a letter of Peter of Blois, congratulating master Alexander of St Albans on having taken up monastic vows. He commends Alexander on having given up the 'honour of a master', as canons did not cease to use the title 'magister', the recipient had apparently ceased to be the master of a school, which more logically points to St Albans rather than Oxford in the context of what is known about Alexander's life. Peter of Blois began to circulate letter collections around 1184, but this epistle occurs in a second recension, traditionally dated c.1197, but now thought to have been compiled between 1198 and 1205. This only circumscribes the latest possible date of its composition, and Peter is known to have added earlier letters to his collections. Peter’s reference to 'your writing, and the scent of your most famous praiseworthy reputation' indicates that Alexander had already produced a substantial body of writing: it is his De utensilibus, Nouus Esopus, Nouus Auianus, and verses that Peter is most likely to have admired. It is also possible that Alexander had already gained a reputation for his knowledge of the Wisdom books – 'you have put out your hand to strong things', Peter writes. This refers to Prov. 31:19, concerning the strong woman that forms the subject of Alexander’s Tractatus super Mulierem fortem. This letter shows that Alexander became a canon in the midst of his teaching and writing career, but does not indicate where or when this occurred.

The only other known evidence for the date of Alexander’s conversion is found in papal letters. Pope Celestine III names 'magister Alexander de Sancto Albano' as a papal judge-delegate on 23 January 1195. Innocent III names him 'magister Alexander de Sancto Albano, canonicus Cirecesterie', on 8 May 1203. Hunt argues that this indicates Alexander must have become a canon in the intervening period. This assumes too much consistency on the part of the papal administration; the Cirencester cartulary itself freely refers to 'magister Alexander' or 'Alexander abbas'. Augustinians frequently functioned as judges-delegate,

*pariter in castris philosophie. et condivideramus nos simul ingressuros fore tabernaculum sapientie. Sed ecce uitis generosity degeneravit in labruscam et philosophus qui aporismatis artere diutius invigilauerat.*


41 Hunt, *Schools*, 11–12.
43 As Southern, ‘From Schools to University’, 25.
and the letter of Celestine III might equally be taken as evidence that Alexander was already involved in the order at this time, if one notes that it concerns Llanthony Priory, an Augustinian foundation. He was later involved in defending this house in a dispute with the earl of Hereford.\(^{51}\)

Alexander was certainly a canon by the time he wrote *Super psalterium*, which, as Hunt himself notes, also has a distinctly scholastic style.\(^{52}\) He writes of his friends that tried to dissuade him from joining a religious order, and hints in *Solatium fidelis animae* at his interest in examining the customs of different religious orders.\(^{53}\) This story from Caesarius of Heisterbach might date from this time:

On a certain day Master Alexander, surnamed Neckam, had come into a convent of black monks. Some of them asked for the sake of the customary how long he would present the word of God in the chapter, and he promised; others asked him, ‘Good master, speak to us briefly.’ To them he responded, ‘Glady.’ Reflecting that they would listen less gladly, he entered the chapter house. And when he had sat down, he burst forth in these words of the Lord, saying, ‘Whoever is from God hears the words of God. The reason why you do not hear them is that you are not of God.’ But thou, O Lord, have mercy upon us.’ And he added, ‘Is that sermon brief enough for you, brothers?’ And then, rising, he went out, leaving them not a little perplexed.\(^{54}\)

It is possible to see from Alexander’s works that there was a time when he was not himself a religious, but preaching to monks; and that he was writing literature designed for schools even after having become a canon. Hunt draws the conclusion from *Super psalterium* that it is written essentially in a lecture format, unlike the works Alexander is certainly known to have produced at Cirencester; but that he cannot have


\(^{52}\) Hunt, *Schools*, 97–103.

\(^{53}\) *Solatium*, Canterbury, Cathedral Library, Lit. B. 6 (4), fol. 18va; cited in Hunt, *Schools*, 10n44:

> Volente enim aliquo arduum iter aggregi dum disponit transire ad frugem honestioris et artioris uite. creat in ipso deus animam uiuentem atque motabilem dum uarios usus religiosarum consuetudinum prudenter attendit: et religionem sanctam circumdatam uarietate decenti considerat.


been at Oxford while writing it, because he refers to himself as cloistered in the text. As can be seen in chapter 5, the booklet of Oxford, Jesus College, 94 containing the Glose was likely produced at Oxford. There is no reason that he could not have been both a lecturer and an Augustinian at St Frideswide’s.

The problem of Alexander’s role in Oxford is compounded by a lack of evidence for when he arrived there. The cartularies for the Augustinian abbeys in Oxford provide slender documentation for this period; it is not even possible to determine the dates of its priors in the late twelfth century. Rigg points out that Alexander shares a story of a barnacle goose with Gerald of Wales’ Topographia hibernica, and that he might thus have been present at Oxford by 1188 to hear Gerald’s recitation of this work.

The earliest datable record for Alexander’s time at Oxford is an Ascension Day sermon given at St Frideswide’s, on which occasion it was customary for the people to make gifts to the church. The need was particularly urgent at this time, it had burned in a fire of 1190 along with a large part of the town, as reported by the annals of Oseney Abbey, though this report is now thought to be exaggerated, and the church was not entirely destroyed. Nonetheless, the work required was substantial, still visible in the present Christ Church, and Pope Celestine III issued a bull in support of the campaign in 1194. Alexander presumably delivered the sermon between these dates, though it should be noted that there is no specific mention of a fire. He exhorts the people of Oxford to restore the church, in a humorous play on the liturgical text:

I grieve, brothers, that ‘this place’ of the church of St Frideswide ‘is awful’ now and horrible because of the ruin of its walls. Why do you not consider, you laymen, that it is literally said, ‘Lord, I have loved the beauty of your house’? Why therefore do you not love the beauty of the house of the Lord?

Alexander frequently uses the phrase ‘uiri fratres’ to address his audience in some of his sermons, and especially in his meditative commentaries; it is usually assumed to refer to his fellow canons. He appears to have borrowed the phrase from the Acts of the Apostles (1:16, 2:29, 2:37, etc.); it occasionally appears elsewhere, as in the letters of Alcuin, but no other medieval author is so fond of it as a catchphrase. Here,
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it can be understood as his method of catching the attention of different parts of his audience. He first addresses the canons of St Frideswide, as equals, and then the laity; this also occurs elsewhere in his sermons. The phrase also appears in the course of a sermon in which Alexander was once again obliged to berate the people of Oxford for their miserliness. This sermon provides insight into the town’s self-perception as a learned centre, quoting both biblical and classical passages. The use of the double address in Oxford strongly suggests that Alexander was himself a canon of St Frideswide’s by this time.

Some sermons indicate that they were delivered before Alexander joined the Augustinian canons, but there is no evidence that they were given in Oxford. Two sermons also show him addressing monks in a highly complementary manner, and as an outsider. In the first of these (not necessarily earlier in chronology), he frames himself as scholaris. This sermon includes many of Alexander’s favourite topics in praise of holy women, and its description of his consideration of the monastic life might almost suggest that it was given on the occasion of his conversion. The second sermon includes many of the same sentiments, but does not indicate Alexander’s own state. It may have been given at Oxford before he became as canon, but does not indicate Alexander’s own state. It may have been given at Oxford before he became as canon,

64 Hunt, Schools, 89, 92–93.
65 Sermo in dominica xii post festum Trinitatis (no. 26), Oxford, Bodleian Library, Wood empt. 13, fol. 74r, cited in Hunt, Schools, 87–88:


66 Sermo in assumptione beate Marie (no. 30), Oxford, Bodleian Library, Wood empt. 13, fol. 53r, quoted in part in Hunt, Schools, 87:


67 Dominica i. post octauam pasche sermo (no. 30), Oxford, Bodleian Library, Wood empt. 13, fol. 86r, cited in Hunt, Schools, 87:

but might equally have been given during his time at St Albans or even Paris. Hunt believed that most of Alexander’s sermons dated to his time at Oxford, but it is shown below (under ‘Walter’s edition of Alexander’s sermons’) that they were instead compiled at Cirencester after his death. Alexander’s sermons – the only category of his writings that can be unambiguously associated with Oxford – consistently suggest that he became a canon there rather than at Cirencester, and much earlier than 1197. It is even theoretically possible but unlikely that he was already a canon at Dunstable, where there was an Augustinian priory, and that he received temporary permission to live outside a community while at St Albans. Such permission was granted infrequently, and the masters of the school at St Albans were usually seculars. Certainly, as his writings show, he had already begun to align himself with ‘uiris claustralibus’ while continuing to participate in the life of the schools.

### 2.3 The intellectual culture of St Frideswide’s

Oxford was one of the most exciting places in England to be an Augustinian in the late twelfth century. It included the priory of St Frideswide’s, re-established in 1122; Oseney Abbey, founded 1129; and St George’s, absorbed by Oseney c.1149, in addition to the foundations elsewhere in the area, shown in fig. 2.1: Bicester (founded in the 1180s), Chacombe (founded in the time of Henry II), Chetwode (1245), Cold Norton (c.1150), Dorchester (c.1140), Netley (c.1160), and Wroxton (c.1217), with possibly other smaller cells. St Frideswide’s had formerly been a mixed house of secular canons; Guimund, previously a royal chaplain, was the first Augustinian prior from 1122 to c.1139, whom William of Malmesbury praised as having transformed the house from a small collection of clerics ‘who were living as they pleased’. Ralph, the first prior of Oseney, had come from St Frideswide’s, but the Augustinians in Oxford did not always cooperate. The cartulary and annals of Oseney Abbey report a dispute with St Frideswide’s over the

predicare opere quam sermone. Verborum tamen predicatio non solet desideris excitat et diligentes.

---

68 Hunt, Schools, 84.
69 An Alexander only occurs in the Dunstable cartulary around the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, and there is nothing to identify him with Alexander Neckam: G.H. Fowler, A Digest of the Charters Preserved in the Cartulary of the Priory of Dunstable, Publications of the Bedfordshire Historical Record Society 10 (Aspley Guise: Bedfordshire Historical Record Society, 1926), 18, 111 (nos. 1, 324).
70 Dickinson, Origins of the Austin Canons, 229.
72 Postles, ‘Patronus et advocatus noster’.
76 Knowles et al., Heads of Religious Houses, 1:180.
investiture of the church of St Mary Magdalen in 1147–51, 1173–76, and 1200, requiring papal intervention on each occasion. The church had been part of St George’s College, and the canons of St Frideswide had grounds to question whether this remained the case following its absorption after Roger of Salisbury declared that he had given the church to St Frideswide’s. While the canons’ precise activities remain uncertain, they were deeply involved in the town’s affairs.

![Figure 2.1: Augustinian foundations near Oxford.](image)

At St Frideswide’s, Alexander was likely inspired by the life and works of Robert of Cricklade. Robert became an Augustinian canon at Cirencester (13 km north-west of Cricklade), witnessing a charter between 1136 and 1139 as ‘magistro Roberto de Krickel’. He wrote De connubio patriarche Iacob at Cirencester between 1135 and 1140. In the preface, addressed to Lawrence of Westminster, he looks back at a career that sounds similar to that of Alexander, explaining why he has sent this book rather than a copy of his Defloratio naturalis historie Plinii secundi: ‘While still a scholar, devoted to the guidance of the schools, you

---


80 Ross and Devine, Cartulary of Cirencester Abbey, 2:337 (no. 372/423).
asked me to send you a little book that I had composed, though I suppose it has escaped your memory. I promised. But lest it should offend the dignity of your most pious soul, given the playful readings that it is filled with, I preferred to become a false promiser.\textsuperscript{81} In the same work, he also praises William of Malmesbury’s \textit{Defloratio Gregorii}, \textit{De miraculis beatae virginis Mariae}, and \textit{Commentary on Lamentations}: he liked these works so well that he had copies made for Cirencester.\textsuperscript{82} He held Cirencester in enough esteem that he gave his lands in Cricklade to the abbey, ‘in which I took up the habit of a canon’, while he was prior of St Frideswide’s,\textsuperscript{83} a position he gained in 1138 or 1139.\textsuperscript{84} This was a period of transition for the Oxford Augustinians: Master Wigod also became prior of Oseney in 1138.\textsuperscript{85} The date of Robert’s death is unknown. ‘Vir erat antiquus’, writes Gerald of Wales in \textit{De principis instructione}.\textsuperscript{86} His last certain occurrence is in 1174.\textsuperscript{87} He was presumably dead before 1180, as he is not present in the list of delegates present at the translation of Frideswide on 12 February 1180 written by his successor, Philip, who describes himself as prior.\textsuperscript{88} It is unlikely that Alexander knew Robert in person, but he probably read his books at St Frideswide’s and later Cirencester, and Robert’s high regard for Cirencester must have helped to maintain a close alliance between the houses, with the abbey continuing to make new copies of his works in the early thirteenth century.

Robert’s approach to writing is remarkably similar to Alexander’s; he seeks to take old material and present it in new ways for a modern audience.\textsuperscript{89} \textit{De connubio patriarche Iacob} is an allegorical interpretation of the story of Jacob, which he later describes as dealing with the conflict of the virtues against the vices, alongside contemplation.\textsuperscript{90} His \textit{Homiliae super Ezechielem} also focus on allegory, in which he occasionally disagrees with the interpretations of Richard of St Victor of the same book. \textit{Speculum fidei} is dedicated to Robert, the second earl of Leicester, whom he addresses throughout the work, aiming to set out a summary

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{De connubio patriarche Iacob}, epistle: Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.4.v, fol. 1v:
\begin{quote}
\end{quote}


\item Ross and Devine, \textit{Cartulary of Cirencester Abbey}, 2:418 (no. 473/719): ‘in qua habitum canonici suscepit’.

\item Knowles et al., \textit{Heads of Religious Houses}, 1:180, 1:284.

\item Knowles et al., \textit{Heads of Religious Houses}, 1:179.


\item \textit{Speculum fidei}, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 380, fol. 132v.
\end{itemize}
of Christianity based on the evidence of the Old and New Testaments, with the interpretation of the church fathers. It is best known for condemning Peter Lombard as a ‘heretic’ based on his Christology, in a passage that suggests Robert was educated at Paris. At Oxford, he wrote Defloratio naturalis historiae Plinii secundi, which as he explains in the prologue seeks to rationalize Pliny’s work and make it more comprehensible. Robert also wrote hagiography: his Vita et miracula Sancta Thomae Cantuariensis is lost, but was the foundation for a rendition in Old Norse. During his time as prior, he also raised the profile of the priory’s patron saint to turn it into a centre of pilgrimage, perhaps encouraged by his own experience of healing at the shrine of Thomas Becket.

One of the most notable features of Alexander’s later work is his enthusiasm for studying the women of the Bible, perhaps prompted by his love for his mother, Hoderna; Oxford’s approach to St Frideswide or Frithuswith may also have fostered this interest. The abbess appears as a precocious child in two twelfth-century lives. In ‘Life A’, from c.1100–30, she learns the Psalter in six months; ‘Life B’, an expanded version dated to c.1140–70 and attributed to Robert of Cricklade, reduces this to five months and emphasizes the extent of the improvement this wrought on her character, reflecting the highest medieval ideals for learning. Indeed, Robert explicitly elevates Frideswide beyond the capacities of any child: ‘England was agog; all marvelled to see the frail sex at so young an age surpassing masculine strength’.

Prior Philip, Robert’s successor, continued to promote the cult. In the priory seal from c.1190, illustrated in fig. 2.2, Frideswide holds a set of wax tablets in her left hand, and a fleur-de-lis in her right.
This connects her equally with the typical female personifications of the liberal arts and the church, as much as with ecclesiastical administration.  

For Alexander, who wished to take up religious vows but also had a deeply practical bent, as visible in works such as *De utensilibus*, the Augustinians were an ideal match; in the Augustinian community, he was able to continue teaching while pursuing a purer existence. He described his choice as a middle way between the earthly life of scholarship and the heavenly life:

> The life of the cloistered is in between the life of scholars and the life of the triumphant. I slept therefore ‘in the middle of lots’ [Ps. 67.14], that is in the middle of fates. For one fate of grace is the honour of the life of scholars; the final fate is the delicious joy of the life of the triumphant; in the middle is the tranquillity of the cloistered.  

The generic terminology Alexander uses reflects an aim to write not for a specifically Augustinian or even monastic audience. Robert of Cricklade similarly took a conciliatory towards his monastic colleagues, though was much more aware, perhaps even proud, of the difference between canons and monks: ‘I am not

---

104 Heslop, ‘St Frideswide’s Monastery’, 271–72.  
105 *Super cantica* 2.16 (Oxford, Magdalen College, 149, fol. 79rb), cited by Hunt, *Schools*, 9843:

> Vita claustralium media est inter uitam scolarium et uitam triumphantium. Dormi igitur *inter mediis cleris* hoc est in medio sortium. Est enim quedam sors gratiae honestas uitam scolarium sors ultima est: deliciosa iocunditas uitam triumphantium: media tranquillitas claustralium.
jealous of writing monks, but I rejoice with them, although I am not a monk, but the most unworthy of the canons of Cirencester'. Alexander both heaped praise upon other orders and continued to write works specifically designed for the schools, such as Sacerdos ad altare, well after his conversion. It is this ability to straddle the worlds of the scholars and the cloistered that Alexander gained from the Augustinians in Oxford. It is often argued that the Augustinians had little influence in the development of the University of Oxford, and the likelihood that one of its earliest known lecturers was also a canon suggests it is time to reconsider this history.

2.4 Alexander at Cirencester

Alexander’s move to St Mary’s Abbey in Cirencester is usually portrayed as a sort of retirement, as if his new situation gave him time away from the jurors, scholars, and prelates to concentrate on writing. While his departure from Oxford may have been a relief in some respects (there is no indication that he was obliged to berate the people of Cirencester for their stinginess), it is unlikely that he was any less busy after the move. With perhaps forty canons resident, Cirencester was one of the largest Augustinian foundations in England. It was respected by contemporaries: as bishop of London, Gilbert Foliot wrote of both Cirencester’s reputation for holiness and its strictness. The earliest mention of Alexander in the Cirencester cartulary, datable between 1200 and 1203, presents him as one of the primary advisors to the abbot; there is also a mention of him as prior in a later manuscript. Surviving charters indicate that the abbey suffered an administrative crisis late in the twelfth century. It required the involvement of Pope Innocent III, who issued a letter in 1199 to enforce safeguards and prevent interference by external prelates. Such a turbulent environment would not have been suited to a new recruit, nor does the position given to Alexander suggest he was a novice. Indeed, it is possible that Alexander was specifically sent to Cirencester to support the reform.

When Alexander later became the abbot of Cirencester in 1213, a position he held until his death in

---

106 *De connubio Iacob* 2.22, Hereford, Cathedral Library, Piv.8, fol. 38v:

Non enim inuideo monachis scribentibus. sed conguadeo: licet non sim monachus, sed dignissimus canonicorum cirecestrensis ecclesie sancte dei genitricis Marie, sub disciplina sancti et uenerabilis Serlonis primi eiusdem loci abbatis, pro remissione peccatorum suorum deo supplicantium.

Quoted in Hunt, ‘English Learning in the Late Twelfth Century’, 31 from Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud misc. 725, fol. 130ra (not 129ya as he records), which omits ‘cirecestrensis’.


1217, he became a powerful figure who was also lord of the manor by royal prerogative. He was the sixth to hold this position since the reconstitution of the abbey by Henry I in 1117. He seems to have been a successful administrator, initiating the fall fair for which Cirencester later earned renown. Yet it was not for worldly power that he moved from Oxford; after travelling to the Fourth Lateran Council, he declared that he was appalled by the curia and terrified by prelates, and simply wanted to be left alone to his books.

Cirencester may have offered a key advantage over Oxford in its rich tradition of book production. The work of its bookmakers is now best known for their peculiarly beautiful method of creating decorated initials. One of the most remarkable features of the earlier books from Cirencester is their detailed colophons, possibly included as a reminder to the canons to pray for the souls of those who made the books and their benefactors, and as will be seen in the fourth and fifth chapters, the canons took a personal interest in ensuring the textual accuracy and readability of the books they produced. If the surviving volumes are representative of the library, there seems to have been a flurry of activity in bookmaking shortly after the establishment of the house, building up a library primarily composed of patristic works, as was common for the Augustinians (see appendix B below, ‘Works available at Cirencester’). The collection supported much of Alexander’s thought, and inspired him towards new heights of creativity.

Until his final days, Alexander continued to define himself as a teacher. His creation of the various renditions of Corrogationes Promethei and Sacerdos ad altare later in life suggests that he continued to work with the school at Cirencester thought to have been run by the canons. His philosophy of writing and teaching is most visible in Corrogationes noui Promethei, probably one of his last works. He emphasizes that these activities reshape both the teaching writer and reading student. The first section of the poem presents an abbot who was benevolent but firm, providing instruction that would be both helpful and enjoyable:

Therefore let the teacher teach by deed and word;
let honey-sweet words advance from the comb of his mouth.

113 Knowles et al., Heads of Religious Houses, 1:159–60, with corrections at 1:278.
Let the usefulness of his words form a foundation, the teaching of the faithful delight, but it pleases more by usefulness.\textsuperscript{121}

Later, he adds that teaching is the means by which he forms himself:

And perhaps someone will be gnawing my verses, for sometimes spite is accustomed to crawl on the ground.

But in writing for others I write for myself. I learn by teaching: thus I wish to be useful both to myself and others.

Improving, I wish to be useful to you, shining reader and my student, but I will be your teacher.

Who disturbs me, ‘better not touch’, I shout: while you are malevolently angry with me, spare yourself.\textsuperscript{122}

Teaching is the unifying strain throughout Alexander’s career, and he brings this to bear on his approach to life as a regular canon. During his time at Paris, Alexander was inspired by figures such as William de Montibus, for whom he has nothing but praise,\textsuperscript{123} to bring the latest in scholastic theology to bear on practical pastoral matters. Given their position in the midst of the secular and monastic worlds, the Augustinians were ideally placed to lead in this, which became a true movement with the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. For his part, Alexander embarked on an innovative new series of writings that combined his scholastic and cloistered experience.

\textsuperscript{121} Corrogationes noui Promethei 109–112, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 11867, fol. 232ra; Cropp, ‘Corrogationes noui Promethei’, 167–68:

\begin{verbatim}
Instruat ergo suos. re. uerbo. doctor. ab oris:
Eius procedant mellea uerba fauo.
Vtilitas uerbis subsit. doctrina fidelis.
Delectat. set plus utilitate iuuat.
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{122} Corrogationes noui Promethei 331–38, Cambridge, University Library, Gg.6.42, fol. 70bisv (quoted here) and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 11867, fol. 232vb; Cropp, ‘Corrogationes noui Promethei’, 177:

\begin{verbatim}
Et fortassis erit aliquis mea carmina rodens.
Nam quandoque solet serpere liuor humi.
Set scribens alius scribo michi. Disco docendo.
Sic michi sic alius utilis esse uolo.
Proficiens prodesse uolo tibi candide lector.
Discipulusque mei set tibi doctor ero.
Qui me commorit melius non tangere clamo. [Horace, Sermones 2.1.45]
Dum michi succenses inuide parce tibi.
\end{verbatim}


\textsuperscript{123} Laus sapientie diuine 4.835–848, Wright, De naturis rerum, 460; Joseph W. Goering, William de Montibus (c. 1140–1213): The Schools and the Literature of Pastoral Care, Studies and Texts 108 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1992), 6–7; Hunt, Schools, 27.
Chapter 3

Alexander’s Meditations

The crowning works of Alexander’s career, and those that most directly reflect his Augustinian mindset, are his commentaries on the Wisdom books: *Expositio super cantica canticorum in laudem gloriose ac perpetue uirginis Marie*; *De naturis rerum*, on Ecclesiastes; the *Tractatus super parabolas Salomonis*, projected to treat the entirety of Proverbs but left unfinished; and the *Tractatus super Mulierem fortam*, considering the end of Proverbs. The limited research that has been conducted on these works has assumed them to be purely ‘monastic’ products, having little relation to his earlier writings, and to be contrasted with his ‘scholastic’ work. Alexander’s commentaries deal with many topics beyond the obvious scope of the biblical texts on which they are based, which has prompted some scholars to label them as encyclopedias, and others to dismiss them as ‘the overflow of his personal devotion’.1 There is some truth in both of these approaches: the encyclopedic argument is to some extent supported by the adaptation of his materials by Bartholomaeus Anglicus and Vincent of Beauvais later in the thirteenth century.2 The commentaries are undeniably designed to prompt fervour, but it does not follow that they should viewed as thoughtless. Neither of these approaches allows one to read the works in the way in which they were intended, or to understand them within the context of the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.

When Alexander himself refers to these writings, he calls them *meditationes*, seeking to draw his audience to a higher level of thought in the natural progression of reading presented by Augustinians such as Hugh of St Victor, but rarely put into practice. This classification also draws his *Solatium fidelis anime* and *Meditatio de Magdalena* into the same category. As Hunt first noted, Alexander’s interpretative tool of choice in these commentaries is tropology.3 Together, these meditations represent the cumulation of Alexander’s experience in the schools and the Augustinian order.

---

1 Hunt, *Schools*, 106.
3 Hunt, *Schools*, 97.
3.1 Alexander’s biblical commentaries

The division drawn by scholars between Alexander’s scholastic and monastic commentaries on the Bible breaks down immediately once one realizes that his meditations are closest in style to his sermons – also his only works certainly written before he became a canon. While the *Glose super psalterium* and *Corrogationes Promethei* cannot be placed among his meditations, they were both certainly written from an Augustinian cloister. These works are both primarily informational, the former providing an orientation to modern scholarship on the Psalter, and the latter investigating unusual words in the Bible, part of the growing demand for handy reference tools for preachers in all clerical circles.\(^4\) The provenance of surviving copies suggests that they were most popular among the cloistered (though this may be misleading, as survival of all records is most common from this group), while *Corrogationes* also had some secular owners. The meditations of *Solatium, Super cantica, De naturis rerum, Super parabolas, De Magdalena, and Super mulierem fortem* were specifically designed to meet the pastoral needs of religious communities, and to this extent the ‘monastic’ label fits, but their contents are highly dependent on Alexander’s scholastic experience.

Alexander’s approach as a preacher can be described as highly practical, focusing on utility rather than elegance, while emphasizing the responsible use of rhetoric to drive home one’s point.\(^5\) He seems to have gained some fame as a preacher; copies of his sermons remained in demand after his death (see below, ‘Walter’s edition of Alexander’s sermons’), and several stories circulated in England and on the continent that depicted him in this role.\(^6\) While homiletics among the Augustinians in England have been called ‘a dead letter’,\(^7\) Alexander’s work shows otherwise, suggesting that the homilies of Robert of Cricklade may have been more than an intellectual exercise. The recent rediscovery of Alexander of Ashby’s work has also shown his innovation in preaching and meditation.\(^8\) It is his preaching style as a secular and canon and focus on the care of souls that inform Alexander’s meditative commentaries, and this is what distinguishes them from his teaching materials.

3.1.1 *Glose super psalterium*

Alexander’s first formal biblical commentary, *Super psalterium*, is also his first work unquestionably written as an Augustinian. In this, he drew not on his experience as a preacher, but as a lecturer, following a style most similar to his commentaries on Martianus Capella and the Athanasian Creed. He takes a traditional approach to biblical interpretation in a classroom setting, concentrating on outlining the authorities for the


\(^5\) Quotations in Hunt, *Schools*, 84–85.

\(^6\) Hunt, *Schools*, 15–16.


interpretation of a given passage, especially the ubiquitous *Glosa*. He weighs between these authorities, and uses them to drive home key theological lessons.

In its earliest manuscript, Oxford, Jesus College, 94, the *Glosa super psalterium* are contained in a separate ‘booklet’ from the rest of the volume, and once a separate manuscript that was later bound with other materials. It appears to be a product of Oxford rather than Cirencester, and is extensively annotated in several versions of Alexander’s own hand, most likely representing his revisions to the lectures as he repeated them. It was also, however, designed for dissemination, including a formal accessus that sets out the four senses in which he will expound the text (history, allegory, tropology, anagoge). His work on this book is solid; in some surviving manuscripts, it is presented in a way similar to manuscripts of the *Glosa* itself, with the full text of the Psalms given in a centre column, and the commentary surrounding it, facilitating its use in the classroom. This layout was also applied to many copies of Peter Lombard’s commentary on the Psalms. Alexander’s glosses function as an admirable update to the other commentaries available in his day, presenting the cutting edge of scholarship in the late twelfth century, and at least eleven copies are known to have existed; but there is nothing particularly innovative about its approach. Records of lectures on the Psalms were common, and there was no obvious need that Alexander’s work filled in contrast to his peers. He did not directly publish the lectures that he indicates he gave on Ezekiel, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs.

3.1.2 *Corrogationes Promethei*

Closest in style to the *Glose super psalterium* is *Corrogationes Promethei*, which also became Alexander’s most widely copied work. A reference to his teaching ‘in the schools’ in the past tense probably indicates that it was written at Cirencester, but the time of its composition is otherwise unknown, and it may have followed one or more of the wisdom commentaries. It is divided into two parts, the first summarizing key grammatical principles (largely based on Priscian) and the second working through the entire Bible, providing explanations of its most obscure words and notes on their spelling. The later metrical version of the work takes a similarly utilitarian approach, and seems to have been conceived, in a typical medieval mode, as verses for memorizing the words it presents.

There has been confusion about the meaning of the title *Corrogationes Promethei* since Alexander’s own time. A letter survives with a thirteenth-century copy of the work glossing the title as ‘collections of a wise

---

9 The only analysis of this work is Hunt, *Schools*, 97–103.
15 The problem is examined in detail by Cropp, *‘Corrogationes noui Promethei’*, 52–71.
or prudent man.' Meyer felt that the title implied a complaint, preferring to translate the title as 'Travaux d’un homme condamné à l’oisiveté.' In support of this view, he cites a preface by the younger Peter of Blois, a canon of Chartres, comparing himself to the suffering and banished Prometheus, 'separated from the scholastic delights.' Alexander does not appear to think of himself as exiled to Cirencester, separated from the scholars of Paris and Oxford. Hunt notes that Prometheus is presented as a teacher when the work is mentioned in De naturis rerum; he glosses the title as 'collections of an instructor in the rudiments.' Wedge, in an attempt to reconcile the three views, amplifies it further: 'collections of a scholar who has only his leisure hours to devote to the study of the Scripture, being at other times weighed down by more worldly duties.' Cropp further points out a Servian interpretation of Prometheus as found in the Third Vatican Mythographer, in which he is presented as a self-sacrificing scholar and instructor. Most convincing is the note, in the Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources, of a reference to Rhetorica ad Herennium 4.9 that compares Prometheus to a 'ridiculous master.' Alexander might have seen this in Priscian's quotation of the passage. This makes the title a self-deprecating and slightly humorous one.

The relationship of Corrogationes Promethei to Alexander’s other biblical work is somewhat difficult to determine. Parts of it were apparently based on his lecture notes, as there are many similarities in approach with Super psalterium. He occasionally refers to the opinion of his own unnamed master. At first glance, the text would appear to offer a glimpse at Alexander’s pure analytical side, but this impression is complicated by Sol meldunensis (Cambridge, University Library, Gg.6.42), which presents several excerpts from Corrogationes Promethei (and its citations tend to be accurate) suggesting that there were several sections of the work contributing levity similar to the exemplaria of his sermons, notably a story of a deacon punished for celebrating a Mass (fols 92r–92v, an added leaf). A critical edition is necessary to understand the context of these quotations. There are also several passages from a prosimetrical version of Corrogationes noui Promethei, not known to survive, but mentioned in the library catalogue of the Augustinian canons at Barnwell. In the context of the early thirteenth century, the most obvious link between Corrogationes Promethei and Alexander’s other works remains that of preaching, which has been shown to have driven much of the demand for similar reference works.

19 Hunt, Schools, 36.
24 Hunt, Schools, 6136.
26 Rouse and Rouse, ‘Statim Invenire: Schools, Preachers, and New Attitudes to the Page’.
3.1.3 **Solatium fidelis anime**

In Alexander’s following works, he returned to his strength in preaching; these commentaries are still visibly supported by his reading of the authorities, but he quotes them with much less frequency, without the intent of teaching how to navigate them. This produces a much more original format: a treatise that happens to follow the framework of a biblical text. His next work after *Super psalterium* is a commentary on Genesis 1:10–2:3. There is nothing explicitly indicating whether it was a product of Oxford or Cirencester. In the sole surviving manuscript, which once belonged to St Augustine’s, Canterbury and is now in that cathedral library, it is given the heading ‘Tractatus moralium super Genesim qui dicitur Solatium fidelis anime’. The work never seems to been widely disseminated, although Alexander refers to it in *De naturis rerum*; there are no records of copies having existed elsewhere. This lends weight to a general sense that the work was somewhat experimental.

*Solatium* is also the first of Alexander’s commentaries that can be labelled as one of his ‘meditations’, though the concept has not yet been fully developed. In contrast to the approach of his glosses on the Psalms that seek to provide a varied approach to the text, Alexander declares that the specific aim of *Solatium* is to provide spiritual refreshment – ‘And so, saving anagoge for other treatises, in this work I will give particular attention to tropology.’ The mechanics of this have been laid out by Tomáš Záhora. Each of the seven days of creation is linked first to an action available to the soul that allows it to be infused with grace, and second to seven corresponding gifts of the Holy Spirit (Isaiah 11:2–3). The pattern is similar to many medieval accounts of the virtues, notably Hugh of St Victor’s *De quinque septenis*, which portrays each of the gifts of the Holy Spirit as being given in response to seven petitions in the Lord’s Prayer (Matthew 6:9–13). Closely linked to tropology in *Solatium* is the idea of meditation, portrayed in the terms of the Victorines: it is a consideration of created things, gradually bringing a person to a state fit for contemplation. Alexander’s meditations are an attempt to undertake this practice – in other words, his endeavour to show his readers what other Augustinians had already established as the direct route to salvation.

3.1.4 **Expositio super cantica canticorum in laudem gloriose ac perpetue uirginis Marie**

Alexander’s commentary on the Song of Songs is a natural progression from *Solatium*. His proem describes the virtues of humility and obedience, continuing through Genesis with Noah, Abraham, Moses, and other figures of the Old Testament. These are all portrayed as forerunners of the Virgin Mary, herself the ideal model for human emulation. The first chapters of Book 1 begin not with the opening of the Song of Songs,
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27 De naturis rerum 2.2, Wright, *De naturis rerum*, 127.
29 Edited and translated in Andrew N.J. Dunning, ‘Hugh of St Victor’s *De quinque septenis* (On the Five Sevens) and Its Versification in Samuel Presbiter’s *De oratione dominica* (On the Lord’s Prayer); Scholarly Editing 37 (2016); for a comparison of Hugh’s categories with Augustine, Paschiasius Radbertus, and Gregory the Great, see Ulrich Rehm, *Bebilderte Vaterunser-Erklärungen des Mittelalters*, Saecula spiritualia 28 (Baden-Baden: Koerner, 1994), 7–14.
but once again with Genesis. If Alexander can be taken at his word, the work was conceived from the outset as the first of a series of commentaries on the Wisdom books. He explains later in Super parabolas that the order of the books’ interpretation differs from that of their appearance (‘just as the order of the edition of the books of Aristotle’): the Song of Songs is logically the first book in terms of exposition, as it addresses the ‘mystery of the Incarnation’; Ecclesiastes relates to the ‘time of apostolic preaching’; and Proverbs to the ‘time of the rise of heretics’.

Like Solatium, Super cantica is founded on a tropological understanding of its text, though it takes a more balanced approach, while further putting the idea of meditation into practice. Specific chapters are labelled ‘tropological expositions’ (e.g. 2.9, 2.15) or allegories (e.g. 2.10), but Alexander mostly focuses on a mystical understanding of a literal reading of the text (as he explains in 1.2, ‘De mistico intellectu et sensu litterali’). Rachel Fulton Brown has shown that Alexander draws not on the traditional allegorical tradition of interpreting the Song of Songs, which understands it as a dialogue between the church and Christ, but on a frame that originated in Carolingian liturgies, taking the text as a literal dialogue between the Virgin Mary and Christ as a child. This occasionally produces interpretations that might today raise eyebrows: ‘Each is the spouse of Christ – the mother of Christ, the daughter of Christ. Each is the spouse of Christ through an unbreakable chain of privileged love. What is written, “They shall be two in one flesh”, can be understood as referring both to Christ and the church, and to Christ and the blessed virgin.’ In Alexander’s case, a basis in the literal sense of the text is only logical, if meditation is to focus on understanding the created in order to attain contemplation of the divine.

It is also in Super cantica that Alexander develops what he later calls ‘consolatory meditations’. He cites Augustine, Gregory, and Anselm of Canterbury as influencing his approach. These typically focus on

31 Super parabolas Proem.6, Oxford, Jesus College, 94, fol. 59rb:


32 Fulton, ‘Mimetic Devotion’, 90.


34 Super cantica 6.13 (Oxford, Magdalen College 149, fol. 173vb), also quoted in part in Hunt, Schools, 107n555:

visualizing the subject he describes in detail. It is difficult for modern readers to relate to these passages due to their length and rhetoric, and Hunt characterizes them as essentially meaningless devotional writing.\(^{35}\) It seems this was a criticism Alexander faced even in his own day, and he later explains in *Super parabolas* that this is a deliberate choice:

I have primarily aimed to devote myself to tropology, so that passages of allegory may be saved for a particular case. And let not a casual observer accuse me of long-windedness; for it is pleasing not to take the duty of an expositor, but to revive the souls of a cloister with consolatory meditations, sometimes shaken by wrongful troubles, and sometimes wounded by its own arrows.\(^{36}\)

Given the intentionally slow pace at which the commentaries unfold, it should be no surprise that readers who have approached Alexander’s commentaries looking for something else have come away disappointed, but that does not mean that they were any less innovative. It has already been noted that Alexander took pains to work with speakers of Hebrew to improve his exegesis.\(^{37}\) There is great potential for reading them in the wrong way if one is unaware of their explicit function as a tool for pastoral care.

### 3.1.5 *De naturis rerum et super ecclesiasten*

What is today Alexander’s most famous work, *De naturis rerum*, is most commonly described as an ‘encyclopedia’, but within the context of his other biblical commentaries these qualities are seen to be the result of his exegetical program. It is unclear who first popularized this approach: it is mentioned in a 1960 letter of Beryl Smalley (quoted above under ‘Alexander’s reception in modern scholarship’), and appears on many occasions in later scholarship.\(^{38}\) These works only engage with the first two books published by Wright, and their interpretation stem directly from his truncation of the work, which he stated ‘was intended dumieximemaiestatisdulcedinemadmiratur.

---

36 *Super parabolas* Proem.6, Oxford, Jesus College, 94, fol. 59b–va, also quoted in Hunt, *Schools*, 97:

Principaliter uero tropologie indulgere proposui. ita ut allegorie loca quedam specialiter reseruentur. Nec me prolixitatis arguant merarius arbiter. neque enim expositoris officium tantum, assumere libet: set etiam consolatoris meditationibus [59va] recreare claustralium animos, non nunquam inustis uexatos molestias. non nunquam proprisi sautiatos iaculis.

to be a manual of the scientific knowledge of the time.' The knowledge of the remainder of the work is reflected in his description of it as a commentary on Ecclesiasticus rather than Ecclesiastes. The most successful treatment of De naturis rerum as an encyclopedia is that of Tomáš Záhora, pursuing Hunt’s observation that in the context of the Ecclesiastes commentary, the true focus of the whole of De naturis rerum is tropology. Unfortunately, he pays limited attention to Alexander’s other commentaries, and insists on referring to both De naturis rerum and Laus sapientie divina as encyclopedias to designate their primary focus. While he mentions some other descriptions of tropology in Alexander’s commentaries, he does not address the obvious paring of those on Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs, or provide any criteria showing why certain of these works are described as encyclopedias, and others are not. Understanding De naturis rerum as an encyclopedia may help to provide context for some of the works following it to which the label has been retroactively applied, but it tells us little about how Alexander conceived of his work.

Alexander leaves no doubt that the three Wisdom books are to be taken as a series, providing a passage explaining their relationship in terms of stages towards contemplation of the divine: Proverbs inviting a person to disregard for oneself, Ecclesiastes for the world, and the Song of Songs to complete joy. He maintains this focus throughout the commentary in a style that directly parallels Super cantica, providing several more of his ‘consolatory meditations.’ The relationship between these works is most fully articulated in Super parabolas.
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3.1.6 Meditatio de Magdalena

It becomes increasingly difficult to establish a chronology for Alexander’s meditations with his later works. His Meditatio de Magdalena is also called Tractatus super admirabili conversione beatisimae Magdalenes in Sol meldunensis (Cambridge, University Library, Gg.6.42). It only refers to Super cantica,\(^{43}\) and may even have been written before De naturis rerum. Alexander’s devotion to Mary Magdalene might have been inspired through the church dedicated to this saint near St Frideswide’s in Oxford, administered by the Augustinians. Its edition correctly associates the work with Alexander’s wisdom commentaries, while omitting Solatium,\(^{44}\) but the imposition of a new paragraph structure on the work obscures its organizational similarities with the other meditations, causing it to appear as a rather amorphous creation. Following the structure of the text provided in the manuscript, De Magdalena emerges as a commentary on the Song of Songs, with divergences into the Gospels. Each of these texts is quoted at the beginning of a new paragraph, as in Alexander’s other meditative commentaries:

1. Song of Songs 1:1, beginning Osculetur me osculo oris sui.
4. Song of Songs 1:9–10, Pulchre sunt gene tue sicut turturis.
5. Song of Songs 2:2, Sicut lilium inter spinas: sic amica mea inter filias.
6. Song of Songs 4:1–12, Quam pulchra es amica mea, quam pulcra.
7. John 20:1, Vna autem sabbati, Maria Magdalene uenit mane, cum adhuc tenebre essent, ad monumentum.
   (with reference to Mark 16:9 and Matthew 28:9–10; closing with Song of Songs 4:8)

This neatly encapsulates the Gospel passages typically associated with Mary Magdalene in the Middle Ages, using these as another literal interpretation of the Song of Songs: ‘Let us listen to the historical words of the evangelist, faithfully expounding the text of Solomon.’\(^{45}\) Mary Magdalene is also associated with other biblical women such as Rebecca and Sara, all put forward as ideal models for anyone who wishes to ‘manfully support a burden and perturbation day and night’\(^{46}\) through meditation and humility, and thereby able to reach the heights of contemplation.\(^{47}\)

---

\(^{43}\) Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.1.2, fol. 140ra: ‘De cursu autem petri et iohannis: dilucide licet breuiter nos expediuimus in laudibus virgis matris.’


\(^{45}\) De Magdalena, Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.1.2, fol. 140ra: ‘Audiamus uerba euangelice historie textum salomonis fideliter exponentia.’

\(^{46}\) De Magdalena, Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.1.2, fol. 136rb: ‘Milites egregii sunt milites cristi. qui uiriliter sustinent pondus et estum dierum et noctum.’

3.1.7 *Tractatus super Mulierem fortem*

Just as *Super cantica* is an expansion of *Solatium fidelis anime*, Alexander’s *Tractatus super Mulierem fortem* even more directly extends his *Meditatio de Magdalena*. It runs through the entire ‘strong woman’ text of Proverbs 31:10–31 three times, dealing in turn with Mary Magdalene, the Virgin Mary, and the Church. The first book includes many borrowings from *De Magdalena*, though it was not conceived as a revision of this work, referring to it separately.\(^{48}\) As with *De Magdalena*, there is no specific evidence that the work was written after *De naturis rerum*. Hunt placed its writing during Alexander’s abbacy on the basis that ‘he assumes the tone of a superior giving instruction’\(^{49}\), but this can be disproven through a cross reference to it early in *Speculum speculationum*, whose title confirms that it was begun while Alexander was still a canon.\(^{50}\) A reference in *Super mulierem* to *Super cantica* refers to this work as finished, perhaps recently.\(^{51}\)

The evidence of a manuscript of the work with Alexander’s autograph corrections, Oxford, Jesus College, 94 (discussed in more detail below) and the structure of the text suggest that second two books were a later addition. It gives the impression of having been written on a piecemeal basis to gradually extend his meditations, perhaps as he delivered them in chapter.

*Super mulierem fortem* does not diverge from the exegetical methods set by Alexander’s other wisdom commentaries: tropology remains the focus,\(^{52}\) and meditation itself continues to be shown as the surest route to kindling love for the divine within oneself.\(^{53}\) The first two books read almost as a catalogue of women from the Old Testament, with the last book showing that the *Mulierem fortem* passage applies to all that is holy. The two Marys are strong in their virtues, while the Church is strong through every type of its members – the married, widows, virgins, confessors, martyrs, and those leaving both active and contemplative lives.\(^{54}\) While the text itself seems to be designed for cloistered communities, the universal

\(^{48}\) Oxford, Jesus College, 94, fol. 79ra: ‘Beata autem magdalena cuius laudibus iterato deseruire stilus noster gloriatur’.


\(^{50}\) *Speculum speculationum* 1.2.10, London, British Library, Royal 5 F. 1, fol. 5va, Thomson, *Speculum speculationum*, 23.

\(^{51}\) Oxford, Jesus College, 94, fol. 99vb: ‘Dulcissima est historialis intelligentie ueritas. quam expositione luculenta declarauimus in opere nostro: quod in laudes gloriose dei genitricis feliciter consummauimus.’

\(^{52}\) Oxford, Jesus College, 94, fol. 99vb: ‘Et dum ordeum simplicis doctrine qua apostoli suos auditores refecerunt, in mensura fidei reseruauit: inuenit tres modios spiritualis intelligentie. tropologiam uidelicet cum allegoria et anagoge.’

\(^{53}\) Oxford, Jesus College, 94, fol. 122rb–va:


\(^{54}\) Oxford, Jesus College, 94, fol. 114vb:

view Alexander takes suggests that he was concerned to help his audience to understand their place within the broadest context possible.

3.1.8  Tractatus super parabolas Salomonis

Alexander’s commentary on Proverbs is unfinished, covering only 1:1 through 3:27. He was presumably still working on it at his death, with the text gradually breaking down into quotations of Bede towards its end – possibly given its final form by his fellow canon Walter de Melida, as suggested below in the discussion of the manuscript, Oxford, Jesus College, 94. He might have had a disadvantage in writing on Proverbs in comparison to Super cantica and De naturis rerum, since he had already lectured on the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes. In spite of its unpolished state, Alexander’s reputation was such that at least two other communities acquired copies.

As it stands, the book provides Alexander’s fullest explanation of his program of meditation, closely linked to his articulation for the relationship between Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs:

The book of Proverbs owes itself to ebbing consideration, by which someone turns towards the state of his condition; Ecclesiastes is answerable to the consideration of the worldly vanities; the book of Canticles indulges divine contemplation. Idida shouts that ‘the beginning of wisdom is the fear of the Lord.’ Ecclesiastes preaches, saying, ‘Vanity of vanities, vanity of vanities, and all is vanity.’ Solomon sighs for the delights of peace, saying, ‘Let him kiss me with the kiss of his mouth.’ Idida, that is ‘you will be beloved by the Lord through humility’, which teaches a person to scorn himself and to take prudent fear. Prudence and hope and temperance confer to you the name of a preacher. Prudence, truly investigating the natures of transitory things, understands them to be subject to vanities. Hope, now holding God himself with the hand of desire, declares that everything apart from God is subject to manifold vanity. Temperance, pondering that what is adequate by nature is restrained, knows that the love of temporal things is to be driven out. Holy love and devotion delight to be loved with a kiss and embraces.

The three works of three-named Solomon are complying, therefore, in threefold consideration: to enter, to depart, to surpass. To enter the chamber of the heart, to enter the dug earth, and


56 Cf. Isidore, Etymologies 7.6.65:

to know your situation. The dug earth is the land of free will, which, if it is tilled well by the
discipline of a farmer, will produce glad crops of virtues. Therefore, a person should meet
himself with the doors of the spirit closed, lest wandering thoughts come near secret tracks,
disturbers of inner stillness; he should consult the conscience as to whether, with his path
directed through the ways of salvation, he is aimed towards the appropriate goal. Afterwards,
to depart from your land with Abraham, that is from the land of free will, and from your family,
now untroubled by the disturbances of the mind – to depart, I say, by the steps of contemplation,
to perceiving the vanities of things and their advantages. What are the vanities of the world to
us, born to greater things? Considering the usefulness of things carries us so much away into
the admiration of divine power as its wisdom and kindness. Finally, surpass the worldly machine,
and direct the sharpness of the mind so that you may drink from the light of immeasurable
glory, and indulge in purified meditations; and with the likenesses of things banished far off,
devotion, leading the way, may prepare a journey in pure simplicity of understanding.57

This scheme is a practical application of Origen’s framing of the Wisdom books in his commentary on
the Song of Songs, a copy of which Cirencester is known to have possessed.58 Origen refers Proverbs,
Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs to three branches of knowledge: moral, natural, and contemplative
(ethicam, physicam, epopticen; or moralem, naturalem, inspectiuam).59 It is this opportunity to express his idea
of the relationship between the books that seems to have captured Alexander’s attention and creativity in
writing the Proverbs commentary. He is concerned at the beginning of the work with the falseness of earthly

57 Super parabolas Proem.1.5–2.1, Oxford, Jesus College, 94, fol. 58va:

Considerationi igitur reciproce qua quis sue conditionis statum attendit: se debet liber parabolorum. considerationi
uani tatum mundanarum: obnoxius est ecclesiastes. contemplationi diuine: obsequitur liber canticorum. Clamat idida
usanitas. Suspirat ad pacis delicias salomon inquiens. Osculetur me osculo oris sui. Idida, idest dilectus eris a domino:
per humilitatem. que et sui contemptorem esse hominem docet. et timorem discretum adducit. Concionatoris nomen
conferent tibi: prudentia et spes et temperantia. Prudentia nimirum naturas rerum transitoriarum inuentigans: eas esse
uanitatis oboixias comprehendit. Spes manu desiderii deum ipsum iam tenens: omnia preter deum uanitati multiplica
subiecta esse profiteetur. Temperantia modicum esse quod nature sat est perpendens: rerum amorem temporalium
abiciendum esse nouit. Amor sanctus et deuotio: osculo et amplexibus dilecti deliciantur.

Ingredere cordis thalamum. ingredere humum fossam: et tui statum agnosce. Humus fossa: est terra liberi arbitrii. que si
aratro discipline bene culta fuerit: letas uirtutum segetes producit. Clausis ergo foribus animi: obsideticus eris a domino:
per humilitym. que et sui contemptorem esse hominem docet. et timorem discretum adducit. Concionatoris nomen
conferent tibi: prudentia et spes et temperantia. Prudentia nimirum naturas rerum transitoriarum inuentigans: eas esse
uanitatis oboixias comprehendit. Spes manu desiderii deum ipsum iam tenens: omnia preter deum uanitati multiplica
subiecta esse profiteetur. Temperantia modicum esse quod nature sat est perpendens: rerum amorem temporalium
abiciendum esse nouit. Amor sanctus et deuotio: osculo et amplexibus dilecti deliciantur.

58 R.A.B. Mynors, Richard H. Rouse, and Mary A. Rouse, eds., Registrum Anglicorum doctorum et auctorum veterum, Corpus of British

59 Origen, trans. Rufinus, Commentarium in Canticum canticorum, Prol.: see Peter William Martens, Origen and Scripture: The Contours
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glory, as he reflects on the inevitable fall of both classical emperors and modern monarchs, appropriate to the final years of the reign of King John. He recognizes that some readers find him too prolix, and though he promises the 'consolatory meditations' of his earlier commentaries, they never appear. Alexander was exhausted by Rome after travelling to the Fourth Lateran Council, writing that he never wished to see the curia again. The incomplete state of both Super parabolas and Speculum speculationum can likely be attributed to his responsibilities as an abbot.

3.2 Meditation and the Augustinians

This survey of Alexander's biblical scholarship shows that, after the traditional approach of Super psalterium, he combined his preaching experience with scholastic knowledge to produce commentaries that would address specific areas not already adequately covered by modern writers. Corrogationes Promethei was probably a tool designed specifically for preachers, while his other works applied tropology to the matter of caring for cloistered communities.

This idea of meditation was inspired directly by Augustinian writers. The idea of meditatio leading to contemplatio is hinted at by Gregory the Great, whose homilies on Ezechiel Alexander would likely have known from lecturing on the book. Alexander cites the influence of Anselm of Canterbury, who portrays meditation as the awakening of the mind to its salvation, but does not clearly articulate this process. Alexander also likely had access to Bernard of Clairvaux's Sermons on the Song of Songs at Cirencester, who only shallowly discusses the idea of meditation in reaction to a quotation from the Psalms, 'my heart became hot within me, and in my meditation a fire will burn', though he once refers to 'our meditations'.

Alexander's understanding of meditation is most directly paralleled in Hugh of St Victor, whose De

60 Super parabolas 1.2, Oxford, Jesus College, 94, fol. 59va:

Audeant iuniores audeant operibus novis insudare dum non nisi molestos et tetricos reperiant lectores. Experiar igitur siquid possum experiar. et lectoribus assistam comes individua. Scribentis diligentiam subtilitatem ostentationi curiose. breuitatem

61 Laus sapientie divinae 5.325–344, Wright, De naturis rerum, 448; translated in Wedge, 'Alexander Neckam's De naturis rerum', 20–21.

62 Gregory the Great, Homilies in Ezechiel 2.1.17, Marc Adriaen, ed., Sancti Gregorii Magni homiliae in Hierosolymum prophetae, Corpus Christianorum, series latina 142 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1971), 223, lines 554–60: 'Hinc est etiam quod helias, cum uocem Domini se cum loquentibus audiret, in speluncae suae ostio stetisse describatur et faciem uelasse, quia cum per contemplationis gratiam uox supernae intellegentiae sit in mente, totus homo iam intra spelunca non est, quia animum carnis cura non possidet, sed stat in ostio, quia mortalitatis angustias exire meditatur.'


64 Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse, Registrum Anglie, 34.21.

65 Psalm 38:4: 'Concaluit cor meum intra me et in meditacione mea exardescet ignis.'

archa Noe was in the Cirencester library. He presents tropology as the key tool for understanding the ark in terms of gradually heightening moral virtues. Exegesis allows the ark to be divided into three houses, representing the shadow, body, and spirit, to which further explanations are applied, cumulating in the works of people, the works of angels, and the works of God; faith, hope, and charity (morally); or right thinking, meditation, and contemplation. This ascent is agreed to be one of the most important features of Hugh's approach, and in particular one of the keys to his success in the creation of mental imagery. Hugh's model for combining intellectual rigour with meditation was quickly accepted within the Augustinian order; this can be seen, for example, in the letters of Hugh Metel, and it is precisely what Alexander puts into practice in his meditative commentaries.

Hugh puts forward meditation not only as a method of ascending in spiritual health and maturity, but also as the logical progression in gaining knowledge and aptitude, as he describes in his Didascalicon. 'The beginning of learning is in reading; its consummation in meditation; which, if anyone learns to love it more intimately and desires to be engaged more often in it, brings life to a very pleasant condition, and offers the greatest consolation in distress.' Meditation accomplishes this because it is not only a step towards learning, but also one of four steps towards the perfection of oneself: reading, meditation, prayer, and activity, all of which finally lead to contemplation of the divine. One can see why this would be so attractive to someone seeking to advance the health of a religious community. This approach to meditation as a unified method of achieving both moral and intellectual progress is precisely what Alexander promotes: 'It is fitting for us to indulge in meditations of this sort, by which the world must be crucified with its vices and desires. These meditations also produce new studies, by which the soul is happily restored.'

While Hugh provides the theories supporting this scholastic idea of meditation, he is vague on the

67 Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse, Registrum Anglie, 97.4.
73 Buttmer, Hugonis de Sancto Victore Didascalicon de studio legendi: A Critical Text, 109, lines 13–17: 'Quattuor sunt in quibus nunc exercetur uita iustorum et, quasi per quosdam gradus ad futuram perfectionem sublenatur, uidelicet lectio siue doctrina, meditatio, oratio, et operatio. Quinta deinde sequitur, contemplatio, in qua, quasi quodam precedentium fructu, in hac uita etiam que sit boni operis merces futurae pretiagogam.'
74 Super mulierem fortun, Oxford, Jesus College, 94, fol. 109rb: 'Huiuscemodi meditationibus indulgere nos deceit, quibus mundus crucifi debet cum uiciis et concupiscentiis. Pariunt et he meditationes: studia nouella. quibus animus feliciter recreatur.'
specifcics of how it is to be practised, and this is the void that Alexander seeks to fill with his commentaries. His fullest articulation of the theory opens Super parabolas:

Human meditation at one moment is turned upon man himself; at another it passes to the other created things. When indeed it is turned back upon man himself, scrutiny is either directed at those things that look to the dignity of a noble creature, or to those which point towards the fragility of the human condition. When, however, reason, just as if it were sitting in a watchtower, discerns the changes of transitory things, it sometimes discovers their vanity, and often their usefulness. But while it ventures towards that immeasurable light, devotion rejoices all the more to fix the sharpness of the mind. For the eye of love gladly returns to the Beloved: sometimes it sees the humility of a humanity sweetly assumed, sometime it reverently regards the height of divine majesty. Therefore reason, entering the inner chamber of the heart and concentrating its thoughts inwards, considers the dignity and fragility of human nature; crossing to the show of the worldly theatre, it recognizes the vanity and usefulness of things; raising itself above itself, it considers the humanity and divinity of the saviour. Thus the dove of divine grace carries the olive branch of peace to one entering the ark with Noah; thus wisdom, symbolized through Rebecca, runs to meet one going out into the field of the world with Isaac by the grace of meditation; thus mysteries that may not be disclosed to a wise person in the flesh are revealed to one carried into heaven with Paul.

In essence, Alexander suggests that meditation allows one to approach the divine perspective on the world, seeing without restrictions of time or space, delighting in the good in all things without being allured by their faults.

Alexander was not the only Augustinian to create examples of how to engage in Hugh’s idea for meditation. Richard of Saint Victor also elucidates the relationship between meditation and contemplation, though no evidence has yet been found that Alexander read his work. Also writing in the early thirteenth century, Alexander of Ashby specifically highlights the Didascalicon as an introduction to understanding

---

75 Super parabolas Proem.1, Oxford, Jesus College, 94, fol. 57ra:

76 E.g. Beniamin maior 1.3, Jean Grosflieller, De contemplatione (Beniamin maior), L’œuvre de Richard de Saint-Victor, 1, Sous la règle de saint Augustin, 13 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), 94.
Scripture in its spiritual senses, the primary focus of his *Meditationes*. Edmund of Abingdon also influenced by the spirituality of the Victorines; he was not himself an Augustinian, but lived in one of its priories for a year and also died in one. The common thread in these works is not only an exploration of meditation, but also a deep commitment to pastoral care.

### 3.3 Public and private meditation

Historians have consistently noted Augustinian concern for the *cura animarum* as one of the order’s defining features. Nonetheless, the extent to which the canons personally served the parishes under the supervision of their abbeys remains ambiguous. Most of what Alexander writes suggests that the scope and anticipated readership of his meditations was limited to cloistered communities, but he may have had wider goals. In considering not only traditional focal points of devotion such as the Virgin Mary, but also minor women of the Old Testament, alongside his extolling of the married state, he may have had the ambition of training...

---


82 *Super cantica* 1.4, Oxford, Magdalen College, 149, fol. 5rb:


*Super mulierem fortem*, Oxford, Jesus College, 94, fol. 35vb:

them to work with the external world. The focus of his meditations is nonetheless on building up individuals within the context of a cloistered community.

Alexander’s interest in pastoral care is visible not only in his meditations, but many other of his works. His philosophy of administration is summarized in Corrogationes noui Promethei: ‘What befits the abbot who desires to be loved more than to be feared? Let love rule from him, and after that fear.’\(^{83}\) He presumably speaks as an abbot himself, but there is no specific evidence to date the work.\(^{84}\) Unfortunately, no more specific examples survive to indicate how Alexander might have applied his principles in administration. The letters of Alan of Tewkesbury, who likely wrote to Alexander for Christological advice, applies exegesis to resolve everyday issues and determine how references in the Gospel might effect monastic life.\(^{85}\) Alexander’s proposal to teach morals through tropology, and the framing of his ‘consolatory meditations’ as introduced in Super cantica as particularly effective in soothing a wounded soul, can be taken in a similar vein.

The meditative commentaries appear to envisage both oral delivery and personal reading. Alexander’s meditations often address the ‘pie lector’, but also addresses an audience as ‘uirifratres’ and occasionally gives relative temporal references.\(^{86}\) The same pattern also occurs in Alexander’s sermons.\(^{87}\) The problem is similar to Bernard of Clairvaux’s Sermons on the Song of Songs: scholars have debated for decades whether their stylistic qualities indicate whether they were purely literary compositions.\(^{88}\) The most recent assessment argues that they are true sermons that Bernard delivered, edited for a reading audience. The same is presumably true for Alexander’s meditations, given polish after an initial delivery in chapter at Cirencester, but the exact context in which this would have taken place is difficult to determine. The Ordo monasterii specifies that adherents should undertake three hours of reading each day at the same time, in addition to listening to readings at meals;\(^{89}\) the Praeceptum only underlines these points.\(^{90}\) In the twelfth century, the Bridlington Dialogue attempt to elucidate the intent of these guidelines for the use of books, based on Richard of St Victor’s De questionibus regule sancti Augustini solutis.\(^{91}\) The Augustinian canons themselves

\(^{83}\) Corrogationes noui Promethei, lines 1–2, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 11867, fol. 231va: Cropp, ’Corrogationes noui Promethei’, 163; as emended by Gärtner, ’Zum Auftakt der Corrogationes noui Promethei (Walther incip. 9291)’:

Quid decet abbatem qui plus optabit amari
Quam metui? regnet hinc amor, inde metus.

\(^{84}\) Other arguments for a late composition are presented in Hunt, Schools, 60–61; Cropp, ’Corrogationes noui Promethei’, 47–52.


\(^{86}\) E.g. Super cantica 4.12, cited in Hunt, Schools, 104.

\(^{87}\) Hunt, Schools, 23, 92.


\(^{90}\) Praeceptum 2.4, 3.2, 4.9–10, Lawless, Augustine of Hippo and His Monastic Rule, 84–85, 96–97.
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had little idea what to make of their rule, and Richard and the Bridlington Dialogue tend towards liberality in their interpretations. Nonetheless, one can determine that there were specific daily periods for both reading and oral delivery of texts, providing an incubator for Alexander’s writings.

This dual public-private approach to books revolves around the term *speculum* (‘mirror’). The image may originate with the Augustinian Praeceptum: “These precepts should be read to you once a week, so that you will see yourselves in this little book as in a mirror and not neglect anything through forgetfulness.”

This passage is probably what Alexander has in mind when he writes in *De naturis rerum* that ‘a person is the most certain mirror of himself.’ Most poignantly, he addresses his *Super mulierem fortem* as ‘speculum animi mei’ in the closing paragraph:

> Perhaps, book, you will outlive your Alexander. For worms will eat me before bookworms gnaw you away. My body is owed to worms; you will be abolished by bookworms. You are the mirror of my soul; you are the conveyor of my meditations, the most certain judge of our intentions; you are the faithful messenger of the feelings of my mind, the sweet comfort of sorrow; you are the witness of a truthful conscience. To you, as though to a faithful depository, I have commended the secrets of my heart. You faithfully return to me the things which I have trusted to your faith; in you I read myself. You will come into the hand of some other devout reader, who will think fit to pour out prayers for me. Then indeed, little book, you will be handed over to the Lord: then you will reward your Alexander with a most pleasing exchange. He will conquer – and I do not begrudge my labour for the prayer of a devout reader – who now puts you in his lap, now moves you to his breast, sometimes places you under his head as a sweet pillow, sometimes caresses you gently with happy hands; for me he will earnestly entreat Jesus Christ, who with the Father and the Holy Spirit lives and reigns, God, through endless ages of ages. Amen.

It can indeed be argued that *Super mulierem fortem* is Alexander’s most personal book, but there was


92 Praeceptum 8.2, Lawless, *Augustine of Hippo and His Monastic Rule*, 102–3: 'Vt autem uos in hoc libello tamquam in speculo possitis inspicere, ne per obliuionem aliquid neglegatis, semel in septimana uobis legatur.'


94 Super parabolae, envoi, Oxford, Jesus College, 94, fol. 123ra:


evidently nothing private about it. If one takes the passage literally, it might challenge notions of what physically constitutes a devotional book: Oxford, Jesus College, MS 94 still has what appears to be its original medieval binding, with soft white tawed leather over wooden boards, and might make a rather decent pillow by monastic standards: the *Super mulierem fortin* pages measure 386 × 283 mm. By contrast, the copy from Reading, now Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 528 (SC 2221), measures 208 × 131 mm, far too small to facilitate slumber for a grown adult. More likely, this is another example of Alexander using himself as the target of ridicule while making a serious point. His comments in *Corrogationes noui Promethei* on the role of an abbot shed further light on his usage: ‘May the pastor be to his own mirror, book, skill, model of the honest; form, measure, guidance, rule, life.’ The key point is ultimately that the book acts as a proxy for Alexander himself, delivering teaching and care in his absence.

3.4 Innovation through meditation

By examining Alexander’s biblical commentaries using his own framing of the works as meditations, the extent of the influence of the Augustinian canons on his writing becomes much clearer. His works become far more palatable to a reader today as it becomes apparent that he was not merely rewriting ancient authors, but experimenting to see how Hugh of St Victor’s idea for a sort of scholastic mysticism might be practised. He does something more than follow the typical examples of twelfth-century scholastics: he not only provides his readers and listeners with information about the world, but teaches them what to do with it.

---

95 *Corrogationes noui Promethei* 137–38, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 11867, fol. 232ra; Cropp, ‘*Corrogationes noui Promethei*’, 169:

Sit pastor speculum, liber, ars, exemplar honesti;
Forma, modus, regimen, regula, uita suis.
Chapter 4
Disseminating Alexander’s Works

The Augustinian influence in Alexander’s career not only defined the character of his writings, but also the form in which they were published. Scholars are often unwilling to speak of ‘publication’ in a medieval context, with the specific modern connotation of printing a work. It might be more accurate to suggest that the process of printing, rather than being a prerequisite for true publication, merely hastened and intensified the process of the commercialization of book publication. Medieval authors conducted similar activities of editing and revision to their modern counterparts, and ‘published’ their work in the literal sense of the word’s origin in publicare, to make public. Richard Sharpe, examining the work of Anselm of Canterbury, has shown that the medieval equivalent to what is today called publication is better found in the term edere, ‘to bring forth’. Research on other authors of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries has shown the extent to which their work cannot be understood outside their institutional context. Authors’ success was dependent not only on the excellence of their work, but on the availability of a community that would aid in the production and promotion of writing both during their lifetime and after their death.

Alexander was no stranger to the publishing process when he came to Cirencester. It stands to reason that at least some of Alexander’s works could also have been produced there, but it is difficult to know which ones. One manuscript that can plausibly be attributed to his time at St Frideswide’s is the first booklet of Oxford, Jesus College, MS 94, which contains his gloss on the Psalter. The last two booklets were produced at Cirencester, and contain his unfinished commentary on Proverbs and his Tractatus super Mulierem fortem. These provide insight into his working methods, showing that he continued to edit his works after they were first published, like many of his contemporaries, with copies representing the unrevised text continuing to circulate. They also hint at a concerted effort to disseminate his works after their completion. He was assisted by his fellow canon Walter de Melida, named variously as a socius, capellanus, or clericus in the

Cirencester cartulary. Two surviving letters document Walter’s enduring concern to catalogue and distribute Alexander’s works after the abbot’s death, building relationships with other nearby religious communities.

4.1 The importance of institutional context to twelfth-century writers

The corpus of Hugh of St Victor, who so deeply influenced Alexander Neckam, exemplifies the prominent role an Augustinian house could take in setting the course of the reception of an author’s writings. After Hugh’s death in 1141, an edition of his complete works was created at the order of his abbot, Gilduin. This effort involved both cataloguing Hugh’s known works and organizing them into four thematic volumes, allowing easy reference and copying. The existence of this effort and its results was discovered only through a document entitled Indiculum that lists the contents of these original four volumes, which survives by chance in a fifteenth-century copy, now Oxford, Merton College, MS 49. It stands to reason that many other such efforts could be found with more careful examination of the evidence. None of the original manuscripts survive, though a direct and contemporary copy from St Victor survives in Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, MS 711, produced between 1141 and 1150. It has become increasingly apparent that this edition was enormously influential in establishing the form and contents of Hugh’s corpus, and in promoting its dissemination. It is also a useful basis for understanding Hugh’s thought within his historical context. Paul Rorem has written a successful introduction to Hugh by working through his major works in the order they appear in the Indiculum. An effort is now underway to recreate the text of this edition. Hugh was also fortunate to have been associated with a well-endowed house that had the resources to continue promoting his work into the modern period, with editions of his opera omnia, as well as those of Richard of St Victor, serving in part as a means to promote that house and coalesce its identity.

Institutional support can, indeed, be found behind almost every medieval author whose works became widely known and survived in any numbers into the present day. William of Malmesbury worked with at

---


least four other assistants to acquire books and make copies of his own. Peter of Blois benefited from his position in government in fostering the dissemination of his letters. Even the works of a minor author such as Samuel Presbiter survived because his connection to Bury St Edmunds allowed him to assemble his works into two matching edited volumes, later preserved in the abbey library. No medieval writer worked alone.

Alexander’s work with other scribes is most obviously demonstrated by his own descriptions of the mechanics of publishing. His remarks in De utensilibus and Sacerdos ad altare, both works designed for teaching Latin, indicate a personal interest in the practicalities of writing. The former treatise is detailed enough that a scribe’s writing desk has been reconstructed primarily based on its description. These works also provide some of the best descriptions that survive of tacketed bookbinding. Contemporary manuscripts surviving from Oxford and Cirencester, some of which include annotations from Alexander himself, give us a glimpse into Alexander’s own working methods, and into the process of disseminating his works during his life and in the decades following his death.

4.2 Scribal additions to Oxford and Cirencester manuscripts

4.2.1 Oxford, Jesus College, 94

It was first proposed by Hunt that Oxford, Jesus College, MS 94 preserves Alexander’s handwriting. Still obscure are the origin of its Gloss super psalterium, and the identity of a hand that is similar to Alexander’s but differs markedly. This script can now be identified with Walter de Melida, Alexander’s clerk, who probably assembled the volume in its final state. Both use what has been called a ‘charter hand’, commonly found in courtly documents of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.

Jesus College 94 once belonged to Cirencester, and consists of three separate booklets. The volume is collated 1, 8, 10–10 (the last of these gatherings marked ·iii·), 10 (·ix·), 8 (·x·) | 8–14, 16, 4 (8 cancelled) | 10–14, 16, 16, for a total of 129 parchment leaves (illustrated in fig. 4.1). These contain, respectively, Alexander’s gloss on the Psalter; his unfinished commentary on Proverbs, to which have been added two spurious sermons; and his Tractatus super Mulierem fortem.

---

9 Thomson, William of Malmesbury, 77.
11 Dunning, Notes from the School of William de Montibus, 10–12.
12 Vezin, ‘Reconstitution d’un fauteuil de scribe à bras mobiles aux Musées d’Art et d’Histoire de la ville d’Auxerre (note d’information)’; for other codicological uses of Alexander’s descriptions, see Gasparri, Sur la terminologie médiévale des écritures; Copeland, ‘Naming, Knowing, and the Object of Language in Alexander Neckam’s Grammar Curriculum’.
14 Schools, 30–31.
4.2.1.1 *Glose super psalterium*

It is immediately apparent from the smaller size of this section (330–43 × 272–85 mm) in comparison to the rest of the manuscript (354–92 × 266–97 mm) that it has a different origin from the other booklets. It is heavily worn, and represents the remnants of a much more extensive manuscript. Its text is incomplete due to lost gatherings, as can be seen from the manuscript’s collation. Alexander’s gloss on the Psalter is directly linked to his teaching work, representing his lectures on this text. Hunt notes a reference to the Third Crusade in the work, meaning that it must have been completed after 1193; he also notes that it must have been written after he joined the Augustinians.\(^\text{16}\) He assumes this means that it must have been completed at Cirencester, probably influenced by the prominent *ex libris* mark.\(^\text{17}\) This is followed by a further rubric, ‘Glose magistri Alexandri abbatis cyrenc’ super psalterium.’ Both of these are later additions to the manuscript: the *ex libris* is written in a fourteenth-century cursive, and the rubric was not intended as part of the original page design, written above the text block in a different shade of red from that used to highlight the letters of the first line. This rubric can only be used to demonstrate that the book was owned by Cirencester in the thirteenth century. The style of the rest of the booklet is entirely unlike

\[\text{Figure 4.1: Collation of Oxford, Jesus College, MS 94, showing booklets for *Glose super psalterium*; *Tractatus super parabolas Salomonis*; and *Tractatus super Mulierem fortem*.}\]

---

\(^\text{16}\) Hunt, *Schools*, 26–27.

\(^\text{17}\) Oxford, Jesus College, 94, fol. 1r:

*Liber sancte Marie Cyrencestr’ in quo continentur glose super psalterium quam composuit Magister Alexander Item tractatus super principium parabolarum et finem Item tractatus super Mulierem fortem*
other manuscripts produced at Cirencester.

The booklet containing the gloss is instead the only known manuscript of Alexander’s whose production can plausibly be attributed to St Frideswide’s. The text is far more extensively revised than any other of his works, increasing the number of references to the biblical *Glosa* and other commentators and even adding new lemmata (fig. 4.2). The other works in Jesus College 94 only make relatively minor improvements to the text, with occasional additions of new biblical quotations. Alexander would have had far more reason to make these changes while he was lecturing on the text; it is most plausible that the book represents the working copy from his lectures.

![Figure 4.2: Additions to Jesus College 94, fol. 2r.](image)

The case that the additions to the manuscript belong to Alexander is strengthened by their integration into London, British Library, Royal MS 2 C. xi. The Royal manuscript also makes additional adjustments to the text, adopting the additions but also tidying them slightly. The nature of these additions indicates that Jesus College 94 could not have been copied from the Royal manuscript. London, Lambeth Palace, MS 61, represents the uncorrected state of the text. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 284 (SC 2339: from Cirencester) also appears to follow this first recension, at least in places, but Hunt believed that it followed the second, and a full collation is required to establish the state of the text more precisely. Similarly to the gloss on the Psalter, there is an alternate recension of Alexander’s commentary on the Athanasian Creed in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson C.67 (SC 15517), though its changes are much less extensive. While Hunt is hesitant to make a definitive judgement on the identity of the scribal additions to the gloss on the Psalter, there seems to be no other plausible explanation than that they are Alexander’s, especially given the additional evidence provided by Gullick.

If the theory is correct and Alexander first wrote his gloss in his earlier days as a lecturer at Oxford, and revised it as he worked, this would also show that he had the means to publish copies from St Frideswide’s.

---

The only other book certainly known to have been produced at St Frideswide’s in this period is now Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS fr. 24766; a note at the end of the text indicates that it was completed for St Andrew’s Day, 30 November 1212.²¹ The implication is that brother A. was working alone. From Alexander’s own time, there is also Prior Philip’s De miraculis sancte Frideswide, uniquely preserved in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 177; although this appears to have once formed part of a larger volume, it likely has an Oxford provenance,²² and additions at the end of the text may represent Philip’s revisions. It is dangerous to work from an absence of information, but given the sheer lack of manuscripts from St Frideswide’s, and the relatively unfinished state of production of the Jesus College 94 booklet of the gloss on the Psalter, the same may also be true for Alexander. He may have copied out his own work himself, working alone, or hired another scribe on an individual basis. The Lambeth copy of the first recension might have originated with a student, as was the case for many such works. If by moving to Cirencester Alexander gained access to its highly trained scribes, that house would have provided resources for publication much better suited to his work than he had at Oxford.

A narrative for this booklet might follow: Alexander’s copy of his gloss on the Psalter was first produced at Oxford after 1193, after which some copies were made from the manuscript. He revised the text as he continued to teach as a canon at St Frideswide’s, and brought the copy (by now somewhat bedraggled from use) with him to Cirencester. More copies were made at some point that included his changes in the text, and either he or another cleric revised the text mildly to integrate the additions more thoroughly. After Alexander’s death, the booklet was included in this manuscript in an attempt to assemble his lesser or unfinished biblical commentaries, and the compiler omitted booklets that had been lost or damaged. Bodley 284 might have been commissioned as a replacement.

4.2.1.2 Super parabolas

Alexander’s commentary on Proverbs, Tractatus super parabolas Salomonis, forms most of the second booklet of Jesus College 94. This copy is unfinished, and it is unlikely that it ever reached a more advanced state. He only claims to have begun the work in Speculum speculationum: ‘Memini autem me aliqua proposuisse super hoc in ingressu tractatus quem institui super parabolas.’²³ This did not stop copies from being made: one was owned by the Carmelite Hulne Priory,²⁴ and another by the Dominicans at Lincoln.²⁵ The only

²¹ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, fr. 24766, fol. 151r:


²⁵ According to Leland’s notes in London, BL, Royal App. 69, fol. 3r: cited in Hunt, Schools, 137.
known excerpts from the work are found in Sol meldunensis; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 102 (SC 4051), fol. 200v, includes two passages that are cited from the commentary on Proverbs, but are from the Tractatus super Mulierem fortem.

Alexander revises the text as he works: the same hand from the gloss on the Psalter can be found making many additions in both this booklet and the Tractatus super Mulierem fortem. While the additions to the gloss focus on revising the content, Alexander is far more interested in smaller details within these booklets, modifying the punctuation and even changing the scribes’ spelling usage. In the Proverbs commentary, there are only a handful of lengthy additions. These are roughed in by Alexander in the margin: they are in ink on the first few folios, and later in plummet. The plummet additions are recopied by a professional scribe with the addition of a decorative frame. As with the gloss on the Psalter, the purpose of the longer additions is typically to integrate additional quotations, as when a line from Job 29:18 is added to an already long collection of Old Testament references in the proem to Proverbs (fol. 57va, fig. 4.3). There are also many corrections of spelling that do not change the meaning of the text. Some of the corrections are made
in a hand similar to Alexander’s, but not the same: this belongs to Walter de Melida, Alexander’s clerk.

The work’s unfinished state becomes more apparent as it progresses, which suggests that the manuscript was copied while Alexander was still in the process of composition. It begins much in the style of his commentaries on Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs, with a formal proem, followed by a confident declaration, ‘Incipit liber primus. Capitulum i.’ on fol. 59va. The only other heading indicating a chapter is for the second, on fol. 60rb, but it can be seen that more were intended from the scheme of initials at appropriate places, and references in the text itself to a chapter structure. Many of the shifts in hand correspond to transitions in the text, as at Prov. 1:6 (fol. 62rb), ending, ‘Set ecce fateor: quia eger dediscitur usus.’ When the text picks up again, with a transitional sentence and a move to Prov. 1:7, the hand is markedly different (fig. 4.4).

Figure 4.4: Shift in hand in Jesus College 94, fol. 62rb.

The text’s state of completion quickly degrades as the work proceeds. From fol. 72r until the end of the text, the shifts in hand become more frequent, as if Alexander were working on the text in short spurts. A catchword is found at the bottom of fol. 72vb, the end of gathering 8: ‘Requi⟨re?⟩ in libro. Et bene.’ The following gathering is in a different hand and on a different grade of parchment, and the text quickly lapses into verbatim quotations of Bede on Proverbs. The remainder of the gathering was originally blank; two
sermons were later copied into fols 74v–77v under Alexander’s name, but one of these is by Peter Comestor, and the other does not match Alexander’s style.26

The state of this manuscript is highly instructive about Alexander’s working methods, and shows that the scribes were working from a written exemplar. If Alexander had dictated the book directly, it is unlikely that he would have taken the time to read from Bede. He appears to have made written extracts of passages he wished to cite, which he worked into a draft for his scribes. One imagines that Alexander was either entirely consumed by administrative duties or died at this point, after the remaining loose notes were copied into the manuscript for posterity.

4.2.1.3 Tractatus super Mulierem fortem

Alexander’s Tractatus super Mulierem fortem is corrected in a similar way to the Proverbs commentary, but while Alexander was revising the latter work before its completion, the bulk of the revision here was done somewhat later. This is revealed through a collation of the text with a copy from Reading, now Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 528 (SC 2221).27 While Mahoney states that ‘no relationship may be established between the MSS. that would suggest one as the possible source of the other’,28 he came to this conclusion only because he did not record the readings of Jesus College 94 from before its correction. Super mulierem is much more discursive than the other wisdom commentaries, and there is no suggestion of divisions into chapters. Alexander’s conception of the work appears to have changed as it progressed: its structure suggests that only the first book, on Mary Magdalene, was part of the original plan. Unlike the first, the second and third books (respectively on the Virgin Mary and the Church) include marginal labels: only an abortive attempt has been made to add these to the first book, at fols 96r and 97v. The later books are also identified using running heads. There appear, then, to be three major stages of the work: the creation of book 1; the addition of books 2 and 3, after which Bodley 528 was copied from the manuscript; and the later correction by Alexander, Walter, and at least one other unidentified hand (figs. 4.5, 4.6).

Figure 4.5: Addition to Jesus College 94, fol. 84r

26 Hunt, Schools, 22–23, 150.
27 It is recorded there in Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse, Registrum Anglie, R42.3.
4.2.2 Other Manuscripts

Gullick argues that Alexander can also be found correcting and annotating a copy of the letters of Thomas Becket (London, British Library, Cotton Claudius B. 11); he notes Alexander’s habit of arranging marginal notes in the form of a reversed triangle – a form repeated even in the marginal notes of copies of Alexander’s works.29 Alexander also adopts a slightly unusual form of punctuation that appears to have been unique to Gloucestershire.30

There are many more Cirencester manuscripts that have hands that might be identified as Alexander’s, but it is difficult to make a definite judgement due to its similarity with that of Walter. While both hands have an angular appearance, Alexander often writes a high double-compartment ‘a’, and almost always uses a ‘g’ with a straight descender; Walter uses a single-compartment ‘a’ with much higher frequency, and usually uses a hooked descender with his ‘g’. In many texts, he places small flourishes on his capital letters.

4.3 Walter de Melida as Alexander’s literary executor

Analysis of Jesus College 94 shows that it was corrected by Alexander, but also that he was not working alone: apart from the scribes who copied it, there is at least one other corrector present, who is highly educated. This reviser can also be hypothesized as responsible for cleaning up the text, potentially after Alexander’s death, and can be thought of as a sort of literary executor. A surviving autograph letter allows this script to be identified as belonging to another canon at Cirencester, Walter de Melida (alternatively

Melide or Melidie). A document dated between June 1200 and July 1205 found in the Cirencester cartulary first refers to him by his full name and later as ‘magistro Waltero’. This appoints him an assistant to Alan the cellarer: together, they are responsible for reporting to the bishop of Worcester and the archdeacon of Gloucester anything the abbot of Cirencester might do that contravenes the arrangement made by this charter. The same document confirms that he is not to be identified with Walter of Gloucester, later abbot from 1217–30.

In September 1212, a Walter was paid for taking a message from the king to Alexander, referred to specifically as the clerk of Alexander. A ‘W. cleric’ also witnesses a charter for Alexander in 1213–17. There are several other Walters in the Cirencester cartulary that might refer to the same person. Various administrative roles are filled by a ‘Waltero capellano’ or ‘magistro W. capellano’ in 1203, 1208, and 1218–36. Documents are found witnessed by a ‘Waltero clerico’ in 1176–81, 1176–93, 1198–1200, and the early thirteenth century. It may be the same ‘Walterum clericum’ that holds the position ‘capellanus de Bachampt’ (Beckhampton, 40 km south of Cirencester) c.1190–93; a ‘Walterus rector capelle de Bach’ also occurs c.1235. There is also a reference in a document of 1187–1208 to a ‘terram que fuit Walteri Clerici’, while an undated thirteenth-century document refers to a ‘terram Walteri capellani’.

Walter’s name presumably refers to Mileto, Calabria, which is called Melide in the chronicle of Roger of Hoveden. Norman connections encouraged frequent contact between England and Sicily at this time. Roger records that Richard I stayed at the town’s Benedictine abbey of the Holy Trinity on 21 September 1190; this abbey was established by Roger I, the Norman count of Sicily, also responsible for an Augustinian foundation at Bagnara. One can find a Peter de Melide living in England a few decades before Walter.
Peter of Blois embarked on an ultimately disastrous venture in the Norman government;\textsuperscript{44} Robert of Cricklade also journeyed there.\textsuperscript{45} Walter may himself have been a Norman.

As a canon, Walter acted as a highly literate administrator. His position as \textit{socius} to Alan the cellarer recalls the position of Reginald of Piperno (Priverno), \textit{socius continuus} of Thomas Aquinas, who acted as a combination secretary and companion.\textsuperscript{46} His script can be found at length at the end of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Lat. 17, fols 223r–224v (fig. 4.7), a set of letters appealing a ruling that concerned several abbots, including that of Cirencester, datable between 1200 and 1213 based on the individuals named. Oxford, Jesus College, MS 48, fol. 85r (fig. 4.8) includes an note on marital consent that is likely in Walter’s hand, placed at the end of the \textit{Speculum ecclesie quod abbass sancti uictoris ex dictis sanctorum patrum compilauit}, as it is entitled in this copy (often attributed erroneously to Hugh of St Victor).

![Figure 4.7: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Lat. 17, fol. 221v.](image)

Walter could also write in a clean book hand. A series of colophons were added to the Cirencester manuscripts in the late twelfth century identifying the scribes who wrote them, though the inscriptions themselves are all in one hand and appear to have been added at the same time, possibly by Walter himself.

\textsuperscript{44} Karla Mallette, \textit{The Kingdom of Sicily, 1100-1250: A Literary History}, The Middle Ages Series (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), 94.  
CHAPTER 4. DISSEMINATING ALEXANDER’S WORKS

Figure 4.8: Oxford, Jesus College, MS 48, fol. 85r.

Figure 4.9: Marquess of Bath MS Longleat 38b, p. 24 (from Gullick, ‘Letters of Thomas Becket’, 9).
(listed in ‘Appendix B: Cirencester’s Library’). London, British Library, Royal MS 7 F. vi (fig. 4.10), a copy of Paterius, was identified as having been written by Walter, canon and deacon, when Andrew was abbot and Adam de la Mora cantor.47 Andrew was in office from 1147 until 1176; Adam’s dates are not known, but he was followed by Alexander of Wellow, under whom at least four manuscripts were completed, meaning that the Royal manuscript could have been completed as late as the early 1170s. If this Alexander can be identified with a canon who witnesses an Oseney Abbey charter datable between 1157 and 1168, Adam was likely still cantor at this time.48

![Figure 4.10: ‘Per manum Walteri’: London, British Library, Royal MS 7 F. vi, fol. 1r.](image)

Gullick identifies Walter as ‘Scribe A’ of four further Cirencester manuscripts, where the canon appears not only to be working with another scribe but to be in charge of ensuring the texts’ accuracy: he is responsible for parts of a Cirenester cartulary (Marquess of Bath, MS Longleat 38b: fig. 4.9), not begun before 1182; parts of a copy of the letters of John of Salisbury, now Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Barlow 48; part of Robert of Cricklade’s De connubio Iacobi in Hereford, Cathedral Library, MS Piv.8; and a copy of the


letters of Thomas Becket in London, British Library, Cotton Clau dius B. 11, also annotated by Alexander Neckam. Walter personally corrected many of these manuscripts and added editorial judgements in the margins, as can be seen for example in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Barlow 48, fol. 64rb. It also appears that Walter added a few corrections to the exemplar of Barlow 48, from Malmesbury, now Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Barlow 6, produced between 1189/90 and 1205, as on fol. 123r (fig. 4.11). He also looks to be responsible for corrections to a volume of Bede, now Oxford, Jesus College, 53 (e.g. fol. 146v). In these volumes, Walter shows himself not only as a precise scribe, but also a textual critic in his own right, and even the modern editors of a critical edition of Thomas Becket’s letters judged his work intelligent.

Walter’s career at Cirencester appears to have lasted from at least c.1175 until after the death of Alexander Neckam in 1217, a period of over forty years, which would require him to have lived until at least sixty-five if one leaves room for a master’s education (Alexander lived to sixty). This fits with the document making him a socius between 1200 and 1205, which places Walter among the more senior canons in the house.

As the clericus of Alexander, Walter was much more than an administrative assistant: his seems to be the second hand that corrects Jesus College 94 noted by Hunt, and can also be found elsewhere. He follows Alexander’s style of roughing in additions to be entered formally by either himself or another scribe, which makes it difficult to distinguish in many cases. Along with additions to the commentaries on Proverbs and the Mulierem fortem, he may be responsible for some of the corrections to Oxford, Magdalen College, MS 139, though there are several hands at work in this manuscript (fig. 4.12); Gullick identifies his book hand in an addition to the bottom margin of fol. 49r. This is a copy of De naturis rerum written in an identical style to the Cirencester copy of the Tractatus super Mulierem fortem, and presumably originating from the abbey. Titles have been added to many chapters, reflecting two different textual traditions: one including numbered chapters with headings in the later books, and one lacking these. He may also be the annotator of London, British Library, Royal MS 7 F. 1, containing Alexander’s Speculum speculationum. The hand

50 Written under abbot Robert of Melun, according to an inscription in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barlow 6, fol. 209r, whose dates were updated in Knowles et al., Heads of Religious Houses, 1:56; Clement C.J. Webb, ed., Ioannis Saresberiensis episcopi Carnotensis Politicati sitae De nugas curialium et vestigii philosorum libri VIII (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909), i:xxv–xvi gives his earliest date as 1187.
52 Forthcoming catalogue of the Magdalen College manuscripts by Ralph Hanna, crediting research conducted by Gullick in 1994; the entry also mentions the possible connection of the canon and deacon Walter with Walter de Melida.
53 Thomson, Speculum speculationum, xx also argues against identifying this hand with Alexander.
corrects most of the text, but does not revise it: where longer additions occur, they can be explained as corrections from an exemplar. This work was also unfinished at Alexander’s death, and this correction work appears to have been part of Walter’s activities as a sort of literary executor for the abbot.

4.3.1 Walter’s edition of Alexander’s sermons

The most vivid evidence for Walter’s work comes in the form of correspondence with two Benedictines. The first appears in Canterbury, Cathedral Library, MS Lit. B. 13 (57, iii), a manuscript that includes a number of sermons written by Alexander; it was owned by Roger Noreys, a monk at Christ Church, Canterbury in the early thirteenth century. He gave a number of books to its library, the number of which is somewhat ambiguous in the catalogue: it might be either eleven or sixty-four, depending on how the entry is read. His donation also included a copy of Alexander’s *De naturis rerum*. It originally lacked the end of Alexander’s sermon 39, and Roger asked about this on a trip to Cirencester. Walter supplies the requested end of the sermon, accompanied by an autograph letter now inserted after fol. 67, asking in return for a list of the sermons by Alexander available to Roger, as quickly as possible:


56 For a listing of Alexander’s sermons, see Hunt, *Schools*, 150–53.
Figure 4.13: Walter’s letter to Roger Noreys in Canterbury, Cathedral Library, MS Lit. B. 13, inserted after fol. 67.
W. de Melida, to his beloved in Christ and friend, the most dear R., chaplain to the archbishop, greetings and himself. I am sending you the end of the sermon beginning, *Thou shalt arise, and have mercy upon Sion*. [Ps. 101:14] I also ask you to mark on some sheet the beginnings of all the sermons that you have in your possession and send them to me by the first messenger you can find. For I found after you left me, as if it happened by the will of God, some sermons of master Alexander where other of his sermons are contained which you do not have in your possession; and because I do not accurately remember all those which you already have, send me the beginnings of them all, that I may thus have written those sermons which you do not have. Farewell.\(^{57}\)

Walter is eager both to spread Alexander’s writings and collect them himself. This letter probably accounts for the process behind the compilation of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Wood empt. 13 (SC 8601), a collection of most, but not all, of Alexander’s sermons (lacking, for example, a few found in the Canterbury manuscript), organized to follow the church year. The manuscript belonged to St Augustine’s in Canterbury, but it is possible that it was originally one of the sermon collections found belonging to Roger Noreys, of which he owned many.

Walter seems to have taken an interest in collecting and disseminating the works not only of Alexander Neckam, but also those of Robert of Cricklade. To Gullick’s identification of Hereford, Cathedral Library, MS Piv.8, a copy of Robert’s *De connubio Iacobi*, can be added his *Homiliae super Ezechielem* in Cambridge, Pembroke College, MS 30 (see fig. 4.14). The manuscript is precisely in the style of Alexander’s *De naturis rerum* in Magdalen College 139 and *Super mulierem* in Jesus College 94; many of the rubrics are completed by the same hand. As in the other manuscript, Walter can be found copying corrected versions of passages into the margins, later integrated with the main text. The manuscript was owned by the Benedictine abbey of Bury St Edmunds by the time of Henry Kirkestede (c.1314—in or after 1378), as the pressmark from his reorganization of the library is found on fol. 1r.\(^{58}\) As Cirencester already had a copy of the *Homiliae super Ezechielem*, now Hereford, Cathedral Library, MS O.iii.10, the manuscript was presumably made for them specifically. Walter appears, therefore, to have been responsible for an effort to disseminate the works of

---


Dilecto sibi in cristo et amico karissimo. R. capellano archiepiscopi. suus W. de Melida. Salutem et se ipsum. Mitto uobis finem sermonis illius qui sic incipit. Tu exurgens misereberis syon. Rogo etiam uos quatinus notetis in quadam cedula omnium sermonum principia quos habetis penes uos et mittatis michi per primum nuntium quem inuenire poteritis. Inueni enim postquam recessistis a me sicut voluntas dei fuit quosdam sermones magistri Alex’ [erasure of approximately fifteen words: ... ut illi quos non habetis ...] ubi continentur alii eius sermones quos penes uos non habetis. et quia memoriter non retineo omnes quos penes uos habetis omnium principia [principia omnium before correction] michi mittite. ut sic sermones illos quos non habetis scribere faciam. Valete.

4.3.2 Walter’s correspondence with Malmesbury on Corrogationes Promethei

The second letter involving Walter is from S., prior of Malmesbury, writing on his admiration of Alexander’s work, and focusing particularly on the *Corrogationes Promethei*. He does not refer to the book by this title, but describes it as being about the meanings of words, designed as an introductory work for the instruction of boys, and having a prologue, which allows it to be identified positively. There seems to have been a special affinity for this work at Malmesbury, as the monks used it as the source for several additions to *Sol meldunensis* (Cambridge, University Library, MS Gg.6.42). Copied of the letter of S. are now found at the end of the verse anthology in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 11867, fol. 240va–b; and in a copy of *Corrogationes Promethei* from Sempringham Priory, now London, British Library, Royal MS 5 C. v, fol. 57rb–vb. S. refers to Alexander in glowing terms: ‘For he has not only accepted gold, but is entirely

---

59 An earlier part of the letter is quoted from the Paris manuscript in Meyer, ‘Notice sur les *Corrogationes Promethei*, 657n1; summarized in Hunt, *Schools*, 11; the letter on *Corrogationes Promethei* found in Évreux, Bibl. Mun., 72, fol. iv is a different text, in spite of the claim of Hunt, *Schools*, 131.
clothed in it.\textsuperscript{60} The prior eludes further identification, though he is also noted in a document from 1246.\textsuperscript{61} Following this effusion in Alexander’s praise, he comes to an intriguing conclusion:

These are my thoughts on the work and the worker. You will have seen whether they are agreeable and clear. My mind suggests to me in faithful testimony not to wander in words. I hope these are pleasing to you; if they are not, let me know first what displeases.\textsuperscript{62}

S. cannot be concerned that Walter will find his views on Alexander controversial; rather, it appears that the letter is intended to fit a particular purpose that Walter requested. The terms in which he speaks suggest that he is writing after the Alexander’s death, and Walter might have solicited an encomium from Malmesbury to commemorate the abbot’s work.

The letter might also have been intended to accompany a new edition of \textit{Corrogationes Promethei}, or even a projected collection of Alexander’s works similar to that created for Hugh of St Victor. Some evidence for such a campaign might be discernible in the consistency and dating of surviving manuscripts. There are several thirteenth-century copies of both \textit{Super cantica} and \textit{De naturis rerum}, and they have a remarkably consistent appearance, sometimes found even in copies from later centuries. Wright first observed that there was a pattern of consistent marginal titles in his manuscripts, and suggested that these were part of an archetype.\textsuperscript{63} The same can also be said of \textit{De utensilibus}, of which there are many more copies, and which was probably one of Alexander’s earlier works: most of its manuscripts are of a similar size, and almost universally they leave space between the lines of the main text for glosses. This phenomenon can be partially explained by arguing that the scribes understood the work’s purpose, and in many cases reproduced what they saw. Walter’s corrections and correspondence also provide evidence for a conscious effort to distribute accurate copies of the works of the authors for which his abbey was renowned.

\subsection*{4.4 Results of the dissemination effort}

Surviving manuscripts and those referred to in medieval library catalogues (listed in Appendix A: Alexander’s Works) together give a sense of the relative success of Alexander’s work. This data must be used with some caution, since the vast majority of records represent institutional holdings, and only a fraction of the catalogues that existed survived the dissolution of the monasteries; of these, an even smaller number are available in an accessible format, and these overwhelmingly represent the British Isles. The table below

\begin{tabular}{|l|c|}
\hline

60 & Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 11867, fol. 240va–b: ‘Non enim solummodo aurum recipit: sed et auro tota uestitur.’


62 & Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 11867, fol. 240vb:

   \begin{quote}
   \end{quote}

63 & Wright, \textit{De naturis rerum}, lxxvii.

\end{tabular}
enumerates these records; any catalogue entries matched to a surviving manuscript are not counted in the total. The provenance of many volumes has not yet been identified, meaning that there will be some duplication between the surviving manuscripts and records. For copies whose orders can be identified, many were owned by Augustinian houses, as one might expect, but far more by the Benedictines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Manuscripts</th>
<th>Records</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Corrogationes Promethei</em></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De utensilibus</em></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De naturis rerum</em></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Super cantica canticorum</em></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Laus sapientie divine</em></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Expositio simboli</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Novus Esopus</em></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Glose super psalterium</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Super mulierem fortem</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Corrogationes Promethei metrice</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Super Martianum</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Novus Auianus</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De commendatione uini</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Meditatio de Magdalena</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Questiones</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Super parabolas</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Corrogationes noui Promethei</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sacerdos ad altare</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Solatium fidelis anime</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Speculum speculationum</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Suppletio defectum</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Copies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benedictines</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustinian Canons</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Friars</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carthusians</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cistercians</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmelites</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franciscans</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is nothing surprising about the widespread copying of *Corrogationes Promethei* (the subject of praise from S. of Malmesbury) and *De utensilibus*. The former would have been a useful tool for anyone needing to work with the Bible. Several institutions even list multiple copies, suggesting that it was in demand as a reference work; the Benedictines of Christ Church, Canterbury may have owned as many as eight, according to the catalogue compiled by Prior Eastry before the end of 1331. Most copies of *De utensilibus* have been personalized in small ways, providing slightly different versions of the Anglo-Norman glosses. What is more surprising is the success of *De naturis rerum* and to a lesser extent *Super cantica*; in some ways – given their monumental size – their wide distribution represents the more impressive accomplishment.

Alexander gained an appreciative readership during his lifetime, and the Cirencester canons were keen to continue promoting his work posthumously. There is little evidence for the means by which he undertook his literary work at Oxford, but the first booklet of Oxford, Jesus College, MS 94, containing his gloss on the Psalter with autograph corrections, was most likely produced there. The survival of copies of the first recension of this text shows that he had the means to publish his work from Oxford, but he may have had to arrange this on an individual basis. At Cirencester, collaborative work with scribes enabled him to produce fair copies of works even as they were being written. Walter de Melida in particular assisted in the correction and presentation of his books, even after Alexander’s death. As can be seen from Walter’s letters, this activity provided the canons with a means to promote relationships with neighbouring houses, as will be also seen in the case of *Sol meldunensis*, a miscellany of Alexander’s works assembled by his nephew and presented to the abbot of Malmesbury.
Chapter 5

*Sol meldunensis*: Reading Alexander at Cirencester and Malmesbury

Long after Alexander’s death, his community at Cirencester continued to repurpose his writings to meet their developing needs. Cambridge, University Library, MS Gg.6.42 is a miscellany consisting almost entirely of the works of Alexander Neckam; it is called *Sol meldunensis* here from its incipit. Its careful construction shows the respect that Alexander Neckam gained among his peers, and hints at how they used his writings. It was written by a Cirencester canon and dedicated to the abbot of Malmesbury, both named Geoffrey. The opening ‘florilegium’, as past scholars have classified it, strings together passages from nearly all Alexander’s prose works (including some that do not otherwise survive): it is key to analysing Alexander’s writings, and the manuscript has fruitfully been used as a repository for identifying which of these are genuine. The excerpts are woven together to form new ‘sermons’, as the compiler presents them, and the collection deserves study in its own right. While the bulk of the manuscript seems to have been created by a small group working at Cirencester, various additions to the manuscript complicates any notion of a linear pattern of production. Both the physical and intellectual details of the book most logically point to the augmented and annotated result being a product of a collaboration between the communities of Cirencester and Malmesbury.

---
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5.1 Cambridge, University Library, Gg.6.42: Physical description

It has been suggested in the past that the book could have originated at either Cirencester or Malmesbury; indeed, it is likely that parts of the manuscript are from both abbeys. The florilegium that forms the bulk of the manuscript must have been compiled at Cirencester, as this is the only known location where all the works it uses were available, and presumably both this and the closing verse anthology, written by the same scribe, were also written there.

The manuscript is multi-layered, but can be understood as a unity: the title Sol meldunensis is used here to refer to the entire volume. It can be divided into three or potentially four booklets, bound as a single volume: the first contains mostly prose extracts from Alexander Neckam, divided into two books; the second Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Prophetia Merlini; the third a collection of verses mostly from Alexander. Hunt refers to the volume as the Florilegium (treating this as a title), but uses the term inconsistently to refer to either the manuscript as a whole or the prose section. Rigg contrasts this ‘florilegium’ with an ‘anthology’ such as the collection of Alexander’s poetic works in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 11867: he defines a florilegium as ‘a collection of excerpts’ and an anthology as ‘a collection of complete items (normally poems).’ Under this understanding, it is strictly only the first part of the manuscript that can be called a florilegium; the verse section is organized in a manner similar to the Paris anthology, and includes complete extracts. An alternate definition of the anthology, taken from Pearsall, could equally be used for entire work: he defined an anthology as an assemblage whose purposes must be ‘specific, direct and fairly obvious to the imagined contemporary reader,’ and contrasts these with miscellanies, books whose contents have been randomly bound up. Without making a judgement between these differing approaches, the more general term ‘miscellany’ will be used here to refer to the manuscript; where the term ‘florilegium’ is used, it refers specifically to the first booklet.

Using the example of London, British Library, Cotton Titus D. xx (containing Alexander’s De utensilibus, among other things), Dinkova-Bruun further suggests that one should distinguish between a secondary miscellany, ‘a codex containing various parts written at different times and by different scribes, which did not belong together originally but were bound within the same covers at a later stage, often at random’, and a primary miscellany, ‘a compilation created from the very beginning by a person or group of people with an overarching idea and purpose.’ The first and third booklets of Gg.6.42 were produced by the same scribes,

3 Also noted by McDonough, ‘Cambridge, University Library, Gg. 6.42’, 792n41.
8 Greti Dinkova-Bruun, ‘Medieval Miscellanies and the Case of Manuscript British Library, Cotton Titus D.XX’, in Medieval Manuscript
while the Geoffrey of Monmouth gathering is imitative of what precedes it in terms of its decoration and page layout, but has an entirely different script, and its lines are widely spaced to allow for glossing. The gathering of Geoffrey’s text is the postulated contribution of Malmesbury abbey. That this is not added from another manuscript is demonstrated on fol. 213v, where a note has been added that appears to be from the Cirencester rubricator. The entire manuscript should be understood as a ‘primary miscellany’.

5.1.1 Structure

The book is collated a², 1⁰+¹ (3 added), 2–6⁰, 7⁸+¹ (8 added), 8⁰, 9¹⁰+¹ (11 added), 10–21⁰ | 22⁰ | 23⁰, 24⁴+¹–⁴ (1 added, 6–8 cancelled), for a total of ii + 236 parchment folios (foliated 1–237, with an inserted slip in gathering 8 foliated 70bis), as illustrated in fig. 5.1. Most pages measure around 210 × 142 mm, having been trimmed on all sides by several millimetres; the binding is 160 × 218 × 62 mm. The additions in gatherings 1, 7, and 24 are irregularly shaped (fol. 5, 142 × 182.5 mm; fol. 70bis, 133 × 89 mm; fol. 233, 133 × 209 mm); gatherings 23 and 24 are slightly wider (144 × 209 mm). The unusual number of folios in gathering 7 might suggest that it was first planned as the end of the manuscript, corresponding to the end of the first book of the florilegium on fol. 68v or 69v (which, unlike book two, is not labelled as such). The proem to Book 2 has been copied into the rest of the gathering, on fols 70r–71v. Gathering 22 both begins and ends with blank leaves, and has a slightly heavier weight of parchment in comparison to the rest of the book. The end of the last gathering has been cut away. The verse anthology ends on fol. 236r, and fol. 236v was blank until annotated by a later owner; both sides of fol. 237 have a hymn, which looks to have been written at Cirencester, but uses a slightly different style of decoration, with green rather than blue initials alternating with red.

An earlier cataloguer has pencilled an alternative collation on the back flyleaf: ‘2 flyleaves. 1⁰ (10 cancelled) 2–6⁰ 7⁰ (2 cancelled) 8–⁰ 10¹² (11 cancelled) 11–21⁰ | 22⁰ | 23⁰ 24⁰ (wants 5–10): 237 ff (out of 242; 238–42 lost; 70bis an inserted slip; 92 misbound after 93).’ This was evidently Henry Bradshaw: the manuscript follows his gathering notation style, with the first folio of each gathering numbered in the bottom right-hand corner and an ‘x’ marked in the same place on the recto immediately following the centre of the gathering. Bradshaw’s mistake appears to have two causes. Each gathering is surrounded by a thin strip of parchment, which can be easily confused with a cancelled folio. (This may have been a modern Cambridge binding practice: it is also found, for example, in Cambridge, University Library, MS Kk.5.10.) The note on folios 92 and 93 was intended as a solution to the problem that the catchphrase on fol. 91v does not match the first line of 92r. Bradshaw, probably recognizing it as a later standalone addition, is reacting to the Cambridge catalogue, which states that a leaf was missing between folios 91 and 92. A mark appears to
Figure 5.1: Collation of Cambridge, University Library, MS Gg.6.42, showing booklets for florilegium, *Prophetia Merlini*, and verse anthology.
direct the insertion of the leaf's text on 93v, but it is not necessary to postulate that the leaf itself should have been placed there when the book was first bound; it is part of gathering 9, not 10 as he thought (the stub from the other end of the leaf is found before fol. 82). The cataloguer modified the pencilled foliation for fols 92 and 93, swapping them to reflect this theory (leaving the real fol. 92 labelled 93 and fol. 93 labelled 92). The manuscript was among those M.R. James examined in his work towards a revised version of the Cambridge University Library catalogue.11

5.1.2 Page layout

The page layout follows a highly consistent pattern: fol. 4r (fig. 5.2) is typical of the florilegium, with vertical rules occurring in pencil, from left to right, at 24, 95.5, 116, 119.5, 141.25, and 142 mm. Horizontal rules occur, from top to bottom, at 2, 16.5, 21.5, 136.5, 141, 180, 184, and 205.5, and 210 mm. The line spacing is typically 4.5 to 5 mm. The last of these rules may be for aligning the catchphrase, and is often omitted; its location varies somewhat (sometimes as high as 203 mm). The three rules below the textblock are sometimes omitted.

Fol. 215r (fig. 5.3), ruled in plummet, is a typical example of the Geoffrey of Monmouth booklet. Vertical rules occur at 13, 18, 105, 110, and 138 mm; horizontal at 18.5, 35.5, 176.5, and 208 mm. The line spacing is 8.5 mm, but the text is only about 5 mm high, leaving extra space for glosses (the same layout found in almost all copies of Alexander Neckam's *De utensilibus*).

In the verse anthology, using fol. 223r (fig. 5.4) as an example, vertical rules occur at 23, 27.5, 98.5, 115.5, 119, and 141.5 mm; horizontal at 14, 19, 154, 157.5, 178, 182.5, 207.5, and 209 mm. The line spacing is, once again, 4.5–5 mm. This variation from the pattern of the florilegium could be evidence of a different date of production for the final two gatherings.

5.2 Origin and address

The compiler of *Sol meldunensis* only names himself ‘Galfridus’:

O sun and moon of Malmesbury, light of the monks,
May your honour accept, I ask, a new song
Which the devotion of simple Geoffrey offers to you.
I thirst for your correction, pious pastor:
May you put a polish on this work, who corrects the roughness of the cloister.
May you be a pious favourer of fault, and may you, a benignant judge,
Absolve what the presumption of the tongue does wrong.12

12 Cambridge, University Library, Gg.6.42, fol. 3r. McDonough, ‘Cambridge, University Library, Gg. 6.42’, 791 prints the first five lines
Figure 5.2: Cambridge, University Library, Gg.6.42, fol. 4r.
Figure 5.3: Cambridge, University Library, Gg.6.42, fol. 215r.
Figure 5.4: Cambridge, University Library, Gg.6.42, fol. 223r.
The word 'simplicis' in the third verse implies that Geoffrey was a monk or regular canon; the line is glossed 'Simplex uocatur claustralis. dicitur et simplex qui sine plica duplicitatis est.' ('The simple man is called cloistered; he is also called simple who is without the fold of deceit.') Mutual correction was one of the classic ideals of friendship.  

A further verse epistle at the end of the proem to book two reveals that the recipient Galfridus holds in such high regard is 'Gaufridus': this most logically points to Geoffrey, abbot of Malmesbury abbey from 1246–60, providing an approximate date for the volume:

My page thinks sweetly when it greets you voluntarily,  
O Geoffrey, pious father, father of all wisdom.  
May, I pray, its hail be pleasing to you, sweet, pleasant.  
It wishes, certainly, to be pleasing to you, O man of honesty:  
Because it magnifies you, it speaks distinctive goods concerning you;  
May you rejoice, then may you think on our salvation.  
Now, good Geoffrey, whose praise resounds everywhere,  
It asks that through you our letters may be safe.  
If perchance this book should speak clumsily to you,  
Judge it sparingly, that it may not be immediately abandoned.  
Often it is helpful to have reread a book and remember it;  
More often, add a hand: what you will have will be, I think, plain.  

and offers two literary parallels; also quoted in Hunt, 'Alexander Neckam', 160:

Sol meldunensis et cinthia lux monachorum.  
Suscipiat tua queso nouum dignatio carmen  
Quod tibi Galfridi deuotio simplicis  
offert.  
Te correctorem sicio pastor pie  
limam:  
Apponas operi. qui corrigis aspera claustri.  
Sis pius indultor culpe. iudexque benignus  
Absolus, quod deliquit presumptio lingue.


15 Cambridge, University Library, Gg.6.42, fol. 71v:

Pagina dulce putat cum te mea sponte [sepe Reginald] salutat:  
O Gavfride [Lamberte Reginald] pieter. omnis papa sophie.  
Sit precor eius aue tibi gratum dulce suuae.  
Esse quidem gratum tibi wlt o uir probitatum:  
Quod te magnificat de te bona singula dicat.  
Grates esse. putes tibi nostras ergo salutes.  
Nunc bone Gavfride [Lamberte Reginald] laus cuius ubique sonatur.  
Tucior ut per te sit littera nostra precatur.  
Hic [Qui Reginald] si forte tibi liber inconcinna loqutur:  
Iudex parce sibi ne statim prociatur.  
Sepe relegisse cartam iuuat et meminisse;
The first eight lines of this poem are taken from the dedication of Reginald of Canterbury’s *Vita Malachi*, lines 2–8, addressed to Lambert, abbot of the Benedictine abbey of St Bertin; Geoffrey wisely omits lines 28–31, which describe the book’s crossing of the sea, and skips to the last four lines.\(^{16}\) There was good reason to be on good terms with Malmesbury, which is only twenty kilometres from Cirencester. Henry III appears to have travelled directly between the two locations during his visit in July 1241.\(^{17}\) The abbot of Malmesbury witnesses several charters found in the Cirencester cartulary, and a mandate from Stephen Langton as archbishop of Canterbury likely issued between 1219 and 1228 makes the abbot responsible for ensuring that the bishop of Worcester did not encroach on the churches belonging to Cirencester abbey.\(^{18}\)

The final verse epistle of *Sol meldunensis* builds on the theme of judgement and correction, once again borrowing from Reginald of Canterbury, here addressing Gilbert Crispin, abbot of Westminster from 1085 to 1117.\(^{19}\) The first group of lines (according to the manuscript’s own divisions) correspond to Reginald’s lines 23–28 and 37–38; the last to his 39–40. Geoffrey also adds something else, via a quotation from Alexander Neckam: a desire to correspond. The two errors made by the scribe in this couplet suggest that he was quoting Alexander’s verses from memory, whereas the quotation of Reginald is flawless:

¶ Now, O father and lord, you will have seen
whether this book carries every point or is full of faults.
If you wish it to remain, it will remain; if not, a blaze will burn it;
your speech is its praise or destruction.
If I have arranged its parts as somebody who does not know the arts,
have mercy on this fate, O apostolic doctor.
Filled with your praise, this poetry gives the rudiments
before the glory of your natural praise everywhere.

¶ Let a page be exchanged between us;
may your mind be known as well as mine, with a note acting as an intermediary.

¶ May God give you the joy of the present and continuing life,
and all good things, my lord.\(^{20}\)

Sepius adde manum. quod habebis [hebebit Reginald] erit puto planum.

The first eight lines are also printed in McDonough, ‘Cambridge, University Library, Gg. 6.42’, 791; Hunt, ‘Alexander Neckam’, 160.


\(^{20}\) Cambridge, University Library, Gg.6.42, fol. 212v; also quoted in Hunt, ‘Alexander Neckam’, 161:

¶ Nunc pater et domne tu uideris hic liber omne:
Seu punctum tulerit seu uiciosus erit.
Stare uelis: stabit. si non: hunc flamma cremabit.
Laus sua sermo tuus interitusue suus.
While these sentiments are standard literary tropes, the invitation to an exchange seems to have been taken literally, explaining the various layers of addition found in the manuscript. The quotations are also a significant clue as to the author’s identity. Alexander’s poem entrusts a nephew for education to a ‘doctor Radulfe’, possibly Ralph of Dunstable, who wrote a verse life of St Alban: 21

Accept, teacher Ralph, the nephew I send to you;
    teach him with diligent care.
I charge him to your trustworthiness; with the vigilance of care
    he will bear the benefits; this labour will not be barren.
Through you, he may flourish in verses and rhymes, in addition to literary style,
    and have watchful attention in these.
Shape him in morals; soak him in virtues;
    adorn him with words; restore him with doctrine; embellish him with metre.
May you be equally a father and teacher; may you seem
    to be both to him: a teacher in warnings, a father in love.
With you as guide let the boy absorb nothing boyish,
    and let the strap steer the youthful impulses of the taught mind.
With you as guide in the tender years let him grow old in excellence of character,
    pure, and from a boy let him cease to be a boy.
May the work commend the artist; may the teaching of the master
    be clear to the student by its own witness.
Let a page be exchanged between us;
    may your mind be known as well as mine, with a note acting as an intermediary. 22

Si posui partes uelud is qui ne(s)cit artes.
    Hac miserere uice doctor apostolice.
Lauda tui plena dedit hec rudimenta camena.
    Ob decus ingenue laudis ubique tue.
¶ Mutua discurrat [discurrant before correction] inter nos pagina. nota:
    Mens tua mensque mea [mea … tua before correction] sit mediante nota.
¶ Gaudia presentis uite semperque manentis:
    Et bona cuncta deus det tibi domne meus.

For the second line, cf. Horace, De arte poética 343–44:

omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci,
    lectorem delectando pariterque monendo.

22 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 11867, fols 238rb–238va:

Quem tibi transmitto doctor Radulpe nepotem:
    Suscipe. deuota sedulitate doce.
Hunc fidei committo tue. uigilancia cure:
    Lucra feret. sterilis non erit iste labor.
Hunt suggests that the nephew mentioned in this poem might have been the Peter addressed in the versified version of *Corrogationes Promethei*, though we know nothing about him; this could just as plausibly be Alexander’s known correspondent Peter of Blois. It is far more likely that the quotation of the couplet in *Sol meldunensis* is self-referential. Geoffrey describes himself as ‘claustralis’, and he must had had extensive access to Cirencester’s library. A surviving manuscript given to the abbey in 1238 belonged to a Geoffrey, sometime vicar of Avebury, who served at the canons’ pleasure; nothing more is known of him. There are only two figures named Geoffrey mentioned in the Cirencester cartulary who could have been active in 1246–60. One is master Geoffrey of Sanderwick, mentioned as owing rent to the house in 1240, but he has no known institutional affiliation. The other candidate is Geoffrey Brito (recorded as Galfridus Britonus), who was not only a canon at Cirencester, but also Alexander Neckam’s nephew.

Geoffrey Brito’s kinship gives him obvious personal motivations for preserving Alexander’s writings. Indeed, the Cirencester cartulary suggest that his livelihood was somewhat dependent on maintaining the memory of Alexander. A document issued between 1215 and 1230 names him as a master, as well as the vicar of Milborne Port, located over a hundred kilometres away from Cirencester, though it is not clear whether he would have served this church in person. The abbey had earlier been obliged to enlist the help of Innocent II and Eugenius III to preserve its right to this church. He likely obtained this position through a relationship to Richard Brito, a royal clerk whose status at Milborne Port was surrounded in legal disputes. A Thomas Brito also made multiple gifts of land to the abbey. It must have been a promotion

---

Versibus et rithmis. et adhuc dictamine. per te:
Floreat. et sit in his sollicitudo uigil.
Moribus informa. uirtutibus inbue. uerbis:
Exorna. refice dogmate. pinge metris.
Sis pater et doctor pariter uidearis uterque:
Esse sibi. monitis doctor. amore: pater.
Te duce nil pueri capiat puer. et pueriles:
Motus: edoecte mentis habena regat.
Te duce sub teneris annis. uirtute senescat.
Purus. et inde puer: desinat esse puer.
Artificem commendet opus. doctrina magistri:
Discipulo pateat testificante sua.
Mutua discurrat inter nos pagina. nota:
Mens tua. mensque mea sit mediante nota.


24 Oxford, Jesus College, 48, fol. 1r: ‘Liber Galfr’ quondam uicarii de Auebyri’.
30 Ross and Devine, *Cartulary of Cirencester Abbey*, no. 523, 524, 527, 528, 529, 636.
when, between 1222 and 1230, Geoffrey was assigned a stall in Cirencester's church of St John the Baptist, in a charter that specifically names Geoffrey as his nephew and indicates the motivation behind the act as a desire to commemorate the dead abbot’s anniversary, presumably that of his death on 31 March 1217.\footnote{Ross and Devine, Cartulary of Cirencester Abbey, 1:299–300 (no. 332).} Between 1230 and 1236, another charter was issued assigning him a messuage near the abbey, speaking in similar terms.\footnote{Ross and Devine, Cartulary of Cirencester Abbey, 1:301–2 (no. 336).} Both are witnessed by William of Blois, bishop of Worcester (where Alexander was buried), and John Walsh, abbot of Malmesbury, further hinting that it was in Geoffrey’s best interests to foster the friendship between Cirencester and Malmesbury.

### 5.3 Stages of production

Hunt guessed that Gg.6.42 was ‘one of the original fair copies’;\footnote{Hunt, Schools, 118.} indeed, it is probably the only copy ever made. The main text is copied directly from manuscripts of Alexander’s works, with Geoffrey Brito either dictating or copying directly, and editing as he worked. At one point, the scribe is copying out the following passage from Neckam’s commentary on Proverbs:

\[
\text{Melius est sedere in angulo domatis quam in domo communi cum uxore litigiosa. Set hec deo annuente exponetur … (fol. 173v)}
\]

\[
\text{It is better to live in a corner of the housetop than in a house shared with a quarrelsome wife. [Prov. 21:9/25:24] But this, God willing, will be explained …}
\]

According to the copy of the commentary in Oxford, Jesus College, MS 94, the next word should have been ‘inferius’ (‘below’), but this is omitted. One can imagine Geoffrey reading along, only to suddenly realize that this will not be ‘explained below’ in his book, because he is planning to end the excerpt at the end of the next sentence. The scribe skips over ‘inferius’, partially erases ‘set hec deo annuente exponetur’ (and further underlines it in red to indicate that it is to be ignored), and moves on (fig. 5.5). While the base of the entire text in the first and last booklets is in the same hand, additions to the first booklet only in several hands as well as the annexed Geoffrey of Monmouth gathering plausibly suggest that the monks at Malmesbury took Geoffrey’s invitation to correct and make additions quite literally. This pattern recalls the Proslogion of Anselm of Canterbury; according to Eadmer, after a monk added a criticism of the argument to the book and Anselm received this via a friend, he added a refutation and asked that both additions should be more widely copied. This became part of the wider manuscript tradition.\footnote{Eadmer, Vita Anselmi 1.19: R.W. Southern, The Life of St Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, by Eadmer, Oxford Medieval Texts (London: Nelson, 1962; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 31; Sharpe, ‘Anselm as Author’, 33–34.} There appear to be at least three major levels of production:

---

\footnote{Ross and Devine, Cartulary of Cirencester Abbey, 1:299–300 (no. 332).}
\footnote{Ross and Devine, Cartulary of Cirencester Abbey, 1:301–2 (no. 336).}
\footnote{Hunt, Schools, 118.}
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Figure 5.5: Correction on fol. 173v.

1. **Cirencester**: Florilegium, opening section (gatherings 1–7); book 2 (gatherings 8–21) — sent to Malmesbury
2. **Malmesbury**: Geoffrey of Monmouth (gathering 22); additions to prose florilegium; illustrations on fol. 5 — returned to Cirencester
3. **Cirencester**: Verse anthology and integration of Malmesbury additions (gatherings 23–24) – returned to Malmesbury?

The first book is not identified as such in the manuscript, and could in theory have ended on folio 68v, where the ‘sermon’ closes with a doxology and space at the bottom of the page; or with the amorphous ‘Ad libellum’ section that follows, which collects several verses and is restricted to both sides of fol. 69. These are nearly at the end of gathering 7, which has fewer leaves than others in the manuscript. If the second book was indeed an unplanned addition, the original recipient of Sol meldunensis could have been John Walsh, Abbot Geoffrey’s predecessor who witnessed the charters concerning Geoffrey Brito, since the abbot is not named until 71v. The remainder of the gathering has been filled out with the proem to book 2, ending with the second verse epistle, where the abbot Geoffrey is first named. It is unlikely that the manuscript would have been sent to Malmesbury without this closing poem. It is theoretically possible that the rubric on fol. 70r opening the second book is a later addition, but there is no visible signs of this. The shape of the text and structure of the manuscript seem to indicate only an expansion of scope after the creation of the opening section, not a gap in activity between the two books.

At this point, the manuscript was probably sent to its addressee at Malmesbury, where additions and corrections were made, following Geoffrey Brito’s invitation. The monks at Malmesbury are likely responsible for the addition of the Geoffrey of Monmouth gathering, which is in a markedly different hand from the rest of the book, and uses a layout that follows the logic of what precedes, with the addition of
space left for glosses. The initials, as well as the illustration of the dragons on fol. 214v (fig. 5.6), follow the basic style of the decorations in the florilegium, but are executed to a higher standard.

Figure 5.6: Cambridge, University Library, Gg.6.42, fol. 214v.

It is not, of course, necessary to argue that gathering 22 was added after the florilegium and before the anthology, since there are many examples of books that were not assembled in chronological order. Several hands, perhaps from Malmesbury, annotate the florilegium: the original decorator has gone back and added a frame matching the rest of the book to most of these.

The inserted leaf that is now fol. 5 is slightly smaller (142 × 181 mm) than the rest of the book, and uses a very different style of drawing from what surrounds it; it may also be from Malmesbury. The recto bears an image of St Francis with another Franciscan; the verso bears an image of two standing monastics, whom Nigel Morgan suggests might be Dominicans (figs. 5.7, 5.8). A faint mark at the bottom likely indicated

---

to the binder where the page was to be inserted in the book. Without knowing the details about Abbot Geoffrey, Morgan suggests that the artist 'was directly acquainted' with the earlier work of Matthew Paris at St Alban's, dating the page to the 1240s.\(^{36}\) It has been argued in the past that 'the drawing has nothing to do with the text',\(^{37}\) but it does underscore the ideas of exchange and collaboration that Geoffrey Brito promotes. Perhaps Malmesbury, commemorating both Alexander's connection to St Alban's and the shared Benedictine affiliation, thought it appropriate to insert an image from that abbey. The young figure may be offering a book to St Francis,\(^{38}\) and his expression matches Geoffrey Brito's words precisely.

After Malmesbury's additions, the manuscript was then probably sent back to Cirencester, where a rubric was added to the Geoffrey of Monmouth gathering and the more substantial marginal additions, and further decoration was added to integrate these. The inserted leaves in the florilegium could originally have been loose additions from Malmesbury, with the Cirencester scribe rewriting them and binding them into the manuscript. The verse anthology’s complete lack of integration with the florilegium, much lower degree of annotation, and total lack of more substantial additions suggest that it is a later addition. The manuscript was then presumably sent back to Malmesbury.

5.4 Hands

The patterns found in the scribal additions to the book support this understanding of Sol meldunensis as a layered composition, originating from more than one institution. Only one thirteenth-century hand can be found across the entire manuscript. Substantive additions have been made to the florilegium by several different readers who do not otherwise write in the book, which have been integrated later, by the original scribe. A different group of readers gloss the Prophetia Merlini, and the few annotations in the verse anthology are likely from the same reader.

5.4.1 Florilegium/anthology scribe

The portions of the manuscript produced at Cirencester appear to be written by the same scribe. There are a few shifts to slightly narrower or wider variants of the hand, but these are brief, and do not show substantial differences in letterforms (e.g. fols 14r, 79v, 134v, 145r, 172r, 191r: fig. 5.9). A similar shift can be found in the rubrics (e.g. fols 43r, 70v: figs. 5.10, 5.11). The rubricator does not necessarily seem to be the same person who drew the frames and other decorations.


\(^{37}\) A.G. Little, Franciscan History and Legend in English Mediaeval Art (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1937), 41.

\(^{38}\) Little, Franciscan History and Legend in English Mediaeval Art, 61.
Figure 5.7: Cambridge, University Library, Gg.6.42, fol. 5r
Figure 5.8: Cambridge, University Library, Gg.6.42, fol. 5v
Figure 5.9: Corrections on fol. 14r, likely the original scribe.

Figure 5.10: Modified border for a rubric on fol. 43r.

Figure 5.11: Apparent addition to a rubric on fol. 70v.
5.4.2 Correctors interacting with the scribe

The scribe could theoretically be Geoffrey Brito himself, but this identification is complicated by the presence of at least two correctors who can be seen to interact with the scribe. If one of these can be identified with Geoffrey, it is probably the one that writes in plummet and occasionally in ink, with a round two-compartment 'a' (e.g. fols 87v, 134r, 145v, 149r, 151r: figs. 5.12, 5.13, 5.14, 5.15, 5.16). This may be the same reader as one who adds numerous 'nota' marks throughout the manuscript. There is also a crayon used to make extensive and intelligent corrections to the Geoffrey of Monmouth gathering and the verse anthology, which may be the same person working at a later date with a different writing implement, but the 'a' takes a slightly different form (e.g. fols 221r, 233r" figs. 5.17, 5.18). It appears to be this hand that makes the only substantial marginal addition to the verse anthology (fol. 235r: fig. 5.19). One correction is found in a neat, upright script (fol. 57v: fig. 5.20).

Figure 5.12: Correcting 'uarias' on fol. 87v (also note the unneeded changes to 'similis' and 'dissimilis' from another contemporary corrector).

Figure 5.13: Correcting 'respiciat' on fol. 134r.

Figure 5.14: Annotating fol. 145v.
Figure 5.15: Correction on fol. 149r, where ‘ad hebreos’ seems to have been originally roughed in and later written formally by the scribe.

Figure 5.16: Addition of ‘et’ on fol. 151r, first added in crayon and later inked in; correcting ‘concupiscencia’ in ink.

Figure 5.17: Correcting the Prophetia Merlini on fol. 221r.

Figure 5.18: Noting errors in ‘flumina’ and ‘species’ on fol. 233r.
5.4.3 Other contemporary correctors

The original scribe frequently makes corrections to his own work in a style consistent with the original script; there also appears to be a reader of the florilegium with access to the exemplars who is unafraid to apply intelligent modifications directly to the text (e.g. fols 74v, 154v, 172r: [fig. 5.21; fig. 5.22; #fig:figure5.23]). It may be the same corrector who makes a number of interlinear modifications in a slightly squat hand (e.g. fols 37v, 85r, 87r: figs. 5.24, 5.25, 5.26).
Figure 5.22: Corrections on fol. 154v.

Figure 5.23: Correcting ‘uitem’ and ‘impera’ on fol. 172r.

Figure 5.24: Changing ‘ad’ to ‘adhuc’ on fol. 37v.

Figure 5.25: Adding a missing word to a marginal note on fol. 85r, and fixing ‘cibariorum’.

Figure 5.26: Adding missing words to a marginal note at the bottom of fol. 87r (note also the unusual script used in the rubric).
5.4.4 Florilegium annotators

Several hands make one-off additions to the florilegium (e.g. fols 9r, 13v, 14r, 166r, 225r: figs. 5.27, 5.28, 5.29, 5.30). A narrow hand with a distinctive ‘g’ also makes a few additions (fols 82v, 87r, 87v: figs. 5.31, 5.32). This hand may be related to one distinguished by the use of paraph marks as nota signs, occasionally repeating the notae of an earlier reader (e.g. fols 9r, 34v, 83r, 84r, 86v, 87r, 106v, 117v, 123r, 124r: fig. 5.33). One other hand, a little like Walter de Melida’s, leaves an annotation on the last page of the manuscript (fol. 237v: fig. 5.34).

Figure 5.27: Extension of a marginal note on fol. 9r.

Figure 5.28: Scribal addition on fol. 13v; the rubric here does not appear to have been added by the original scribe.
Figure 5.29: An addition in a somewhat spidery hand on fol. 166r, later integrated into the manuscript’s system of decoration.

Figure 5.30: Gloss to a marginal note on fol. 225r.
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Figure 5.31: Annotation on fol. 82v.

Figure 5.32: Gloss on fol. 87r.

Figure 5.33: Annotation on fol. 83r.

Figure 5.34: Addition in the bottom margin of fol. 237v.
5.4.5 Geoffrey of Monmouth scribes

There are two scribes responsible for the *Prophétia Merlini* gathering, with the shift occurring about halfway through the text (fol. 217v: fig. 5.35). There is also a hand that makes corrections to the *Prophétia Merlini* in a cursive script (fols 214r, 214v, 219r: figs. 5.36, 5.37, 5.38). This is also an example of the original scribe adding glosses to the text, which is limited to the first few pages of the *Prophétia Merlini*, perhaps as an example of how the page layout was intended to be used. Following this, there are at least two cursive hands adding more glosses to the text (e.g. fol. 215r: fig. 5.38).

Figure 5.35: Shift in hand on fol. 217v.

Figure 5.36: Opening rubric at the bottom of fol. 214r for the Geoffrey of Monmouth gathering (copied by the Cirencester rubricator on the previous page before it was trimmed): ‘Epistula magistri galfridi monumutensis directa alexandro lincolnensi episcopo’.

5.4.6 Later readers

The use of the manuscript did not end in the thirteenth century. The only personal marks of ownership appear to come from a later date:
Figure 5.37: Heading for the *Prophetia Merlini* at the bottom of fol. 214v (later copied by a humanist hand onto the top of the following page).

Figure 5.38: Fixing an instance of homeoteleuton on fol. 219r (with another example of the thick crayon).
To Cirencester & bid them pray for me.  
He thatprayeth for me Jesu have merci on hym.

In the centre of the page has been added the only mark of personal ownership in the book:

Iste liber constat moritio  
Gyffardi Testante Iesu

Maurice was probably local to Cirencester, since the name Gyffard or Giffard occurs frequently in the abbey’s cartulary, and this was a prominent family in the area.\(^{39}\) It seems to be his hand that adds some of the glosses to the *Prophetia Merlini*, and he may also have contributed a selection of prophecies on England on fol. 236v, the first of which, ‘Cesaris inperium per tempora longa latebit’, is grouped in other manuscripts with a set of prophecies originating in the twelfth century at the Augustinian priory of Bridlington, though its relationship to these is unclear.\(^{40}\) Separately, a seventeenth-century hand has tentatively identified the compiler of the book as Geoffrey of Malmesbury (fol. 1r).

\(^{39}\) Baddeley, *A History of Cirencester*, 7, 175, 190.  
A fifteenth- or sixteenth-century reader has worked through most of book 2 of the florilegium, adding running heads to many pages (only a few of the examples include fols 74v, 75r, 75v, 130r, 131v, 132r, 132v, 190r, 198r). There is no obvious candidate for the identification of this hand, since the manuscript’s provenance after the dissolution is obscure: the manuscript was among the books owned by John Moore, bishop of Ely (1646–1714), and was presented to the University Library in 1715 by George I, with the standard bookplate found on the opening flyleaf.41

5.5 Contents

5.5.1 The prose Alexander Neckam ‘florilegium’ (gatherings 1–21, fols 3–212)

This is the original part of *Sol meldunensis*. It has been used in the past as a mine for information on the canon of Alexander Neckam’s writings, but the nineteenth-century cataloguers were closer to its character in calling it ‘A Theological Treatise composed of extracts from the various works of Alexander Necham’.42 Its outline runs as follows:

- [3r] 0. Epistula.
- 1. *Liber Primus*
  - 1.1. Sermo in festiuitate reliquiarum. excerptus ex libris magistri alexandri abbatis cyrenestrie.
    - 1.1.1. Ex sermone de sancto iohanne. qui sic incipit. Fuit homo.
    - 1.1.2. Ex tractatu super mulierem fortcm.
    - 1.1.3. Ex tractatu super parabolas.
    - 1.1.4. Ex eodem tractatu.
    - 1.1.5. Ex tractatu super cantica canticorum.
    - 1.1.6. Super parabolas.
    - 1.1.7. Ex tractatu super parabolas.
    - 1.1.8. Ex tractatu super mulierem fortcm.
    - 1.1.9. Super cantica.
    - 1.1.10. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. omnia tempus habent.
    - 1.1.11. Item. Super cantica.
    - 1.1.12. Super mulierem fortcm.
    - 1.1.13. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Dulce est lumen.
  - [5r/5v: portraits]

* 1.1.16. Ex tractatu super mulierem fortém.
* 1.1.17. Ex eodem tractatu.
* 1.1.18. Super ecclesiasten.
* 1.1.20. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Scio quod redemptor meus uiuit.
* 1.1.21. Ex tractatu super cantica canticorum.
* 1.1.22. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
* 1.1.23. Ex tractatu super cantica.
* 1.1.24. Ex libro edito in laudem gloriose uirginis.
* 1.1.25. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Hec est dies.
* 1.1.27. Ex glosa super Quicumque uult.
* 1.1.28. Ex tractatu super cantica.
* 1.1.29. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Nox precessit.
* 1.1.30. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
* 1.1.31. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Tanquam aurum in fornace.
* 1.1.32. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Absterget deus.
* 1.1.33. Ex eodem sermone.
* 1.1.34. Ex Glosa super matheum.
* 1.1.35. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Absterget deus.
* 1.1.36. Ex eodem sermone.
* 1.1.37. Ex eodem sermone.
* 1.1.38. Ex Glosa super psalmum xxxvi.
* 1.1.39. Ex tractatu super cantica.
* 1.1.40. Ex sermone de apostolis qui sic incipit. Hi sunt uiri misericordie.
* 1.1.41. Ex tractatu super cantica canticorum.
* 1.1.42. Ex tractatu super mulierem fortém.
* 1.1.43. Ex sermone de apostolis.
* 1.1.44. Ex tractatu super cantica canticorum.
* 1.1.45. Super psalmum xxxvi.
* 1.1.46. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
* 1.1.47. Ex questione scolastica.
* 1.1.48. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
* 1.1.49. Ex sermone de sancto iohanne.
* 1.1.50. Ex tractatu super mulierem fortém.
* 1.1.51. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Cum esses iunior.
– 1.1. Descriptio misericordie et de eius commendatione.
* 1.1.1. Ex sermone de omnibus sanctis.
* 1.1.3. Ex sermone de omnibus sanctis.
* 1.1.4. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Tu autem cum ieunias.
* 1.1.5. Ex tractatu super cantica.
* [14r] 1.1.7. Ex tractatu super cantica canticorum.

– 1.3. De speciebus misericordie.
* 1.3.1. Ex sermone de omnibus sanctis.
* 1.3.1. Super mattheum.
* 1.3.4. Ex sermone de omnibus sanctis.

* 1.4.1. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Spiritus intelligentie.
* [16v] 1.4.1. Super cantica.
* 1.4.3. Ex libro edito in laudem gloriose uirginis.
* [17r] 1.4.4. Ex eodem libro.
* 1.4.5. Ex eodem libro.
* [18r] 1.4.7. Ex libro edito in laudem gloriose uirginis.
* 1.4.8. Ex eodem libro.
* 1.4.10. Ex libro edito in laudem gloriose uirginis.
* [20r] 1.4.11. Item ex eodem capitulo.
* [21r] 1.4.11. Item ex eodem libro.
* [22v] 1.4.15. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Inclinauit celos.
* 1.4.16. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Dabo uobis cor carneum.
* 1.4.17. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Que est ista que ascendit de deserto.
* 1.4.18. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Ecce ego mitto angelum meum.
* 1.4.19. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. ponam tabernaculum meum.
* 1.4.20. Ex libro edito in laudem gloriose uirginis.
* 1.4.23. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Dixit deus. fiat lux.
* 1.4.24. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Inclinauit celos.
* [32r] 1.4.25. Ex libro edito in laude gloriosa virginis.
* 1.4.27. Ex tractatu super cantica.
* 1.4.28. Ex proemio super parabolas.
* [33r] 1.4.29. Ex sermone de incarnatione domini. qui sic incipit. ponam tabernaculum meum.
* 1.4.30. Ex eodem sermone.
* [33v] 1.4.31. Ex eodem sermone.
* [34r] 1.4.31. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Dixit deus. fiat lux.
* 1.4.33. Ex eodem sermone.
* 1.4.34. Ex libro edito in laudem gloriose virginis.
* [34v] 1.4.35. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Tu exsurgens misererebis syon.
* [35v] 1.4.36. Ex eodem sermone.
* [37r] 1.4.37. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Tu es qui uenturus es.
* [38v] 1.4.38. Ex eodem sermone.
* 1.4.39. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Dixit deus. fiat lux.
* 1.4.40. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Tu es qui uenturus es.
* [39v] 1.4.41. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Dixit deus. fiat lux.
* [40r] 1.4.41. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Nox precessit.
* [40v] 1.4.43. Ex eodem sermone.
* 1.4.44. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Nox precessit.
* 1.4.45. Ex libro edito in laudem gloriose virginis.
* [41r] 1.4.46. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Et tu turris gregis.
* 1.4.47. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Tu es qui uenturus es.
* 1.4.48. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Et tu turris gregis.
* 1.4.49. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Tu es qui uenturus es.
* [42r] 1.4.50. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Et tu turris gregis.
* [42v] 1.4.51. Ex eodem sermone.
* 1.4.51. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Cum exaltatus fuero a terra.
* [43r] 1.4.53. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Et tu turris gregis.
* 1.4.54. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Tu es qui uenturus es.

– 1.5. De misericordia gloriose virginis.

* 1.5.1. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Spiritus intelligentie.
* [43v] 1.5.1. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Transeamus usque belhleem.
* 1.5.3. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Spiritus intelligentie.
* 1.5.4. Super cantica.
* 1.5.5. Super mulierem fortem.
* 1.5.6. Super cantica.
* 1.5.7. Super mulierem fortem.
* 1.5.8. Super cantica.
* 1.5.9. Ex tractatu super mulierem fortem. Vbi legitur. De nocte surrexit. deditque predam domesticis suis.
* 1.5.10. Ex tractatu super cantica.
* 1.5.11. Ex tractatu super mulierem fortem.
* 1.5.15. Super cantica.
* 1.5.16. Item. Super cantica.
* 1.5.17. Super mulierem fortem.
* 1.5.18. Ex eodem tractatu.
* 1.5.19. Ex libro edito in laudem gloriose uirginis.
* 1.5.20. Ex tractatu super cantica.
* 1.5.21. Ex eodem capitulo.
* 1.5.22. Ex eodem tractatu.
* 1.5.23. Super mulierem fortem.
* 1.5.24. Ex libro edito in laudem gloriose uirginis.
* 1.5.25. Super mulierem fortem.
* 1.5.26. Ex libro edito in laudem gloriose uirginis.
* 1.5.27. Super mulierem fortem.
* 1.5.28. Ex eodem libro.
* 1.5.29. Super cantica.
* 1.5.30. Ex libro edito in laudem gloriose uirginis.
* 1.5.31. Ex tractatu super cantica.
* 1.5.32. Super mulierem fortem.
* 1.5.33. Super mulierem fortem.
* 1.5.34. Ex eodem tractatu.
* 1.5.35. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Venit mater salomonis.
* 1.5.36. Super cantica.
* 1.5.37. Super cantica.
* 1.5.38. Super cantica.
* 1.5.39. Super cantica. libro secundo. capitulo viiiº.
* 1.5.40. Ex capitulo sequenti.
* 1.5.41. Super cantica.
* 1.5.41. Ex eodem libro.
* 1.5.43. Ex libro edito in laudem gloriose uirginis.
* [57v] 1.5.44. Ex eodem libro.
* 1.5.45. Super cantica.
* 1.5.46. Super cantica.
* 1.5.47. Super cantica.
* 1.5.48. Ex eodem tractatu.
* 1.5.49. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Spiritus intelligentie.

* 1.6.1. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Egressus petrus de carcere.
* [60v] 1.6.1. Ex eodem sermone.
* [61v] 1.6.3. Ex eodem sermone.
* 1.6.4. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Misis herodes rex manus.
* [62v] 1.6.5. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
* 1.6.6. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Egressus petrus de carcere.
* [63v] 1.6.7. Ex tractatu super cantica canticorum.
* [64v] 1.6.8. Super ecclesiasten.
* [65r] 1.6.9. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Egressus petrus de carcere.
* 1.6.10. Ex eodem sermone.
* 1.6.11. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Absterget deus.

* 1.7.1. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
* 1.7.1. Super cantica.
* 1.7.3. Ex tractatu super mulierem fortem.
* [66r] 1.7.4. Ex tractatu super cantica canticorum.
* 1.7.5. Ex tractatu super mulierem fortem.
* 1.7.6. Ex sermone de apostolis. qui sic incipit. Hii sunt uiri misericordie.
* 1.7.7. Ex tractatu super cantica canticorum.
* 1.7.8. Ex G(l)osa super psalmum quintum.
* 1.7.9. Ex sermone de apostolis.

– 1.8. [untitled]
* [66v] 1.8.1. Ex libro qui intitulatur solacium fidelis anime.
* [67v] 1.8.1. Ex tractatu super cantica.
* 1.8.3. Ex eodem tractatu.
* [68r] 1.8.4. Ex tractatu super cantica.
* [68v] 1.8.5. Ex tractatu super parabolas salomonis.
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* 1.8.6. Ex tractatu super cantica.
* 1.8.7. Ex tractatu super parabolas salomonis.

  * 1.9.1. Ex libro qui intitulatur laus sapientie diuine. Ex Distinctione septima.
  * 1.9.1. Ex libro qui intitulatur laus sapientie diuine. Distinctione quarta.
  * 1.9.3. Ex Distinctione quarta.
  * 1.9.4. Ridemus de curia.

• [70r] 2.0 Incipit proemium in librum Secundum.
  – 2.0.1. Ex libro qui intitulatur Speculum Speculationum. Ex distinctione quarta.
  – 2.0.2. Ex libro qui intitulatur laus sapientie diuine. Distinctione quinta.
  – [70bis] 2.0.2. Ex libro qui intitulatur corrogationes noui promethei.
  – [70v] 2.0.4. Ex libro qui deseruit laude sapientie diuine. Distinctione secunda.
  – 2.0.5. Ex eodem libro. Distinctione secunda.
  – [71r] 2.0.6. Ex libro qui intitulatur laus sapientie diuine. Distinctione quinta.
  – 2.0.7. Ex libro qui intitulatur laus sapientie diuine. Distinctione .iiiª.
  – 2.0.9. Ex eodem libro. Distinctione .iiiª.
  – 2.0.10. Epistola.

• [72r] 2. ¶ Incipit liber secundus. In quo agitur de misericordia: et de suggillatione quorundam uitiorum.
  – 2.1. De circumstantiis misericordie et de elemosinarum efficacia.
    * 2.1.1. Ex sermone de omnibus sanctis. qui sic incipit. Beati pauperes spiritu.
    * 2.1.2. Quis.
      · [72v] 2.1.2.1 Super cantica.
      · 2.1.2.2. Ex libro qui intitulatur corrogationes noui promethei.
      · [73r] 2.1.2.3. Ex tractatu super cantica canticorum.
    * 2.1.3. Quid. De spirituali elemosine.
      · 2.1.3.1. Ex sermone de omnibus sanctis.
      · 2.1.3.2. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Erunt signa in sole et luna.
      · [73v] 2.1.3.3. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Erunt signa in sole et luna.
      · [74r] 2.1.3.4. Item. Ex eodem sermone.
      · 2.1.3.5. Item. Ex eodem sermone.
      · 2.1.3.6. Ex libro de naturis rerum.
      · [74v] 2.1.3.7. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Nox precessit.
      · 2.1.3.8. Questio scolastica.
2.1.3.9. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Hodierna die noster dominus.

2.1.3.10. Ex tractatu super cantica cantorum.

2.1.3.11. Ex glosa super epistulam secundam ad thessalonicentes.

2.1.3.12. Ex questione scolastica.

2.1.3.13. Super psalmum .xlviii.

* 2.1.4. De elemosina corporali.

2.1.4.1. Ex sermone de omnibus sanctis.

* 2.1.5. Cur.

* 2.1.6. Quantum.

* 2.1.7. Cui.

* 2.1.8. Quali.

2.1.8.1. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Nuptie facte sunt.

2.1.8.2. Ex sermone de omnibus sanctis.

2.1.8.3. Ex tractatu super parabolas ubi agitur de iudicio et iusticia. et equitate scilicet capitulo secundo.

* 2.1.9. Qualiter.

2.1.9.1. Ex sermone de omnibus sanctis.

* 2.1.10. Ex quo.

2.1.10.1. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Tu es qui uenturus es.

2.1.10.2. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Exeamus extra castra.

2.1.10.3. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Inclinuit celos.

2.1.10.4. Ex sermone de omnibus sanctis qui sic incipit. Beati pauperes spiritu.

2.1.10.5. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Exeamus extra castra.

2.1.10.6. Ex eodem sermone.

2.1.10.7. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Dicit iesus petro.

2.1.10.8. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Exeamus extra castra.

2.1.10.9. Ex libro qui intitulatur solacium fidelis anime.

2.1.10.10. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Tu es qui uenturus es.

2.1.10.11. Ex tractatu super parabolas.


2.1.10.13. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Et tu turris gregis.


* 2.1.10.15. Item. Ex quo.

2.1.10.16. Ex sermone de omnibus sanctis.

2.1.10.17. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Ad locum unde exeunt flumina.

2.1.10.18. Ex sermone de omnibus sanctis qui sic incipit. Beati pauperes spiritu.
· 2.1.10.19. Ex eodem sermone.
· [82v] 2.1.10.20. Ex sermone de apostolis petri et pauli.
· [83r] 2.1.10.21. Ex tractatu super cantica canticorum.

* 2.1.11. De hanibalo.
· 2.1.11.1. Ex sermone de apostolis.
· 2.1.11.2. Ex tractatu super cantica.
· 2.1.11.3. Ex sermone de apostolis.
· [83v] 2.1.11.4. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten vbi legitur. Non prohibui cor me quin omni voluptate frueretur: et oblectaret se in hiis que preparaueram.
· [84v] 2.1.11.5. Ex libro de naturis rerum.
· [85r] 2.1.11.6. Ex libro de naturis rerum.
· [85v] 2.1.11.7. Ex tractatu super mulierem fortem.
· 2.1.11.8. Ex tractatu super cantica canticorum.
· 2.1.11.9. Ex libro de naturis rerum.
· 2.1.11.10. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.

– 2.2. Narraciuncula.
* [86r] 2.2.1. Ex libro qui intitulatur de naturis rerum.
* [86v] 2.2.2. Ex tractatu super parabolae.
* [87r] 2.2.3. Super mulierem fortem.
* 2.2.2. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Exeamus extra castra.
* 2.2.5. Ex libro qui intitulatur corrogationes promothei.
* 2.2.6. Ex sermone. exeamus extra castra.
* [87v] 2.2.7. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
* 2.2.8. Ex eodem tractatu.
* 2.2.9. Ex libro de naturis rerum.
* 2.2.10. Super ecclesiasten.
* 2.2.11. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Ductus est iesus in desertu.
* [88r] 2.2.12. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Omnia tempus habent.
* 2.2.13. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Agar ancilla saray.
* [88v] 2.2.12. Ex eodem sermone.
* 2.2.15. Ex tractatu super cantica.
* 2.2.16. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Agar ancilla saray.
* 2.2.17. Ex libro qui intitulatur solacium fidelis anime.
* [89r] 2.2.18. Ex eodem libro.
* [90v] 2.2.19. Ex libro qui intitulatur solatium fidelis anime.
* [91r] 2.2.20. Ex libro de naturis rerum.
* 2.2.21. Ex libro qui intitulatur solatium fidelis anime.
* [93r] 2.2.22. Ex sermone de sancto paulo qui sic incipit. Nunquid ad preceptum tuum.
* 2.2.23. Ex eodem sermone.
* 2.2.24. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Hii sunt uiri misericordie.
* 2.2.25. Ex libro qui intitulatur solatium fidelis animae.
* [92r] 2.2.26. Ex libro qui intitulatur corrogationes promothei.
* [93v] 2.2.27. Ex eodem tractatu.
* [94r] 2.2.28. Ex tractatu super cantica canticum.
* [94v] 2.2.29. Ex sermone de spiritu sancto qui sic incipit. Spiritus intelligentie.
* 2.2.30. Super psalmum primum.
* 2.2.31. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Operamini opus uestrum.
* [95r] 2.2.32. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Cantate domino.
* 2.2.33. Ex tractatu super mulierem fortem.
* [95v] 2.2.34. Ex libro qui intitulatur de naturis rerum.
* [97r] 2.2.35. Ex tractatu super cantica canticum. Vbi legitur ego dilecto meo: et ad me conversio eius.
* [98r] 2.2.36. Super psalmum Vigesimum tercium qui sic incipit. Dominus regit me.
* 2.2.37. Ex tractatu de conversione admirabili beatissime magdalenes.
* [98v] 2.2.38. Ex eodem tractatu.
* 2.2.39. Ex sermone de magdalena. qui sic incipit. Ad locum unde exeunt flumina.
* 2.2.40. Ex tractatu super admirabili conversione beatissime magdalenes.
* [99r] 2.2.41. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Ad locum unde exeunt flumina.
* 2.2.42. Ex eodem sermone.
* [99v] 2.2.43. Ex tractatu de conversione ad mirabili beatissimae magdalenes.
* [100r] 2.2.44. Ex tractatu super cantica.
* 2.2.45. Ex eodem tractatu.
* 2.2.46. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Operamini opus.
* 2.2.47. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Cantate domino.
* 2.2.48. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
* [100v] 2.2.49. Ex sermone qui sic incipit cantate domino.
* 2.2.50. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Operamini opus uestrum.
* [101r] 2.2.51. Ex tractatu super parabolas salomonis.
* [101v] 2.2.52. Ex tractatu super mulierem fortem.
* 2.2.53. Ex tractatu super parabolas.
* 2.2.52. Ex eodem tractatu.
* [102r] 2.2.55. Ex eodem tractatu.
* 2.2.56. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
* 2.2.57. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
* 2.2.58. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
* 2.2.59. Ex tractatu super mulierem fortem.
* 2.2.60. Ex eodem tractatu.

– [103r] 2.3. [untitled]
* 2.3.1. [untitled]
* 2.3.2. Ex tractatu super mulierem fortem.
* 2.3.3. Ex eodem tractatu.
* [103v] 2.3.2. Ex eodem tractatu.
* [104r] 2.3.5. Ex eodem tractatu.
* 2.3.6. Ex tractatu super cantica canticorum.
* [104v] 2.3.7. Ex libro de naturis rerum.
* 2.3.8. Super cantica.
* [105r] 2.3.9. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Exeamus extra castra.
* [105v] 2.3.10. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Cum exaltatus fuero a terra.
* 2.3.11. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Siquis uult uenire post me.
* [106r] 2.3.12. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
* [106v] 2.3.13. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Siquis uult uenire post me.
* [107v] 2.3.14. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Grata est serenitas.
* [108r] 2.3.15. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Exeamus extra castra.
* 2.3.16. Ex tractatu super cantica canticorum.
* 2.3.17. Ex eodem capitulo.
* [108v] 2.3.18. Ex eodem tractatu.
* [109v] 2.3.19. Ex tractatu super cantica canticorum.
* 2.3.20. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Operamini opus uestrum.

* [112r] 2.4.1. Ex tractatu super parabolas.
* 2.4.2. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Tu autem cum ieiunas.
* 2.4.3. Ex libro qui intitulatur solatium fidelis anime.
* [113r] 2.4.4. Ex libro qui intitulatur solacium fidelis anime.
* [113v] 2.4.5. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Exeamus extra castra.
* 2.4.6. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Inclinauit celos.

– [114r] 2.5. De auaris.
* 2.5.1. Ex libro de naturis rerum.

* 2.6.1. Ex eodem libro.
* [115r] 2.6.2. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
– [115v] 2.7. [untitled]
  * [116r] 2.7.1. Ex tractatu super cantica.
  * 2.7.2. Item ex eodem tractatu.
– 2.8. [untitled]
  * 2.8.1. Ex libro qui intitulatur de naturis rerum.
  * [116v] 2.8.2. Ex eodem tractatu.
  * 2.8.3. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
  * 2.8.4. Ex libro qui intitulatur de naturis rerum.
  * 2.8.5. Ex libro qui intitulatur de naturis rerum.
  * [117r] 2.8.6. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Cantate domino.
  * 2.8.7. Ex tractatu super cantica canticorum.
  * 2.8.8. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Apertis thesauris suis.
  * [118r] 2.8.10. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
  * 2.8.11. Ex eodem tractatu.
  * 2.8.12. Ex tractatu super mulierem fortem.
  * [118v] 2.8.13. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
  * 2.8.15. Ex eodem capitulo.
  * [119r] 2.8.16. Ex eodem capitulo.
  * 2.8.17. Ex eodem capitulo.
  * 2.8.18. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Ponite corda uestra.
  * 2.8.19. Ex eodem tractatu.
  * [119v] 2.8.20. Ex libro qui intitulatur solacium fidelis anime.
  * [120r] 2.8.21. Ex tractatu super cantica.
  * 2.8.22. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Cum uenerit plenitudo temporis.
  * 2.8.23. Ex libro qui intitulatur solatium fidelis anime.
  * [120v] 2.8.24. Ex tractatu super cantica canticorum.
  * 2.9.1. Ex libro qui intitulatur de naturis rerum.
  * [121v] 2.9.2. Ex tractatu super cantica.
  * 2.9.3. Ex tractatu super cantica canticorum. capitulo .xx.
  * 2.9.4. Ex eodem tractatu. capitulo .xix.
  * [122r] 2.9.5. Ex eodem capitulo.
  * [123r] 2.9.7. Ex tractatu super cantica.
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- [124r] 2.9.10. *Ex tractatu super mulierem fortem.
- [125r] 2.9.12. *Ex libro qui intitulatur solacium fidelis anime.
- 2.9.15. *Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Mane nobiscum domine.
- [127v] 2.9.16. *Ex libro qui intitulatur solacium fidelis anime.

- 2.10. [untitled]
  - 2.10.1. *Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
  - 2.10.2. *Ex eodem capitulo.
  - [129r] 2.10.3. *Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Ductus est iesus. etc.
  - 2.10.4. *Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
  - [129v] 2.10.5. *Ex eodem tractatu.
  - 2.10.6. *Item ex eodem tractatu.
  - [130r] 2.10.7. *Ex eodem tractatu.
  - 2.10.8. *Ex eodem tractatu.
  - [130v] 2.10.9. *Ex eodem tractatu.
  - 2.10.10. *Ex libro de naturis rerum.
  - 2.10.11. *Ex sermone qui sic incipit. operamini opus uestrum.

- [131v] 2.11. *De detractoribus.
  - 2.11.1. *Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
  - [132r] 2.11.2. *Ex libro de naturis rerum.


- [133r] 2.13. *Quod uir sapiens ulcisci non debeat iniuriam sibi in detraktionibus illatam incidenter.


- 2.15. *Qualiter uulpis circumuenit coruum adulatione sua.
* 2.15.1. Ex eodem libro.
  * 2.16.1. Ex eodem libro.
  * 2.17.1. Ex libro de naturis rerum.
- 2.18. De ambitiosis.
  * 2.18.1. Ex eodem libro.
  * [139r] 2.19.1. Ex libro de naturis rerum.
  * [139v] 2.19.2. Super ecclesiasten.
  * 2.19.3. Ex libro de naturis rerum.
- [140r] 2.20. De hypocritis.
  * 2.20.1. Super ecclesiasten.
  * 2.21.1. Ex libro de naturis.
- [140v] 2.22. Contra illos qui muneriibus inhiant.
  * 2.22.1. Ex eodem libro.
  * [141v] 2.22.2. Ex libro qui intitulatur solacium fidelis anime.
  * 2.22.3. Ex tractatu super cantica.
  * 2.22.4. Ex libro qui intitulatur solatium fidelis anime.
  * [142r] 2.22.5. Ex libro qui intitulatur solatium fidelis anime.
  * [142v] 2.22.6. Ex libro de naturis rerum.
  * [143r] 2.22.7. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Omnia tempus habent.
  * 2.22.8. Ex libro de naturis rerum.
  * [143v] 2.22.9. Ex sermoni qui sic incipit. Omnia tempus habent.
  * 2.22.10. Ex libro qui intitulatur speculum speculationum. caput. lxxv. libri terti.
  * 2.22.11. Ex eodem libro. caput. sequenti.
  * 2.22.12. Ex libro qui intitulatur solacium fidelis anime.
  * [144r] 2.22.13. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
  * [144v] 2.22.12. Ex libro de naturis rerum.
  * 2.22.15. Ex sermoni qui sic incipit. Obscuro uos tam quam auuenias.
  * [146r] 2.22.16. Ex sermoni qui sic incipit. Filioli mei.
  * [146v] 2.22.17. Ex sermoni qui sic incipit. Obscuro vos.
  * [147r] 2.22.18. Ex eodem sermoni.
  * [147v] 2.22.19. Ex libro de naturis rerum.
* 2.22.23. Ex libro qui intitulatur corrogationes noui promothei.
* [148r] 2.22.21. Ex libro de naturis rerum.
* 2.22.22. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Ductus est iesus in desertum.
* 2.22.23. Ex tractatu super parabolas.
* [148v] 2.22.22. Ex proemio super parabolas.
* [149r] 2.22.26. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Filioli me. manete nunc in cristo.
* 2.22.27. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Exeamus extra castra.
* [149v] 2.22.28. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Filioli manete nunc in cristo.
* 2.22.29. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Cum natus esset.
* 2.22.30. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Cantate domino.
* [150r] 2.22.31. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Cum natus esset.
* 2.22.32. Ex libro qui intitulatur solacium fidelis anime.
* [150v] 2.22.33. Ex libro edito in laudem gloriose uirginis.
* [151r] 2.22.35. Ex eodem sermone.
* 2.22.36. Ex eodem sermone.
* 2.22.37. Ex libro de naturis rerum.
* [151v] 2.22.38. Ex eodem libro.
* 2.22.39. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Probasti cor meum.
* 2.22.40. Ex sermone de omnibus sanctis.
* [152r] 2.22.41. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Probasti cor meum.
* 2.22.42. Super ecclesiasten.
* [152v] 2.22.43. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Tu es pastor ouium.
* [154r] 2.22.42. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Funes ceciderunt.
* [154v] 2.22.45. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Filii hominum.
* 2.22.46. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Si obliti sumus.
* 2.22.47. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Funes ceciderunt.
* [155r] 2.22.48. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Dixit iesus petro.
* [155v] 2.22.49. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Inclinuit celos.
* [156r] 2.22.50. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Pascha nostrum.
* [156v] 2.22.51. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Videte vigilate et orate.
* [157v] 2.22.52. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Quare appenditis argentum.
* [158v] 2.22.53. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
* 2.22.52. Ex eodem capitulo.
* 2.22.55. Ex eodem capitulo.
* [159r] 2.22.56. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Ascendit deus in iubilo.
* 2.22.57. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Quare appenditis argentum.
* 2.22.58. Super ecclesiasten.
* [159v] 2.22.59. Super matheum.

– 2.23. De officio prelatorum.
* 2.23.1. Super mulierem fortem.
* 2.23.2. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Nuptie facte sunt.
* [160r] 2.23.3. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Dulce est lumen.
* 2.23.4. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Letare ierusalem.
* [161r] 2.23.5. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Ad te domine leuaui animam meam.
* [161v] 2.23.6. Ex eodem sermone.
* [162v] 2.23.7. Super ecclesiasten.
* 2.23.8. Super psalmum .xxiii.
* 2.23.9. Super ecclesiasten.
* 2.23.10. Super psalmum .xxiii.
* 2.23.11. Ex libro intitulatur corroagationes promothei.
* 2.23.15. Ex eodem tractatu.
* [163v] 2.23.16. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Cum appropinquasset iesus.
* 2.23.17. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Delibuta est fortitudo portantis.
* [164r] 2.23.18. Ex tractatu super cantica canticorum. In fine canticorum.
* [165r] 2.23.19. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Delibuta est fortitudo portantis.
* 2.23.20. Ex tractatu super mulierem fortem.
* 2.23.21. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Operamini opus uestrum ante tempus.
* 2.23.22. Ex tractatu super cantica canticorum.
* 2.23.23. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
* [165v] 2.23.24. Ex libro qui intitulatur solacium fidelis anime.
* [166r] 2.23.25. Ex libro de naturis rerum.

– 2.24. De Inuidia aristotilis.
* 2.24.1. Ex libro de naturis rerum.
* [166v] 2.24.2. Super ecclesiasten.

* 2.25.1. Ex libro de naturis rerum.

**2.26.1.** Ex libro de naturis rerum.

- **2.27. [untitled]**
  * **2.27.1.** Ex eodem capitulo.
  * **[168v] 2.27.2.** Ex tractatu super mulierem fortem.
  * **2.27.3.** Super cantica.
  * **[169r] 2.27.4.** Super mulierem fortem.
  * **2.27.5.** Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Agar ancilla saray.
  * **2.27.6.** Ex libro qui intitulatur solacium fidelis anime.
  * **[169v] 2.27.7.** Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Agar ancilla.

- **[170r] 2.28.** De Inconstancia claustralium.
  * **2.28.1.** Ex libro de naturis rerum.

- **2.29.** De Vagis claustralium discursibus.
  * **2.29.1.** Ex libro de naturis rerum.
  * **[171r] 2.29.2.** Super ecclesiasten.
  * **2.29.3.** Ex libro de naturis rerum.

- **2.30.** Quod felix sit conditio claustralium.
  * **2.30.1.** Ex tractatu super mulierem fortem.
  * **[171v] 2.30.2.** Ex proemio super parabolas.
  * **[172r] 2.30.3.** Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Dixit iesus petro.
  * **[172v] 2.30.2.** Ex proemio super parabolas.

- **[173r] 2.31.** De perturbatoribus pacis fraterne.
  * **2.31.1.** Ex capitulo tercio libri primi de naturis rerum.

- **[174r] 2.32.** Item. De superbia et invidia.
  * **[174v] 2.32.1.** Ex eodem capitulo.

- **[175r] 2.33.** De Inuidia.
  * **2.33.1.** Ex libro de naturis rerum.
  * **[175v] 2.33.2.** Ex sermone qui sic incipit.
  * **[176r] 2.33.3.** Ex libro de naturis rerum.
  * **2.33.2.** Ex libro de naturis rerum.
  * **2.33.5.** Ex proemio super parabolas.
  * **[176v] 2.33.6.** Ex tractatu super parabolas.

- **[178r] 2.34.** De Niso et mustela.
  * **[178v] 2.34.1.** Ex libro de naturis rerum.
  * **2.34.2.** Super ecclesiasten.
* 2.34.3. Super parabolas.
– [179r] 2.35. Item. De Inuidia.
  * 2.35.1. Ex libro de naturis rerum.
  * 2.36.1. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Ponite corda uestra.
  * 2.37.1. Ex libro de naturis rerum.
  * 2.38.1. Ex eodem libro.
  * 2.39.1. Ex eodem libro.
  * [183v] 2.39.2. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Ductus est iesus.
  * 2.40.1. Ex libro de naturis rerum.
  * 2.41.1. Ex eodem libro.
– 2.42. Contra Inuidiam.
  * 2.42.1. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Ductus est iesus.
– [185r] 2.43. De Ira.
  * 2.43.1. Ex libro de naturis rerum.
– [185v] 2.44. [untitled]
  * 2.44.1. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
  * 2.45.1. Ex eodem tractatu.
– [186v] 2.46. De lubricitate lingue.
  * 2.46.1. Ex tractatu super mulierem fortem.
  * [187r] 2.46.2. Super ecclesiasten.
  * [187v] 2.46.3. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
  * [188r] 2.46.2. Ex eodem tractatu.
  * [188v] 2.46.5. Super cantica canticorum.
  * 2.46.6. Super mulierem fortem.
  * [189r] 2.46.7. Super mulierem fortem.
  * 2.46.8. Super mulierem fortem.
– 2.47. Narraciuncula. De stultiloquio.
  * 2.47.1. Ex libro de naturis rerum.
  * [190r] 2.47.2. Ex libro de naturis rerum.
  * [190v] 2.47.3. Ex libro de naturis rerum.

– 2.48. De Inuidia Iudeorum.
  * 2.48.1. Ex libro de naturis rerum.
  * 2.48.2. Super mulierem fortem.
  * [191r] 2.48.3. Super cantica.
  * 2.48.2. Super cantica.
  * 2.48.5. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
  * 2.48.6. Ex tractatu super cantica.
  * 2.48.7. Ex eodem tractatu.
  * [191v] 2.48.8. Item. Ex eodem tractatu.
  * 2.48.9. Ex tractatu super cantica.
  * [192r] 2.48.10. Ex eodem tractatu.
  * [192v] 2.48.11. Ex eodem tractatu.
  * 2.48.12. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
  * 2.48.13. Ex eodem tractatu.
  * 2.48.15. Ex glosa supper mattheum.
  * 2.48.16. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Memento homo.
  * [194r] 2.48.17. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Ponite corda uestra.
  * 2.48.18. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. transeamus usque beleem.
  * 2.48.19. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Ponite corda vestra.
  * [195r] 2.48.20. Ex tractatu super ecclesiasten.
  * 2.48.21. Item. Ex eodem capitulo.
  * [195v] 2.48.22. Item. ex eodem capitulo.
  * [196r] 2.48.23. Ex eodem tractatu.
  * [196v] 2.48.22. Ex eodem tractatu.
  * 2.48.25. Ex eodem tractatu.
  * 2.48.26. Ex libro de naturis rerum.
  * [197v] 2.48.27. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Misit herodes rex manus.
  * 2.48.28. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Abraham mortuus est.
  * [198r] 2.48.29. Ex eodem sermone.

– [198v] 2.49. [untitled]
  * [198v] 2.49.1. Ex sermone qui sic incipit. Omnia tempus habent.
  * [199v] 2.49.2. Super mulierem fortem.
Geoffrey is careful in citing the sources he uses. The beginning of each source is carefully noted, though occasional errors are made, usually through the omission of rubrics. Yet he does not quote sources verbatim: instead, Geoffrey recasts passages from Alexander to fit their new context, adding connecting phrases and
other passages from Alexander in the margins as explanations. He also adds words to make the excerpts flow together, and ensures that no loose ends are left after their removal from their original context – deleting cross references, or some of Alexander’s exclamations (e.g. ‘O pia magdalena’) not related to the new theme at hand. Even where he is following the text fairly closely, he often modifies the punctuation. For instance, this passage from the Tractatus super Mulierem fortem appears as follows in Sol meldunensis:

Ex tractatu super mulierem fortem.

Nonne claustri leta facies paradysi representat amenitatem? Viror intermedius planiciei interiacentis: ad pascua uite nos inuitat, prenuncians orci deliciarum uluptates arbor meditulium prati obumbrans: ligni uite quod est in medio paradysi tipum gerit. si formam dispositionis quadratae consulas. transmiteris ad conformitatem .iiii. or uirtutum principialium. longitudo ex equo respondens latitudini docet equalia esse latera ciuitatis.

In the original, it takes a slightly different form:


The Oxford manuscript is the Cirencester copy of the Tractatus super Mulierem fortem, and there can be no doubt that this is the text he was using, since one can often find a mark in the margin both before and after the intended quotation, as Jesus College 94, fol. 120v. This quotation is broken in two in Sol meldunensis, though there is no mark in the middle of the passage to indicate this. Following the quotation above is an extract from Alexander’s commentary on the Song of Songs, after which he returns to the same passage from Super mulierem. This is the common practice in Sol meldunensis. Each passage is not necessarily a new selection; a single long passage is often selected and interspersed with other works. The result of this is that, although Geoffrey uses nearly every writing of Alexander, the selections from within those works tend to be concentrated to certain parts of the book. The many quotations from the Meditatio de Magdalena, for instance, are only two contiguous passages of the original, interspersed with other texts.

5.5.2 Geoffrey of Monmouth, Prophetia Merlini (gathering 22, fols 213–222)

At first glance, the Prophetia Merlini would seem to have nothing to do with Alexander Neckam. It makes more sense when described as it is titled in the manuscript, written in the same Cirencester hand that
Figure 5.40: Marks in Oxford, Jesus College, 94 corresponding to the beginning and end of a *Super Mulierem fortem* quotation in *Sol meldensis*. 
rubricates the rest of the book: ‘Epistle of master Geoffrey of Monmouth addressed to Alexander, bishop of Lincoln’. Like the florilegium, it is yet another section involving a Geoffrey and an Alexander, also addressing the matter of prophecies that occur with particular frequency in Augustinian manuscripts from this period. There might also be an implied pun on the name of Geoffrey Brito, since Geoffrey of Monmouth’s famous History of the Kings of Britain was sometimes known as De gestis Britonum. Alexander Neckam also knew this book, and cites Geoffrey’s story of Gurmund connected to Cirencester.47

The text is widely spaced to allow for glosses to be inserted between the lines, and a later reader has taken advantage of this. It is in two sections:

- Epistula magistri Galfridi monumutensis directa alexandro Lincolniensi episcopo. [fols 213v–214r]
- Prophetia Merlini. [fols 214v–223r]

The manuscript is given the siglum ζ in Michael Reeve’s edition of the text, one of five manuscripts viewed as stemming from the hypothetical ancestor Π.48

5.5.3 The verse ‘anthology’ (gatherings 23–24, fols 223–237)

The final section of the manuscript is a collection of verses, and all but the opening three sections of these are by Alexander Neckam. Unlike the prose florilegium, there is no overarching system of organization of the poetry, though it is still better ordered than the Paris anthology of Alexander’s verses, and its text is usually better. In common with the first part of the manuscript are the page layout, the marginal titles, and the script.

5.5.3.1 Poems on wine (fols 223r–232r)

This section of the anthology is the most cohesive witness to an exchange between Peter of Blois and Robert of Beaufeu on the merits of wine and beer. This is the only manuscript that preserves the response by Peter of Blois, and two errors have been made because scholars have not treated the whole as an integral unit. The exchange between Peter and Robert has been segregated from the work by Alexander; and the verse epistle to Thomas, abbot of Gloucester has been considered as a separate poem rather than part of De commendatione uini. The group is structured under the following headings:

- Versus magistri petri Flesensis. De commendatione uini.
- Versus Roberti de Bellafago. De commendatione ceruisie.
- Respontio magistri petri Blesensis.

46 ‘Epistula magistri Galfridus monunutensis directa Alexandro Lincolniensi episcopo’, fol. 213v, also written at the base of fol. 214r, partially trimmed away.
• Magister alexander Domino .T. abbati claudie.
• Versus magistri alexandri nequam. de Vino. liber primus.
• Liber secundus de commendatione vini.
• Liber tercius de commendatione vini.

It is significant that this is the only part of the manuscript as it was produced at Cirencester that uses works from authors other than Alexander. The compiler perhaps felt that these poems were integral to the context of De commendatione uini, a connection that might have been drawn either from written source materials or living memory of the dialogue. The exchange between Peter of Blois and Robert de Bellofago has been edited among Peter’s other poems. Braunholtz was the first to edit the verses by Robert, but does not mention the existence of Alexander’s verses. Wilmart discovered an additional contribution to the series, and speculated that it was another reply by Robert. Excerpts of De commendatione uini were reproduced at an early date from the Paris anthology. There is a brief quotation of ‘Serlo’, who might have been assumed to be Serlo the first abbot of Cirencester. The full work was edited by Hochgürtel, who allowed that Alexander was familiar with Peter’s work, but he does not see De commendatione uini as a direct response. Further, he produced an entirely idiosyncratic organization for Alexander’s poems with little reference to their sequence in the manuscripts. In this sense, he took the suggestion of Rigg that the books ‘may originally have been separate’ too far, and, though he gives no explanation for this, he apparently did not consider the verse epistle to Thomas to have any relationship to the text, and edited it separately.

Given the rest of the information that can be gleaned from the Cambridge manuscript, the most obvious way to understand the poem to Thomas is as a dedication to De commendatione uini, which is how it is listed in the Cambridge catalogue. This interpretation is also supported by a reference to Ecclesiastes that suggests the poem was written around the same time as De naturis rerum. In the Paris anthology, the poem has no connection to this work, though that manuscript’s presentation of De commendatione uini is somewhat confused: the first two books (fols 214v–215v) are separated from the third (fols 216v–217r).

49 Carsten Wollin, ed., Petrus Blesensis Carmina, Corpus Christianorum, continuatio mediaevalis 128 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998), 275–85 (nos. 1.6, 1.6a, 1.7).
53 Oberg, Serlon de Wilton, 33–34 discusses this citation.
54 Hochgürtel, Carmina, 195–218 (carmina metrica, 1–3), with an introduction at lix–lxvi.
55 Hochgürtel, Carmina, lixiv, noting that Wollin’s manuscript C2 is the same as Gg.6.42.
57 Rigg, History of Anglo-Latin Literature, 121; Hochgürtel, Carmina, lix–lx.
58 Hochgürtel, Carmina, 235–36 (carmina rhythmica, 9).
60 De commendatione uini 3.173, Gg.6.42, fol. 232r: Hochgürtel, Carmina, 217.
and some of the verses are repeated on fol. 238ra. Hunt takes this repetition as a fragment, while Cropp argues that it could equally be understood as the conclusion to *Corrogationes noui Promethei*, which ends at this point. The poem to Thomas appears only on fol. 240ra, surrounded by other assorted verses. Madrid, Biblioteca de Palacio, II.468 (formerly 2.e.5), has the verses to Thomas on fol. 27v, and *De commendatione uini* on fols 179v–188v. The Cambridge manuscript is thus alone in associating the poem with the rest of *De commendatione uini*, but this organization seems sensible both in terms of the text and the historical context. While the poem does not refer directly to a work on wine, the opening line (‘Munus. set munusculum’, fol. 224r) mirrors that of the response by Peter of Blois (‘Scribo. set inuitus’, fol. 223v), and the Goliardic rhyme scheme matches the first poem by Peter and Robert’s response. The epistle must have accompanied some ‘munusculum’ by Alexander, and the manuscript and stylistic evidence, as well as the note of satire and references to food, suggest *De commendatione uini* ahead of any of his other works.

A letter of Peter of Blois criticizing a Thomas for his promotion of beer over wine provides further evidence for linking the dedicatory verses to this debate. Unfortunately, the opening of this letter has been lost; Revell suggested that it could have been addressed to either Alexander or Robert. The former is perhaps more likely, based on a passage towards the end of the letter that Alexander echoes in his own work. Revell also points out a letter from Peter to a magister A. on alcohol, though in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 426 this is addressed to a magister Ambrosius. The address of a letter criticizing the views of a magister A. on whether guilt could return to a sinner is also ambiguous. Given Peter’s congratulations to Alexander on taking up monastic vows, and the fact that he seems to have maintained a close connection with Cirencester, it is likely that they corresponded further.

Regardless of how the exchange came about, it seems certain both that Alexander is responding directly to the poems of Peter and Robert, within a broader debate that also involved Thomas. The only figure at Gloucester during Alexander’s lifetime with the latter name was Thomas Carbonel, abbot from 1179 until 1205. Hochgürtel instead identifies the recipient as Thomas of Bredon, abbot from 1224–1227/8. While it is true that this Thomas owned Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.i.2, containing the sole surviving copy of the *Meditatio de Magdalena*, the addressee is referred to as abbot in the titles of all three manuscripts attesting this poem, which would require the convoluted assumption that all copies are descended from one updated after Thomas of Bredon had become abbot, long after Alexander’s death. If, then, one accepts the poem as a dedicatory epistle to *De commendatione uini*, this would date the work to before 1205 (probably

---

62 Revell, *The Later Letters of Peter of Blois*, 159–60n (no. 31.1).
65 Revell, *The Later Letters of Peter of Blois*, 304n (no. 70).
quite close to this date, based Alexander’s self-characterization as a ‘crazy and absurd old man’, ‘delirus ridiculous senex’).

5.5.3.2  *Nouus Auianus* (fols 232v–234v)

The Cambridge copy is, on the whole, the most accurate manuscript of *Nouus Auianus* work, which has been edited many times.\(^71\) It is structured here as follows:

1. De lupo.
2. De testudine.
   1. Copiose.
   2. De eodem compendiose.
3. De Cancro.
4. De phebo et borea.
5. De asello.
6. De Rana.

The work ends with a space until the end of the page (fifteen lines). Bisanti discusses it in more detail in the context of the Avianus tradition.\(^72\)

5.5.3.3 Other verses by Alexander Neckam (fols 235r–236r)

Alexander’s minor verses have already received ample treatment.\(^73\) The collection that closes the verse anthology is structured opens with a set of poems that are several lines long, each opening formally with a drop capital:

- *Diuisio huius nominis roma.* (inc. ‘En dabit absque mora: celsus rome tibi mora.’)
- *De Vase aureo in quo continetur eucharistia.* (‘Non manus artificis. non auri gloria. dignum:’)
- ‘Dulcessit crebro fructus radicis amare.’
- *Entre dous uertes-la terce meure.* (‘Maturum medium cingit utrumque uiror.’)
- *Contra avarum.* (‘Cur homo qui cinis es. per auaritiam sepelis es?’)

‘Contra avarum’ ends on fol. 236r with a few lines separated only by paraph marks:
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- *Divisio huius nominis uires.* (inc. ‘Redde michi uires. sum debilis. et sine ui res.’)
- *Divisio huius uerbi laborauki.* (‘Casu labor aui. uisu subito labo rauki.’)
- ‘Multa deus de te dicunt per signa prophete.’

A new section is then signalled with a drop capital, with the following poems:

- *Uersus retrogredi.* (inc. ‘Urbe licet mesta. faciunt turbe sibi festa.’)
- *De absconsa. Compendioso.* (‘Lumine pretendor. ne ledat lumina splendor.’)
  - *Subcincte.* (‘Sum. ne lux lumen ledat. nec cera volumen.’)
- *De laterna.* (‘Lucida laterne facies est grata lucerne.’)
- *Ieo tute uail cink mars de or.* (‘Vi ualeo tota marcas dor. subtrahe iota.’)
- *Beau Gwerre chastete.* (‘Forma decens oris: expugnat castra pudoris.’)
- *Apres peyre. vin ou proueyre.* (‘Post pirra presbiterum quere uel adde merum’)
  - ‘Gaudeo legatus niueum michi misit olorem.’
  - ‘O stupor. anguillas martyr mutauit in hillas.’

Höchgurthel doubts the authenticity of some of these poems, though as Margaret Gibson notes, it is difficult to separate much of this from other contemporary material.

This section was originally followed in the manuscript by a blank page, later filled in by Maurice Gyffard with prophecies (see above).

5.5.3.4 *De passione saluatoris* (fol. 237r–v)

The text on the final folio of Gg.6.42 is written in a slightly different hand from that responsible for most of the manuscript. The text begins ‘Splendor. patris fons. sol. ares’ (the punctuation was presumably intended as ‘Splendor patris. fons. sol. ares’), and is printed in the Analecta hymnica, which however provides an incorrect title and omits two lines, after 7.5 and 9.11. It is not explicitly attributed to anyone, and its authorship has never been analysed in a published work. It includes wordplay, rhetorical questions, and the use of exclamations such as ‘ha’ typical of Alexander’s style; if it is not his work, it is someone purposely imitating him.

5.6 Remembering Alexander

This narrative description of Cambridge, University Library, Gg.6.42 has aimed to present the evidence for understanding the manuscript as a whole, a compilation of Alexander’s writings but also a work in its

74 Hochgürtel, *Carmina*, lxxvi.
own right. Its originator can be positively identified as Alexander’s nephew, Geoffrey Brito, who had clear motivations for maintaining the abbot’s memory. The structure of the text and the pattern of its annotation suggests that the book as it now exists is the product of an exchange between the canons of Cirencester and the monks of Malmesbury.

Alexander was well recognized in his own time as a writer: it is often noted that Alfred of Sareshel dedicates *De motu cordis* to his ‘great master Alexander Neckam’.\(^77\) *Sol meldunensis* shows how Alexander’s own community at Cirencester commemorated his work. The amount of care put into the book surely reflects the high regard in which he was held by his peers. The book also carries on Alexander Neckam’s sunny view towards religious orders other than his own. In his *Tractatus super Mulierem fortem*, commenting on Prov. 31:27 and taking the strong woman as the church, he remarks:

> Therefore, holy mother church ‘has looked well to the ways of her house’ when the enthusiasm for prayer finds the special practices of the regular life, leading most directly to the house concerning which truth speaks: ‘In the house of my Father are many mansions.’ In different churches, different customs are observed, and although they may seem to oppose themselves, yet they lead those who observe them directly to the heavenly palace. Consider the Cistercians, the Cluniacs, the Carthusians, and the most holy customs of the other orders: what will you find in them other than the delicious joy of holy love?\(^78\)

What does monastic cooperation look like in practice? In the experiment that is *Sol meldunensis*, Geoffrey Brito and the community at Cirencester extended a gesture of friendship by inviting correction and augmentation to their work. The monks at Malmesbury responded enthusiastically, probably returning the book with a new illustration, marginal additions and correction, and a new gathering of Geoffrey of Monmouth, and using a page layout that specifically invites further glossing. They could have found no better way to honour the memory of the unremittingly optimistic abbot.

---


\(^78\) *Super mulierem fortetem*, commenting on Ecclesia, Prov. 31:27, Oxford, Jesus College, 94, fol. 123va–b:

> Considerauit igitur sancta mater ecclesia semitas domus sue. dum speciales resentantes uite regularis admunenit studium deuoitionis: ducentes directissime ad domum illam de qua ait ueritas. *In domo patris mei: multe mansiones sunt.* [John 14:2] In diuersis diuere consuetudines obseruantur ecclesiis. que licet sibi adversari uideantur: tum directe ducent ad celeste palatium obseruatores suos. Cisterciansium. cluniacensium. chartusiensium et ceterorum ordinum sanctissimas institutiones considera. quid in eis nisi deliciosa amoris sancti iocunditatem reperies?
Chapter 6

Alexander’s Future

6.1 Community and writing

This study has investigated the influence of the Augustinian order in Alexander Neckam’s writing, both in its creation and circulation. We have seen that Alexander most likely joined the Augustinians at St Frideswide’s in Oxford, and that the Augustinian order was a much earlier influence in his life than has previously been thought. As a result, Alexander’s entire literary output needs to be seen as a unity rather than two almost separate groups addressed to scholastic and monastic audiences, marked by a clean break occurring when Alexander moved to Cirencester. His time at Oxford appears to have nourished his particular commitment to expounding the relevance of female figures as role models, reflecting the approach to Frideswide taken by Robert of Cricklade. Most of all, the influence of Augustinian writers such as Hugh of St Victor prompted him to develop biblical commentaries in the form of meditationes, applying the knowledge he acquired in the schools in a form suitable to the pastoral care movement.

Alexander’s biblical commentaries form the centrepiece of his work at Cirencester, reflected both by the effort put into them and in their afterlife. Surviving copies show Alexander’s revisions to allow easier reference and comprehension. He appears to have been working on his commentary on Proverbs as well as his theological treatise Speculum speculationum at his death. There is a remarkable consistency between the various copies, suggesting that they were the product of a co-ordinated publication campaign. Direct evidence for this is found in the work of Walter de Melida, who is known to have been particularly interested in collecting and spreading Alexander’s sermons. Letters involving Walter and documentary evidence shows that this literary activity gave the abbey the opportunity to pursue relationships with other religious communities – and not only Augustinians – which reflected Alexander’s own priorities. Evidence for this collaboration is vividly preserved in Sol meldunensis (Cambridge, University Library, Gg.6.42). Originally produced by Alexander’s nephew Geoffrey Brito, this is a miscellany of Alexander’s works, addressed to Geoffrey the abbot of Malmesbury from 1246 to 1260. The book appears to have circulated between the two
houses at least once, with both communities making additions and revisions to the text.

6.2 Future work

The study presented here is meant to set the stage for greater understanding of the influence of communities in the intellectual life of medieval Europe. There are still many questions concerning the work of the Augustinians at Oxford; the character of Cirencester and its tradition of manuscript production; and the relationship between these and other houses. To advance our knowledge of Alexander himself and to make his work accessible to a modern audience, there is a pressing need for editions and translations of his works that take into account our knowledge of the manuscript tradition. In all of Alexander’s writings, there is a great deal that is not yet understood, and allowing him to speak to modern readers will challenge our stereotypes of premodern approaches to learning, women, marriage, and community.

6.2.1 Oxford and the Augustinians

Work on the history of educational institutions in Paris has benefited enormously from greater understanding of the school of Saint-Victor, which has helped to define the extent of that abbey’s influence both on learning and on the reception of its writers, especially Hugh of St Victor. No such study has yet been undertaken for the history of Oxford, where the assumption of nineteenth-century historians that the Augustinians had little or no influence on the university still holds sway. Whatever might have happened in later times, the influence of Robert of Cricklade, the probability that Alexander was both a lecturer there and a member of St Frideswide’s, and the safe assumption that he wrote more than three of his works there shows that the role of the Augustinians in late twelfth-century Oxford needs reconsideration.

6.2.2 Understanding Cirencester

The almost complete lack of evidence for bookmaking at Cirencester after the time of Geoffrey Brito’s Sol meldunensis might be due to the ravages of the dissolution, though book production was declining by the thirteenth century in many cloistered communities.¹ This may have been exacerbated in Cirencester’s case after its corrupt prior William de Haswell squandered the abbey’s resources in the 1270s.² By the time of the dissolution, the house appears to have recovered, with a much higher income than many other houses.³ The forty-five known manuscripts surviving from Cirencester nonetheless form a remarkable collection,

including volumes at Jesus College, Oxford and Hereford Cathedral preserved with their original bindings. These manuscripts also contain several works that have received no scholarly attention, notably those by Robert of Cricklade (some in autograph). Studying these manuscripts, the texts they contain, and their scribal additions would further illuminate the reading interests of the Augustinians, their processes of book production, and the relationships between Cirencester and its neighbours. Most of all, as the cases of Walter de Melida and Geoffrey Brito show, there are many stories waiting to be told from combining palaeographic, literary, and diplomatic evidence.

6.2.3 Editing Alexander

If Alexander Neckam is to have a future more reflective of the importance of his life and thoughts, either in scholarship or among general readers, it is critical that we edit and translate his works. Editions have been slow to appear, and many have been promised that were not delivered. This seems likely to remain the case until editing ceases to be viewed by the scholarly community as an ancillary activity, and until we provide the means to publish premodern source materials in more accessible formats. Without new editions, scholars impeded from making either new or more solidly grounded judgements.

The study of medieval history will advance faster if we abandon the printed critical edition as an ideal in favour of technology-independent publications of diplomatic or documentary texts, published in electronic and eventually printed formats as appropriate. As part of this study, I created electronic editions of the Meditatio de Magdalena or Tractatus super admirabili conversione beatissime Magdalenes, from Hereford, Cathedral Library, MS O.1.2; Questiones secundum magistrum Alexandrum de Sancto Albano, from London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 421; Tractatus super Mulierem fortun, from Oxford, Jesus College, MS 94; Tractatus super parabolas Salomonis, from the same manuscript; and Sol meldunensis, Geoffrey Brito’s miscellany in Cambridge, University Library, MS Gg.6.42. My aim is eventually to provide at least one diplomatic edition of each of Alexander’s works, which will allow their text to be searched, enable the application of stylometry and other statistical analysis, and most of all make it possible to read them together with ease for the first time.

Part of the aim of this work on Alexander Neckam is to provide a more sustainable model for producing a first edition of a premodern work that is only available in manuscript form. While modern researchers sometimes bemoan the greater productivity of scholars of past centuries, it is rarely recognized that we have been working to a different standard. When many medieval works were printed for the first time in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, they were only based on one or two manuscripts – and these continue to be the editions we use today, even for works by prominent authors such as Peter Lombard and Peter Comestor, because it is impossible to replace them with full critical editions in a climate that devalues editing and promotes short-term funding. Documentary editions, however, can be produced in this context; by making them immediately available in an electronic form, we circumvent the impropriety of printing a provisional

---

4 Early versions have been integrated with the Corpus Corporum database operated by the University of Zurich.
text. Over time, these documentary editions can gradually be built up into more accurate texts that take
more manuscript evidence into account. Unfortunately, there are no publishers of technology-independent
editions of premodern texts as of this writing, which means that application of this model remains difficult.

_Sol meldunensis_ is a particularly apt example for the applicability of this model. As it has been shown
that the scribe – working from Cirencester – was careful and had accurate sources available, it also follows
that the manuscript can be helpful in cases of textual difficulty. Yet the miscellany is itself a standalone
work: as Geoffrey melds together excerpts from Alexander’s books as new ‘sermons’, adding phrases and
modifying the text as he goes, many of the variants found in this book were purposely introduced, but
it is difficult to judge what these are without comparison to original text. It would make little sense to
show all variants from this manuscript in the form of a critical apparatus, nor would this provide enough
context to allow readers to make judgements about the texts it contains. Any full critical edition of a text by
Alexander Neckam is therefore dependent on _Sol meldunensis_, but the text requires its own edition, and it
cannot be considered complete without editions of all the works by Alexander to which it refers. This is
a typical example of how a printed book with a critical apparatus fails scholars: it simply cannot contain
the information necessary for the reader to check the work of the editor. The transmission of Alexander’s
works cannot be fully understood without this manuscript; but _Sol meldunensis_ cannot be published in a
lasting form without editions of Alexander’s works. What is needed is a method of provisionally editing a
documentary edition of each manuscript, gradually linking these with new texts and updating them as the
contents of the manuscripts are revealed.

Creating a transcription of a manuscript on its own terms is a way to account for a scribe’s understanding
of the work, and to help avoid common syntactical errors. The original punctuation, capitalization, and
spelling of a manuscript reveal a great deal about a scribe’s approach, and can even save an editor time. Most
editors of medieval Latin texts learn textual criticism through classical works, where the punctuation is
never original and often misleading; because of this, many editors ignore the punctuation in a manuscript,
and insert modern marks as they work. Inevitably, however, the manuscript influences the transcription,
which often results in a period or a comma appearing wherever any kind of punctuation appears in the
witness. This is often conveys the impression that the scribe had no understanding of the text, when more
fault lies with the modern transcriber. Medieval Latin texts were written with a predecessor to our system
of punctuation, but with significant differences. There are many variations on its application, meaning that
it is often necessary to read a section of the text in the original form to understand how scribes use their
marks, the utility of which M.B. Parkes5 sought to convince scholars. In thirteenth-century manuscripts,
the proper transposition of a _punctus elevatus_ into our modern system is often not a comma – but nothing
at all. Having realized this simple fact, I was able to find many places where I had oversimplified or even
mangled a sentence in my own editions. It is surprisingly common to find errors in published editions
from this period that can be traced to an inappropriate and usually undocumented imitation of the original
punctuation. Given that, in medieval Latin manuscripts, punctuation sometimes represents the writer’s

own wishes – in Oxford, Jesus College, MS 94, a hand that emends the punctuation extensively probably belongs to the author – it is only sensible to pay close attention to its function, and in some cases even to present it within the edition rather than impose a modern system. Readers of medieval Latin are already accustomed to reading differing English, French, German, and Italian customs of punctuation, along with the *per cola et commata* method found in editions of the Vulgate, and there is no reason to think that they could not also deal with the original, especially if a vernacular translation is supplied in parallel with the edition. Moreover, in a digital publication, it is possible to provide both a diplomatic transcription of the original and a format designed for less specialized readers.

### 6.3 Alexander the Augustinian

Alexander Neckam shows that there is much still to be learned about the relationship between medieval writers and the communities in which they lived, as well as the consequences of their context to the reception of their works. At the same time as being a lecturer in Oxford, Alexander also appears to have been an Augustinian; his move to Cirencester was not an escape from the scholastic to the monastic world, but simply a way to continue his work, and perhaps gain access to superior resources for publication. Once we understand the rationale for his style as supporting growth in both intellect and health, he shines forth as relevant to present-day concerns, and positively likeable. Rather than a cleric who knew nothing but book learning, we find someone equally at home in the vestry, wilderness, court, or kitchen. Far from skirting creativity or viewing the *auctores* as fully sufficient, Alexander sought to make them newly accessible to his students, and to enable them to do new things with them. Instead of loathing women, he unceasingly puts them forward as examples worthy of contemplation and imitation. If this study has succeeded to any degree, it has begun to show that the connections between his life, works, and community are still worth consideration in the modern world. Let us find out more about Alexander’s works, and enable a new generation to read them.
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The following catalogue presents Alexander’s works in the order of the approximate date of their completion given in chapter 2, under ‘The chronology of Alexander’s works as an Augustinian’. This is an update of Hunt, itself built on earlier lists. Bibliographies published since have been taken into account. It has been possible to find only a handful of manuscripts of which Hunt was not aware, and it has not been necessary to update his listing of them significantly, though corrections have been made based on updated catalogues and examination of manuscripts where possible. Following Hunt’s practice, a solidus is used to indicate a fragment in quoting incipits and explicits. For a table summarizing the numbers of copies, see above in chapter 4, under ‘Results of the dissemination effort’. The records of manuscripts have been entirely reworked, based on the Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues.

Major Works

*De utensilibus*

**inc.** Qui bene uult disponere familie sue et rebus suis
**exp.** nisi quisque fideliter firmiterque crediderit saluus esse non poterit. Explicit.

Hunt (1991, 1:178) prints the standard *accessus* to the work, which specifies the title as *De utensilibus*, also used in several manuscripts; the form *De nominibus utensilium* seems to have been popularized only because it appears in the manuscript used for the first edition, by Wright (1857, 1:96).

---

1 Schools, 125–49.

134
Manuscripts

- Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, lat. fol. 607r (formerly Phillipps 13835), fols 1ra–9rc (s. xiv³); glossed
- Besançon, Bibliothèque municipale, 534, fol. 35v (s. xiv²); glossed
- Bruges, Openbare Bibliothek, 536, fols 80r–89v (s. xiii/xiv); glossed
- Bruges, Openbare Bibliothek, 546, fol. 1r–v (s. xiii)

  exp. sali mixta/ (Scheler 1866, 61, line 14)

- Cambrai, Bibliothèque municipale, 969 (867) (s. xiv)

  RUBRIC  Dictionarius magistri Iohannis de Gallandia
  INC. GLOSS  In principio huius uoluminis plura incurrunt inquieenda

- Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, 136 (76), pp. 1–20 (s. xiii³); glossed
- Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, 385 (605), pp. 341–344 (s. xiii); abbreviated version
- Cambridge, Trinity College, O.7.9 (1337), fols 122r–135r (s. xiii)

  RUBRIC, IN GLOSS  partes magistri Alexandri
  INC. GLOSS  Cognitioni uniuscuiusque causati

- Canterbury, Cathedral Library, Add. 129/1 (s. xiv²)
- Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Fabricius 92 (iv) 8º, fols 25v–42r (a. 1308)

  RUBRIC  Dictionarius magistri Alexandri nequam
  INC. GLOSS  materia libri scriptoris sunt utensilia

- Dublin, Trinity College, 270 (D.4.9), fols 26r–33v and 157r–169r (s. xiii–xiv); glossed; two copies of the text
- Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, Advoc. 18.4.13, fols iiiir–ivv (s. xiv); heavily glossed; the outer bifolium of a quire, providing only the beginning and end of the text
- Erfurt, Stadt- und Regionalbibliothek, Amplon. O.12, fols 12v–22v (s. xiii/xiv)

  RUBRIC, IN GLOSS  partes magistri Alexandri Nequam
  GLOSS  Materia huius libri sunt utensilia

- Kiel, Universitätsbibliothek, KB 38, fols 6r–25v (s. xiv); glossed
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exp. sic inutile a me sepe accepiisti
rubric, in gloss auctor … magister Alexander Nequam
inc. gloss In principio huius libri ista sunt scienda et notanda

- Lincoln, Cathedral Library, 132 (C.5.8), fols 37r–51r (s. xiii)
  inc. gloss Nota quod hic diccio

- London, British Library, Add. 8092, fols 1r–5v (s. xiii)
  exp. prosequutus sum (Scheler 1866, 163, line 4)
  rubric, in gloss Incipiunt epistole magistri Alexandri Nequam de utensilibus domorum
  inc. gloss Materia huius libelli sunt utensilia

- London, British Library, Cotton Titus D. xx, fols 3r–66v (s. xiv)
  inc. gloss In principio huius libri sunt ista inquirenda, scilicet quid sit titulus, quis sit auctor, que materia … secundum magistrum Alexandrum

- London, British Library, Harley 683 (s. xiii)
  a. fols 12r–19r; glossed
  b. fol. 36r–v, running lemmatized commentary on the opening of De utensilibus
  c. fols 38r–54v
    gloss In principio huius libri uidendum est quod auctor dicitur magister Alexander

- London, Wellcome Library, 801A, fols 104ra–118rb (s. xiii: Bury St Edmunds; formerly St Edmundsbury Cathedral, MS 4, purchased 1971); glossed

- Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, I 246 inf., fols 1or–24r (s. xiv)

- Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 37, fols 121r–133v (s. xiii); owned by master Elias de Trykyngham
  exp. et depingendum. Explicit. (Scheler 1866, 171, line 7)
  rubric, in gloss Hic incipiunt partes magistri Alexandri Nequam
  gloss Intentio autoris est nomina utensilium colligere

- Oxford, Bodleian Library, Lat. misc. B.13, fol. 49r (s. xiii), fragment
  inc. /tate emergente (Scheler 1866, 165, line 3)
  exp. et nunc superioretur/ (Scheler 1866, 166, line 22)
• Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud misc. 497, fols 300r–303v (s. xiii), fragment (example of the gloss provided in Meyer 1868, 298)

inc. /penula taxea (Scheler 1866, 63, lines 23–4)
exp. cererem terre/ (Scheler 1866, 162, line 11)

• Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawl. G.96 (SC 15567), pp. 177a–196b (s. xiii)

inc. gloss Virorum (recte cum rerum) noticia

• Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawl. G.99 (SC 15462), fols 138r–149v (s. xiii)

rubric, in gloss libellus magistri Alexandri Nequam de utensilibus

• Oxford, St John's College, 178, fols 402r–411r (s. xiii)

exp. scribi debet/ (Scheler 1866, 169, line 20); a few glosses

• Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 7679, fols 5v–25v (s. xv)

rubric Incipit de utensilibus Alexandri
gloss Hec dictio 'qui' quandoque est relatiuum

• Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 15171, fols 176ra–95ra (s. xiii)

exp. nomina uel uocabula/ (Scheler 1866, 173, line 13)
rubric, in gloss (fol. 194va) Explicit libellus magistri Alexandri Nequam
inc. gloss Sicut dicit Tullius in principio siue prologo sue retorice, Eloquentia sine sapientia nocet

• Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, 1210, fols 70r–73v (s. xii); incomplete

• Saint-Claude (Jura), Bibliothèque municipale, 6, pp. 123–46 (s. xiii)

• Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 12535, fols 1r–8r (s. xiii); glossed

• Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 13.10 Aug. 4º (3035), fols 196r–197r (s. xiii), fragment (Scheler 1866, 63–74, 155–56; see Rose 1907, xvii)

• Worcester, Cathedral Library, Q.50, fols 5r–18v (s. xiii)

gloss In principio huius libri hec inquirenda sunt, Quis auctor
Appendix A. Alexander’s Works

Records

- Augustinian Canons, Leicester, 15th cent. catalogue (Webber and Watson 1998, A20.4978); attributed to John of Garland
- Augustinian Canons, Leicester, 15th cent. catalogue (Webber and Watson 1998, A20.10001); ‘qui bene uult disponere’
- Austin Friars, York: Catalogue, 1382, with additions (Humphreys 1990, FA8.502f)
- Benedictines, Canterbury, Christ Church: Prior Eastry’s catalogue, not after 1331 (James 1903, BC4.1356), ‘Alexander coquinarius’
- Benedictines, Canterbury, Christ Church: Prior Eastry’s catalogue, not after 1331 (James 1903, BC4.1371d), ‘Alexander coquinarius’
- Benedictines, Canterbury, St Augustine’s: 15th cent. catalogue (Barker-Benfield 2008, BA1.1117e), ‘liber A. Necquam qui incipit Qui bene uult disponere’
- Benedictines, Dover, St Martin’s: John Whitfield’s catalogue, 1389 (Stoneman 1996, BM1.378c), ‘qui bene uult disponere’
- Benedictines, Dover, St Martin’s: John Whitfield’s catalogue, 1389 (Stoneman 1996, BM1.408d), ‘Alexander cusyneyer’
- Benedictines, Dover, St Martin’s: John Whitfield’s catalogue, 1389 (Stoneman 1996, BM1.412b), ‘Alexander cusynyer’
- Benedictines, Dover, St Martin’s: John Whitfield’s catalogue, 1389 (Stoneman 1996, BM1.442e), ‘Alexander cusynyer’
- Benedictines, Durham (Botfield 1838, 33)
- Benedictines, Holme, St Benet’s: Leland, c.1536–40 (Sharpe et al. 1996, B50.1)
- Brigittines, Syon: Registrum of the library of the Brethren, c.1500–c.1524 (Gillespie and Doyle 2001, SS1.9c), ‘tractatus qui uult disponere familie sue cum glasa’
- Carmelites, Hulne: Catalogue, 1433 (Humphreys 1990, FC3.49b), ‘libro de gramatica de nominibus utensilium in asseribus cum albo coreo et modici valoris’
- Carmelites, Norwich (Bale 1902, 23–24)
- Carthusians, Witham: John Blacman’s gifts, c.1463–74 (Gillespie and Doyle 2001, C8.15f)
- Eton (Bale 1902, 23)
- Premonstratensians, Titchfield: Catalogue, Michaelmas 1400 (Bell 1992, P6.157a)
- Premonstratensians, Titchfield: Catalogue, Michaelmas 1400 (Bell 1992, P6.178c)
Appendix A. Alexander’s Works

Editions

Hunt (1991, 1:181–190, gloss 2:65–122), from London, Wellcome Library, 801a; Scheler (1866); Wright (1857)

Literature

Amt (2010); Copeland (2010); Dinkova-Bruun (2013); Ellis (1889); Gasparri (2007); Gullick (1996); Gumbert (2011); Holmes (1952); T. Hunt (1979a); T. Hunt (1979b, 1:177–190); Lendinara (1993); Shaw (2013); Vezin (2005)

Nouus Esopus

INC. Ingluuiæ cogente lupus dum deuorat ossa

EXP. Qui nostre causas utilitatis habent.

Manuscripts

- Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, F.IV.50, fols 174v–181r (s. xv), nos. 1, 3, 4, 22, 24, 25, 29 (imperf.), 30–3, 36, 39, 42
- Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Santen B.4, fols 38va–42va (1449: France), nos. 1–11, 13, 12, 15–17, 14, 18–30, Walther 583, 31–42
- Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, Advoc. 18.4.9, fols 57vb–9vb (s. xiv), nos. 31, 32, 34, 38, 39, 41, 42, 19, (43), 8, 6, 1, 2, 9, 10, 13–16, 20–25; also includes ‘Arboris in patula mel reperit ursa cauerna’ (fol. 58vb: edited in Hochgürtel 2008, 244).
- London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian B. xxiii, fols 110v–118v (s. xiv), nos. 1–42
- Madrid, Real Biblioteca, II.468, fols 11r–24v (s. xiv), nos. 1–11, 13, 12, 14–42
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 2904, pp. 153–4 (s. xiiex), nos. 1–6 (no. 7, rubric only)
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 8471 (s. xiii’)
  a. fols 1r–15v, nos. 1–42
  b. summary, fols 16r–17v


- Chartres, Bibliothèque municipale, 620, fols 136v-149r (‘ex bibliotheca capitula canonici’), destroyed in 1944
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- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, fr. 15213, fols 1r-54r (s. xiv)
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, fr. 24432, fols 171rb-184ra (s. xiv)

Records

- Austin Friars, York: Catalogue, 1382, with additions (Humphreys 1990, FA8.493e), ‘fabule Ysopi’ = Cotton Vespasian B. xxiii
- Bale (1902, 26)
- Benedictines, Glastonbury: Catalogue, 1247, with additions (Sharpe et al. 1996, B39.338), ‘liber Osopis Atheniensis de fabulis’
- Benedictines, St Albans-Belvoir: List of books (Sharpe et al. 1996, B92.9d), ‘Osopus’

Editions

Robert (1825, 1:109, 124, 194, 205, 237, 260); du Méril (1854, 169–213); Bastin (1929, 1:ix–xii, 3–30); Garbugino (1987); Hervieux (1883–1899, 1:702–716, 2:787–812)

Literature


Nouus Auianus

inc. Vincere quod lenis nequit exhortatio uincit
exp. Si conferre potes omnibus ergo tibi.

Manuscripts

- Cambridge, University Library, Gg.6.42, fols 232v–234v (s. xiii med.), nos. 1–6
- Madrid, Real Biblioteca, II.468, fol. 24v–7 (s. xiv), nos 1–6
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 11867, fols 217va–18ra (s. xiii), nos. 1–6

A manuscript owned by Bale (1902, 26).

Editions

du Méril (1854, 260–67); Froehner (1862); Hervieux (1883–1899, 3:222–234, 462–67); Klein (1998)
Literature
Bisanti (2002); Bisanti (2010); Boatti (1998); Dicke (1987); Giovini (1998); Hodapp (2003); Rigg (2008)

Super Martianum

INC. Marciani Minei Felicis Capelle de nuptiis Philologie et Mercurii fabula incipit. Titulus iste demonstrat exp. 'Habes electorum'. Quasi diceret, scis quid scriptum et quid scribendum sit.

TITLE Alexander Nequam super Marcianum de nupciis Mercurii et Philologie

Manuscripts
- Cambridge, Trinity College, R.14.9 (884), fols 38r–63 (s. xiv)
- Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 221, fols 34vb–88ra (s. xiv)

Records
- Bale (1557–1559, 2:167)
- Benedictines, Dover, St Martin's: John Whitfield's catalogue, 1389 (Stoneman 1996, BM1.316b)
- Franciscans, Reading: Leland, c.1536–40 (Humphreys 1990, F10.2)
- Austin Friars, Oxford: Books noted by Thomas Gascoigne, c.1430 (Humphreys 1990, F35.2)

Edition
McDonough (2006)

Literature

Expositio simboli Athanasii episcopi

Stegmüller (1950–1980), no. 1170

INC. PROL. Caput aquile uisum ab ezechiele eminentius erat tribus ceteris capitibus suppositis. Per que tria: designantur. Ratio. memoria et intellectus. Per caput aquile: designatur fides. que eminentior est ratione. memoria et intellectu.

EXP. PROL. In commendatione ergo orthodoxe et catholice fidei hereses extirpare et eradicare intendit athanasius in hoc simbolo dicens.

INC. TEXT Quicunque uult. etc. Hec est enim victoria que uincit mundum: fides nostra. [1 John 5:4]
Signanter dicit uult et non dicit quicumque salus erit.
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EXP. TEXT ut eueniret unam et eandem personam esse hominem et esse deum: cui persone honor et gloria in sempiterna secula amen.

Manuscripts

- Cambrai, Bibliothèque municipale, 977 (875), fols 172r–184r (s. xiii
\[\text{rubric} \text{ Tractatus magistri Alexandri Nequam super Quicumque uult.}\]

- London, British Library, Harley 3133, fols 92r–100r (s. xiii)
\[\text{rubric} \text{ Explicit fides catholica Anthanasii episcopi exposita a magistro Alexandro de sancto Albano.}\]

- Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. D.2.9 (SC 2330), fols 184va–188rc (s. xiii)
\[\text{rubric} \text{ Expositio fidei catholice a magistro Alexandro edita.}\]

- Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 284 (SC 2339; s. xiii: Cirencester)
  a. fols 297r–306r
  b. fols 306r–307r, an anonymous abbreviation of Alexander’s commentary, inc. ‘Caput aquile uisum ab ezechiele eminentius erat tribus ceteris capitibus. Per quod designatur quia fides est supra rationem et memoriam et intellectum.’
\[\text{rubric} \text{ Expositio simboli Anthanasii episcopi secundum Magistrum Alexandrum Nequam inc. prol.}\]
\[\text{exp. prol.} \text{ Dicit apostolus. Fides est fundamentum quod inuitari non potest.}\]
\[\text{exp. text} \text{ Quicumque uult saluus esse. Sic ordinate constructionem.}\]
\[\text{exp. text} \text{ hoc propter paruulos. saluus esse non poterit.}\]

Records

- Augustinian Canons, Hexham: Henry de Kirkestede, Catalogus, c.1360 (Rouse and Rouse 2004, K4.10)
- Benedictines, Bury: Henry de Kirkestede, Catalogus, c.1360 (Rouse and Rouse 2004, K4.10)
- Benedictines, Canterbury, Christ Church: Prior Eastry’s catalogue, not after 1331 (James 1903, BC4.1256) = Registrum Anglie, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.10), correcting from Carthusians, Witham
- Benedictines, Peterborough: Catalogue, late 14th cent. (Friis-Jensen and Willoughby 2001, BP21.159*)
- Benedictines, Peterborough: Catalogue, late 14th cent. (Friis-Jensen and Willoughby 2001, BP21.162f)
• Benedictines, Ramsey: Henry de Kirkestede, *Catalogus*, c.1360 (Rouse and Rouse 2004, K4.10)
• Benedictines, St Albans: Leland, *c.1536–40* (Sharpe et al. 1996, B91.1) = *Registrum Anglie*, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.10), correcting from Carthusians, Witham

Literature
Häring (1972); Ommanney (1897, 241–48); Burn (1896, 44)

**Questiones**

**INC.** Queritur utrum Abraam alio modo posset saluari
**EXP.** perfecta suadentur.

**TITLE** Incipiunt questiones secundum magistrum Alexandrum de sancto Albano.

**Manuscript**

• Lambeth, Palace Library, 421, fols 124va–127ra (s. xiii

Quotations from a work with this title in *Sol meldunensis*, with an expanded text.

**Records**

• Augustinian Canons, Lanthony: Catalogue, late 14th cent. (Webber and Watson 1998, A16.*209*) = Lambeth 421
• Carthusians, Witham: *Registrum Anglie*, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.12)

**Glose super psalterium**

Stegmüller (1950–1980), no. 1163

**INC. PROL.** De ortu deliciarum paradysi
**EXP. PROL.** *(original)* nulla discordia. nec postulatio. qualis sit in uia.

 *(revised)* que per regnum salomonis designata est.

**INC. TEXT** Beatus uir ... Licet psalmus iste exponatur
**EXP. TEXT** quia idem est deus ueteris et noui testamenti [Ps. 145:10].

**Manuscripts**

• Lambeth, Palace Library, 61, fols 1ra–115vb (s. xiii: Lanthony); lacks Pss. 30:8–33:2, 56:4–67:10

**RUBRIC** Psalterium magistri Alexandri (fol. 1r)
exp. uisum est quid ideo specialiter [Ps. 89:1]

- *second recension*: London, British Library, Royal 2 C. xi, fols 1ra–206va (s. xiii: Ramsey)

rubric Psalterium magistri Alexandri Nequam (added s. xiv)

- Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 284 (SC 2339), fols iiiir–295va (s. xiii*: Cirencester)

rubric Alexander Necham super psalmos (fol. iii: Leland’s hand)

- *corrected by author* Oxford, Jesus College, 94, fols 1ra–56vb (s. xii*: ?Oxford); lacks Pss. 37:2–90:16

exp. uiuifica me iuxta uerbum tuum [Ps. 118:107]

Excerpts in *Sol meldunensis*.

Records

- Benedictines, Canterbury, Christ Church: Prior Eastry’s catalogue, not after 1331 (James 1903, BC4.1249a)
- Benedictines, Kelso: *Registrum Anglie*, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.5)
- Benedictines, Peterborough: Catalogue, late 14th cent. (Friis-Jensen and Willoughby 2001, BP21.94e)
- Benedictines, St Albans: *Registrum Anglie*, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.5)
- Library of King Henry VIII, Westminster: Inventory of the Upper Library, 1542 (Carley 2000 H2.*588 = H4.*1) = Royal 2 C. xi

Dating

Post 1193: Refers to the Third Crusade (Hunt 1984, 26–27).

Literature

Dahan (1990)
Corrogationes Promethei

INC. PROL. Ferrum situ rubiginem ducit et uittis non putata in labruscam siluescit
EXP. PROL. si non circa uilem patulumque morabimur orbem.
INC. PART 1 Excellentissimo philosopho Platoni usum est grammaticam non esse censendam nomine arris
EXP. PART 1 et senex dicitur delirus. Horatius in fine uersus deliret acumen [Epp. 1.12.20].
INC. PART 2 Post hec de singulis libris bibliothecae aliquas dictiones proferre libet in medium
EXP. PART 2 iam humanam naturam excellentiorem esse angelica.

Manuscripts

- Berne, Burgerbibliothek, B 45, fols 1r–103v (s. xiv), ends with the beginning of John; index at fol. 104v
- Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 217, fols 318r–362v (s. xiii: Worcester)
- Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 460 (s. xiii–xiv, ?East Anglia)
  a. fols 25r–37v
    RUBRIC (fol. 25r) Incipit tractatus alex. nequam secundum promatheum.
    INC. (fol. 25r) Quoniam autem gramatice partes sint ortographia prosodia sunanologia (?) uel sintesis
    RUBRIC (fol. 34r) Hic incipiunt prologi bibliie. secundum promatheum.
    INC. (fol. 34r) Antequam ad expositionem partium librorum bibliotece
  b. alphabetical version: fols 37v–68r
    INC. (fol. 37v) Post hec de singulis libris bibliotece
    RUBRIC (fol. 68r) Explicit compendium super promatheum alexandri nequam.
- Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, 236 (122), pp. 1a–309a (s. xiii: ?Ramsey or St Ives), Part 2 only (expanded)
- Cambridge, Pembroke College, 103, fols 85ra–125va (s. xiii)
  RUBRIC Incipiunt Corrogaciones Promethei. Prologus magistri Alexandri Nequam.
- Cambridge, Pembroke College, 112, fols 53–70 (s. xiii); part 1 only
- Cambridge, Pembroke College, 275, fols 15ra–24rb (s. xiii: Reading); part 2 only
  EXP. de cordibus hominum. De (?) canniate/ [Job].
- Cambridge, University Library, Kk.5.10, fols 32Sr–68vb (s. xiii: Durham, s. xv, from Thomas Swalwell; see Emden, BRUO 1828, Ker, MLGB, p. 258), Part 2 only
Appendix A. Alexander’s Works

rubric Incipit summa magistri A. Nequam.

exp. mandata eius/ [1 John 5:2]

• Dublin, Trinity College, 256, fol. 1r–113r (s. xiii)

inc. /minis ut cum paricida.

• Dublin, Trinity College, 257, fol. 1r–85v (s. xiii)

• Évreux, Bibliothèque municipale, MS L. 72 (s. xiii: Lyre)
  a. fol. 1v, letter explaining the title Corrogationes Promethei (printed by Omont 1887, 65; Meyer 1896, 651–52; Guéry 1917, 393–94)
  b. fol. 2r–109r

rubric Correctiones Promethei

• Lambeth, Palace Library, 162, fol. 67r–121v (s. xv). Part 2 only

exp. ad tactum fimbrie domini sanata est emorissa a profluuo/ [Mark 5:25]

rubric Ferrum super genesim.

• Lincoln, Cathedral Library, 162 (B.2.4.), fol. 203r–209r (s. xiv); part 2 only (described in Thomson 1989, 130–31)

• London, British Library, Egerton 2261, fol. 111rb–174va (s. xiii); part 2 only

rubric Expliciunt excerpta super singulos libros bibliotheca edita a magistro Alexandro nequam dicto per contrarium. (fol. 174va)

• London, British Library, Harley 6, fol. 150r–196r (s. xiii: Chichester)

rubric Incipiunt corrogationes Promethei. Prologus.

• London, British Library, Harley 1687, fol. 128r–139r (s. xiii/xiv); part 1 only

• London, British Library, Royal 2 D. viii (s. xiiiex)
  a. text preceded on fol. 1r–10r by an alphabetical list of words dealt with in part 2
  b. fol. 10va–11vb list the capitula of 1–2, headed ‘Incipiunt capitula super Ysagogas Magistri Alexandri Nequam’
  c. fol. 16r–145v, text
exp. Set quid. Nonne/ (1 Thess. 4:15)

- London, British Library, Royal 5 C. v
  a. fols 2ra–57rb (s. xiii-xiv: Sempringham)
    rubric Corrogationes Premothei
  b. fols 57rb-vb, letter from S., prior of Malmesbury, to Walter de Melida (see above, 'Walter's correspondence with Malmesbury on Corrogationes Promethei')

- London, British Library, Royal 8 A. xxı, fols 170r–183v (s. xiii); part 2 only, Exodus to Maccabees

- London, British Library, Royal 15 B. iv, fols 16r–23vb (s. xiii); part 1 only
  exp. an ordaceus/

- Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. F.5.23 (SC 2674), fols 7ra-86rb (s. xiiiex: Coventry)
  rubric Libellus iste dicitur ferrum quem exposuit magister Alexander Necham (fol. 85v: s. xiv)
    Expliciunt exposiciones parcium biblie secundum magistrum Alexandrum Necham (fol. 86: s. xiv)


- Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 550 (SC 2300), fols 1ra–100rb (s. xiii2: Reading)
  rubric Incipiunt corrogationes promethei. (fol. 1ra)

- Oxford, Bodleian Library. Bodley 760 (SC 2673), fols 99ra–171va (s. xiiiex: Reading)
  rubric Explicit liber magistri Alexander Nequam Abbatis. (fol. 171vb)

- Oxford, Bodleian Library. f (SC 4094), fols 3ra–143vb (s. xiii)
  rubric (In)cipit ysago(gi) cum magis(tri) Alexandri. (fol. 3ra)

- Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 112, fols 9ra–42va (s. xiii: Ely)
  rubric Incipiunt Corrogaciones promethei. Prologus (fol. 9ra); in list of contents: Summa que uocatur Prometheus (fol. 1vb)

- Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawl. c.67, fols 95–161v (s. xiii: ?Hereford), Part 2 precedes Part 1
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rubric
Explicit summa magistri A. Nequam super Bibliam. Sequitur summa de cognicione locutionum figuraturarum [sic] ab eodem compilata (fol. 145v); Explicit expositio litteralis diccionum difficilium in totam biblia (fol. 161v)

- Oxford, Balliol College, 234, fol. 1r (s. xiii); part 1 (fragment)
- Oxford, Merton College, 254, entire manuscript (s. xiii

rubric
Incipit ysagogicum magistri Alexandri Nequam (fol. 1r)

- Oxford, St John’s College, 178, fols 105r–139r (s. xiiiex: Westminster), part 1 only

rubric
Prologus magistri Alexandri Nequam.

- Paris, Bibl. Ste-Genevieve, 1211, fols 277r–306r (s. xiii-xiv), Part 2 only; see Meyer (1896, 676n1, 680n4)
- Pommersfelden, Gräflich Schönborn’sche Schloßbibliothek, 177, fols 109r–113r, part II only
- Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, 1048, item 11 (s. xiii: Clairvaux; see Vernet (1979, 1:72); part 2 only, Ecclus. Sap.

rubric
Glosule magistri A N super Ecclesiasticum, Job, Parabolos, Ecclesiastem, Cantica Canticorum et Librum Sapiencie.

- Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale, D.V.29, fols 1ra–46 (s. xiii: English, later in Vercelli), part 2 only, damaged.

rubric
Hic incipiunt expositiones uerborum bibliothecae secundum magistrum Alexandrum Nequam.

- Uppsala, University Library, C.145, fols 73r–98r (s. xiii1, Paris?), part II only
- Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 1310, fols 1r–108r (s. xiv, Bremen), part II only
- Worcester, Cathedral Library, F.1, fols 168ra–2S4rb (s. xiii: Worcester)

Records

- Austin Friars, York: Catalogue, 1382, with additions (Humphreys 1990, FA8.†142d), ‘Alex. Nequam de partibus biblie’
- Austin Friars, York: Catalogue, 1382, with additions (Humphreys 1990, FA8.31a)
- Benedictines, Canterbury, Christ Church: Prior Eastry’s catalogue, not after 1331 (James 1903, BC4.1235e), ‘Glose super nouum Tesamentum secundum A. Nequam’ (i.e. part 2)
- Benedictines, Canterbury, Christ Church: Prior Eastry’s catalogue, not after 1331 (James 1903, BC4.1249), ‘Promotheus’
- Benedictines, Canterbury, Christ Church: Prior Eastry’s catalogue, not after 1331 (James 1903, BC4.1355a), ‘Tractatus M. A. Nequam super uetus et nouum Testamentum’ (part 2)
- Benedictines, Canterbury, Christ Church: Prior Eastry’s catalogue, not after 1331 (James 1903, BC4.1371b), ‘Summa magistri A. Nequam’
- Benedictines, Canterbury, Christ Church: Prior Eastry’s catalogue, not after 1331 (James 1903, BC4.561), ‘Summa M. A. Nequam’
- Benedictines, Canterbury, Christ Church: Prior Eastry’s catalogue, not after 1331 (James 1903, BC4.650a), ‘Promotheus Alexandri Nequam’
- Benedictines, Canterbury, Christ Church: Prior Eastry’s catalogue, not after 1331 (James 1903, BC4.710b–c), ‘Tractatus M. A. Nequam de ortographia’
- Benedictines, Canterbury, Christ Church: Prior Eastry’s catalogue, not after 1331 (James 1903, BC4.727), ‘Promotheus Alexandri Nequam’
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- Benedictines, Canterbury, St Augustine’s: Catalogue, 15th cent. (Barker-Benfield 2008, BA1.307a)
  ‘Prometheus A. N. de accentibus et expositiones extraneorum vocabulorum biblie’
- Benedictines, Canterbury, St Augustine’s: Catalogue, 15th cent. (Barker-Benfield 2008, BA1.308),
  ‘Prometheus A. N. de expositione diuersorum vocabulorum biblie’, part 2 only
- Benedictines, Canterbury, St Augustine’s: Catalogue, 15th cent. (Barker-Benfield 2008, BA1.309)
- Benedictines, Dover, St Martin’s: John Whitfield’s catalogue, 1389 (Stoneman 1996, BM1.439v), ‘Visio
  Platonis de grammatica’
- Benedictines, Durham (Botfield 1838, 49)
- Benedictines, Evesham: Books acquired by Abbot Thomas Marlborough, early 13th cent. (Sharpe et
  al. 1996, B39.32)
- Benedictines, Gloucester: Books owned by Robert of Aldsworth, 13th cent. (Sharpe et al. 1996,
  B47.21), ‘ferrum sita’ = Registrum Anglie, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.8),
  ‘super nouum et uetus testamentum’ = Henry de Kirkestede, Catalogus, c.1360 (Rouse and Rouse
  2004, K4.9)
- Benedictines, Muchelney (London, BL, Royal 7 A.II, fol. 1v): ‘Memoriale de Mucheln’ propter
  Ysagogicum magistri Alexandri Nequam’
- Benedictines, Peterborough: Books given by Abbot Alexander of Holderness (1222–26) (Friis-Jensen
  and Willoughby 2001, BP5.9), ‘corrogaciones Promethei’
- Benedictines, Peterborough: Catalogue, late 14th cent. (Friis-Jensen and Willoughby 2001,
  BP21.114d–e)
- Benedictines, Ramsey: Catalogue roll, late 14th cent. (Sharpe et al. 1996, B68.23)
- Benedictines, Ramsey: Catalogue roll, late 14th cent. (Sharpe et al. 1996, B68.327)
- Benedictines, Ramsey: Catalogue roll, late 14th cent. (Sharpe et al. 1996, B68.471)
- Benedictines, Ramsey: Catalogue roll, late 14th cent. (Sharpe et al. 1996, B68.516a)
- Benedictines, Ramsey: Fragment of catalogue, mid-14th cent. (Sharpe et al. 1996, B67.101)
- Brigittines, Syon: Registrum of the library of the Brethren, c.1500–c.1524 (Gillespie and Doyle 2001,
  SS1.868j), ‘Repertorium quoddam siue expositio optima verborum difficilium biblie secundum
  ordinem singulorum libroru m eiusdem’
- Cambridge, King’s College (Bale 1902, 24)
- Carmelites, Norwich (Humphreys 1990, FC6.1)
- Cistercians, Meaux: Inventory of books, 1396 (Bell 1992, Z14.260a)
- Cistercians, Meaux: Inventory of books, 1396 (Bell 1992, Z14.261)
- Eton (Bale 1902, 23)
- Library of King Henry VIII, Westminster: Inventory of the Upper Library, 1542 (Carley 2000, H2.*1229) = Royal 5 C.V
  1400 (Thomson 2015, UO35.22b), ‘promotheum siue ferrum’
• Oxford, Merton College: Inventory of books drawn up for the Marian commissioners, 1556 (Thomson 2015, UO68.*.144), ‘Isag. Alex. Nequam’ = Merton College 254
• Premonstratensians, Titchfield: Catalogue, Michaelmas 1400 (Bell 1992, P6.32a), ‘ferrum’
• Robert Raynhull, vicar of St Cross, Canterbury, 1417 (Jacob 1938–1947, 2:119)
• Winchester College: Inventory of the library, 30 July 1428 × 24 August 1429 (SC335.229a), ‘quidam tractatus grammatice super diccionibus uocatus Ferrum’

Literature
Brown (1920); Gärtner (2009b); Glunz (1933); Hunt (1991, 1:235–246); Meyer (1896); Wolff (1974)

Corrogationes Promethei metrice
Walther (1969), no. 6045

INC. Excipit a. bissus. et ab hoc generatur abissus.
EXP. Fluxus adest exta languentibus excoriantur.

Manuscripts
• London, British Library, Royal 9 A. xiv, fols 141r–156r (s. xiii)
• Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 56, fols 101r–130r (s. xiii), belonging to Thomas Allen (Watson 1978, 311)
  RUBRIC Incipiunt expositiones bibliothece (fol. 101r)
• Oxford, St John’s College, 119, fols 121r–149v (s. xiii)
  EXP. Dirigit ut cursus nauis nec promouet ipsam/ [Acts: lacks final five lines]

Records
• Benedictines, Peterborough: Catalogue, late 14th cent. (Friis-Jensen and Willoughby 2001, BP21.241h), ‘promotheus uersificatus’
• Brigittines, Syon: Registrum of the library of the Brethren, c.1500–c.1524 (Gillespie and Doyle 2001, SS1.352c), ‘de quorundam terminorum explanacionibus omnium librorum Biblie in metro’
• ?Premonstratensians, Titchfield: Catalogue, Michaelmas 1400 (Bell 1992, P6.147h, P6.156e)

Literature
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Solatium fidelis anime
Stegmüller (1950–1980), no. 8987

Incidet. Rerum subtilium fugas uenari: presentis renuit pagine simplicitas.

Inc. De causa creationis rerum et hominis ingratitudine. Deus. totius origo boni: quem non externe pepulerunt fingere cause materie fluitantis opus:
Exp. De causa creationis rerum et hominis ingratitudine. Deus. totius origo boni: quem non externe pepulerunt fingere cause materie fluitantis opus:

Deus. totius origo boni quem non externe pepulerunt fingere cause materie fluitantis opus:
Exp. Deus. totius origo boni quem non externe pepulerunt fingere cause materie fluitantis opus:

Manuscript

- Canterbury, Cathedral Library, Lit. B. 6 (4), fols 1ra–28vb (s. xiii):
- St Augustine’s, Canterbury; note that there are two sets of foliation in this manuscript, the original being 1r–28v, and another 2r–29v.

Title tractatus Moralium super Genesim qui dicitur Solatium fidelis anime (fol. i)
Rubric Incipit solatium fidelis anime. (fol. 1ra)

Excerpts in Sol meldunensis.

Records


The only other record of Solatium is a seventeenth-century annotation to Super cantica (London, British Library, Royal 4 D. xi, fol. 32r): ‘Neckami liber inscriptus Solatium fidelis animae’. The ‘Liber supplicationum’ noted by Damon (1957, 102) is Suppletio defectuum (Hunt 1984, 139).

Literature

Ellis (1886); Záhora (2011)

Expositio super cantica canticorum in laudem gloriose ac perpetue uirginis Marie
Stegmüller (1950–1980), no. 1168

Inc. Humilitas uera gloriam excellencie et dignitatis feliciter
Exp. Conferat nobis omnibus subsidium dominus noster iesus noster qui est benedictus in secula. Amen.

Inc. Book 1 Ortus deliciarum paradisi celestis scripture amena iocunda
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exp. book 1  ut pro me misero misericordie mater intercedes ad dominum nostrum ihesum cristum filium tuum, cui laus et honor et imperium per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.


exp. book 2  Hec uita est quedam ymago future uite ad quam nos perduat qui est benedictus in secula amen.

inc. book 3  Gloriosa dei genitrix est et habundans materia laudis et preclara laus paterie scribencium.


exp. book 4  Opem nobis conferat dilectus noster iesus noster: qui est benedictus in secula amen.


exp. book 5  Quod igitur malis completi desideramus. in nobis compleat iesus cristus dominus noster. cui honor in seculorum secula Amen.

inc. book 6  Quid uidebis in sunamitem nisi choros castrorum. [Song 7:1] Legitur hester fuisse formosa ualde et incredibili pulchritudine. omnium oculis graciosa et amabilis.

exp. book 6  Supplico igitur mater salutis. amor mundi. celorum delicie: ut pro me misero. misericordie mater intercedes ad dominum nostrum ihesum cristum filium tuum. cui laus et honor et imperium: per infinita secula seculorum amen.

*Laus beatissime uirginis* was once thought to have been a separate work (McDonough 2004).

Manuscripts

- Cambridge, University Library, Li.2.31, fols 132ra–254va (s. xiv)
  
  Rubric  Prohemium Alex. Nequam super cantica.

- Lambeth, Palace Library, 23, fols 1ra–143vb (s. xiv/xv: Durham)

- London, British Library, Royal 4 D. xi, fols 1ra–205vb (s. xiii)
  
  Rubric  Alex. Nequam super cantica (fol. 1: s. xv)

- Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 356 (SC 2716), fols 7ra–257vb (s. xiii: Bury St Edmunds)
  
  Inc. /hominis deuetis (1.4)
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SPINE
Alexander nequam super cantica (s. xiii)
Rubric, fol. 52v Incipit expositio super cantica canticorum in laudem gloriose ac perpetue uirginis marie.

• Oxford, Balliol College, 39, fols 2r–133r (books 1–3) (s. xiii: Buildwas)
• Oxford, Balliol College, 40, fols 1r–118r (books 4.4–5) (s. xv: William Gray, bishop of Ely)
• Oxford, Magdalen College, 149, fols 1ra–194ra (s. xiii); given s. xv by John Mower (Emden 1957–1959, 1326–7)
• Oxford, New College, 43, fols 3r–235v (s. xvi\textsuperscript{in}: Archbishop Wareham)

Records
• Augustinian Canons, Cirencester: Leland, c.1536–40 (Webber and Watson 1998, A9.9), ‘de laude gloriosae uirginis’
• Austin Friars, London: Leland, c.1536–40 (Humphreys 1990, F24.13)
• Benedictines, Canterbury, Christ Church: List of books repaired, 1508 (James 1903, BC8.42) = Registrum Anglie, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.1)
• Benedictines, Canterbury, St Augustine’s: Catalogue, 15th cent. (Barker-Benfield 2008, BA1.807f)
• Benedictines, Gloucester: Registrum Anglie, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.1) = Leland, c.1536–40 (Sharpe et al. 1996, B49.9 ?= B47.18, anon.)
• Benedictines, Reading: Registrum Anglie, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.1)
• Benedictines, St Albans: Registrum Anglie, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.1)
• Benedictines, St Neots: Registrum Anglie, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.1)
• Benedictines, York St Mary’s: Index catalogue of selected authors, 15th cent. (Sharpe et al. 1996, B120.501)
• Brigittines, Syon: Registrum of the library of the Brethren, c.1500-c.1524 (Gillespie and Doyle 2001, SS1.449)
• ?Carthusians, Hinton: Registrum Anglie, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.1)
• Cistercians, Buildwas: Registrum Anglie, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.1) = Balliol College 39
• Oxford, Balliol College (Bale 1902, 26) = ?Balliol College 40
• Oxford, Magdalen College: Will of John Mower, 12 April 1489 (Thomson 2015, UO147.*2) = Magdalen College 149
• Richard Grafton (Bale 1902, 26)

Literature

Fulton (1996); Fulton (1998); Guglielmetti (2006, 306–7); Holdsworth (1996); Loewe (1966); McDonough (2004); Riedlinger (1958, 320–33)

De naturis rerum et super Ecclesiasten

Stegmüller (1950–1980), no. 1172

INc. book 1 Forma decens. admiratione dignis nature munifice dotata deliciis

Exp. book 1 Quid quod uesica carent?


Exp. book 2, prol. ut de aquis et ornatu ipsorum. pisces loquor agamus.

INc. book 2 Secundum uritatem doctrine aristotilice: omnes aque sunt indifferentes secundum speciem.

Exp. book 2 Samis quandoque uti persuadebit uoluptas. ut uariatis calicibus uariarentur et uina.

INc. book 3 Superfluo detinerer labore si species et uarietates uanitatum sufficienter exequi conarer.

Exp. book 3 Sed proloxitatis tedium subterfugere uolens: ad sequentia festino.

INc. book 4 Tenebre erant super faciem abissi. antequam abyssus abyssum inuocaret: in uoce catharactarum.

Exp. book 4 sed alius erit ipsius usus in gloria felicitatis eternae. ad quam nos perducat iesus cristus qui est benedictus in secula amen.

INc. book 5 Legentium mare timor remittitur. spes intenditur. augetur leticia. dum terram optatam letis intuentur aspectibus.

Exp. book 5 Et ecce iam nutu diuino nobile opus ecclesiastes exposuimus. gratiarum acciones uberrimas persoluentes deo omnium bonorum largitori. cui honor et gloria per infinita secula seculorum amen.

Manuscripts

• Cambridge, Trinity College, R.16.3 (951), fols 1ra–153rb (s. xiii
1)
• Cambridge, Trinity College, R.16.4 (952), fols 1ra–237rb (s. xiiex: Oseney, s. xv); capitula of books 1–5, fols ira-iii
b
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Rubric  Incipit opus magistri Alexandri de sancto Albano de naturis rerum

- Cambridge, Trinity College, O.4.1 (1232), fols 1ra–168rb (s. xiii: Barnwell)

Rubric  Incipit opus magistri Alexandri de sancto Albano De Naturis rerum.

- Cambridge, University Library, Kk.4.5, fols 146ra–239rb (s. xiv: Norwich)

Rubric  Magister Alexander de naturis rerum.

- Durham, Cathedral Library, Hunter 58
  a. fols 1r–3v, alphabetical index by Oliver de Wakefeld
  b. fols 30r–54r (s. xivmed), excerpts

- Durham, University Library, Routh I b 16, pastedown (s. xivim: formerly at Magdalen College), *De naturis rerum* 2.14/19 (Ker [1954] 2004, no. 279)

- London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. xii, fols 46ra–94vb (s. xiii: Eynsham), books 3–5 only, burnt (Watson 1969, 24, no. 29)

- London, British Library, Harley 3737, fols 2ra–255rb (s. xii/xiii: St Albans) (Thomson 1982, no. 24)

Rubric  Incipit opus magistri Alexandri de sancto Albano de naturis rerum.

- London, British Library, Royal 12 F. xiv, fols 3ra–134rb (s. xiii); text includes the additional chapter ‘De preuaricatione et penitentia Salomonis’ (fol. 134rb-vb), with a reference to it at 3.10 (fol. 74rb)

Rubric  De naturis rerum. Incipit opus magistri Alexandri de sancto Albano.

- London, British Library, Royal 12 G. xi (s. xv). Three leaves lost after fol. 57, six after fol. 167, and one at the end.
  a. fols 1r–3r, index
  b. fols 4ra–208rb (s. xv)

  Expl. per ignem. Estet/ (5.12)

- Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 45, fols 4ra–185vb (s. xiii: Reading)

Rubric  Explicit tractatus magistri Alexandri Necham super ecclesiasten de naturis rerum. (fol. 185vb)
• Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 245, fols 1ra–94vb (s. xv: Syon, later to John Dee, whose cypher is on fol. 1) (Roberts and Watson 1990, 18i, no. OM149)

exp. potest gratiam/ [5.5]

• Oxford, Magdalen College, 139, fols 1ra–135vb (s. xiii: Cirencester)

exp. latus cui preest/ [5.2]

• Oxford, St John’s College, 51, fols 1ra–170va (s. xiii); later belonged to Henry Savile (Watson 1969, 18, no. 9)

• Windsor, St George’s Chapel, Jackson Collection 32 (s. xiii\textsuperscript{t}), fragment

Excerpts in Sol meldunensis.

Records


• Austin Friars, London: Leland, c.1536–40 (Humphreys 1990, F24.5), ‘A. \Necham/ de S. Albano de naturis rerum’

• Austin Friars, York: Catalogue, 1382, with additions (Humphreys 1990, FA8.334)

• Benedictines, Bury: Henry de Kirkestede, Catalogus, c.1360 (Rouse and Rouse 2004, K4.1), ‘de naturis rerum’

• Benedictines, Canterbury, Christ Church: Prior Eastry’s catalogue, not after 1331 (James 1903, BC4.708a) = Registrum Anglie, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.2 = R42.6)

• Benedictines, Canterbury, Christ Church: Prior Eastry’s catalogue, not after 1331 (James 1903, BC4.738a) = Registrum Anglie, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.2 = R42.6)

• Benedictines, Canterbury, St Augustine’s: Catalogue, 15th cent. (Barker-Benfield 2008, BA1.866a–b), ‘Alexander Necquam de naturis rerum et in eodem libro idem alexander super ecclesiastem’

• Benedictines, Crowland: Select list, early 14th cent. (Sharpe et al. 1996, B24.72)

• Benedictines, Gloucester: Registrum Anglie, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.2)

• Benedictines, Goldcliff: Registrum Anglie, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.2 = R42.6)

• Benedictines, Reading: Registrum Anglie, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.2) = Corpus Christi College 45
• Benedictines, St Albans: *Registrum Anglie*, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.2) = Harley 3737
• Benedictines, Westminster (Robinson and James 1909, 32: no. 115)
• Brigittines, Syon: *Registrum of the library of the Brethren*, c.1500-c.1524 (Gillespie and Doyle 2001, SSt.154)
• Brigittines, Syon: *Registrum of the library of the Brethren*, c.1500-c.1524 (Gillespie and Doyle 2001, SSt.*870k), 'de naturis rerum' = Barlow 49; Corpus Christi College 245
• Cambridge, King's College (Bale 1902, 24)
• Cambridge, Queens' College: Inventory, 1472 (Clarke 2002, UC50.86), 'Alexander Nekkam de naturis rerum'
• Carmelites, London: Leland, c.1536–40 (Humphreys 1990, FC5.28), 'super Ecclesiasten Forma decens'
• ?Carthusians, Hinton: *Registrum Anglie*, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.6)
• Carthusians, Witham: *Registrum Anglie*, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.2)
• Cistercians, Bordesley: *Registrum Anglie*, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.2 = R42.6)
• Cistercians, Buildwas: *Registrum Anglie*, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.2 = R42.6)
• Dominicans, King's Lynn: Books bequeathed by Thomas Lexham, 1382 (Humphreys 1990, F19.31), 'idem super Ecclesiastem, Forma decens'
• Franciscans, London: Leland, c.1536–40 (Humphreys 1990, F7.5), 'Alexander Necham/ de s. Albano de naturis rerum'
• Oxford, Canterbury College: Inventory of Warden Edward Bocking, on entering office, 1510 (Pantin 1947, 1:46, no. 34)
• Oxford, Merton College: Inventory of books drawn up for the Marian commissioners, 1556 (Thomson 2015, UO68.179)
• Oxford, New College: Inventory of books in the library, c.1386 and later (Thomson 2015, UO70.34; Leach 1896, 224, no. 134)

Henry de Kirkestede, *Catalogus*, c.1360 (Rouse and Rouse 2004, K4.7), 'super ecclesiasten', has no additions to the *Registrum*. 
Editions

Wright (1863, 1–354: books 1–2 only); a full edition and translation is in preparation by Faith Wallis (McGill University).

Literature

Abramov (2003); Adams (1938); Alessio (1994); Berlioz and Polo de Beaulieu (1994); Brown (2013); F (1896); Fumagalli and Parodi (1985); Gaselee (1935–1937); Janson (1952); Kelly (1972); Larson (1913); Lippmann (1934); Meyer (1897); Milliman (2012); Ribémont (1995); Ribémont (2002); Schuler (2000); Schuler (2002); Talavera Esteso (1983); Talavera Esteso (1987); Tilliette (2005); Voorbij (2000); Wedge (1967); Wirtjes (1986); Wolfe (1931); Záhora (2007); Záhora (2014)

Cross-References

- Corrogationes Promethei (1.2: Wright 1863, 16)
- Expositio super cantica canticorum (1.2: Wright 1863, 16)
- Solatium fidelis anime (1.2: Wright 1863, 16)

De commendatione uini

RUBRIC TO EPISTLE Magister alexander Domino Thome abbati claudie.
INC. EPIST. Munus. set munusculum tibi mitto thoma
EXP. EPIST. Recreent. ut celicum sentias aroma
INC. BOOK 1 Cum (Dum Gg.6.42) corpus curas: studeas subducere curas
EXP. BOOK 1 Hoc michi solamen nunquam desit precor. Amen.
INC. BOOK 2 Rursus Bache tuas laudes describo libenter
EXP. BOOK 2 Cordi (exordi Gg.6.42) lingua meo dissona semper erit.
INC. BOOK 3 Nobilis est potus me iudice nobile uinum
EXP. BOOK 3 Ipse deus. perpes gloria. uera quies.

Manuscripts

- Cambridge, University Library, Gg.6.42, fols 224v–232r (s. xiii²med)
  
  TITLE Versus magistri alexandri nequam. de Vino.
- Madrid, Real Biblioteca, II.468, fols 179v–188v (s. xiv)
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 11867, fols 214va–215vb, 216va–217rb (s. xiii²)

Bale owned the Madrid manuscript (Bale 1902, 26).

Dating

Dedicated to Thomas Carbonel, abbot of Gloucester from 1179 until 1205. See the description of the work in Sol meldunensis (Gg.6.42) above in chapter 5, 'Poems on wine (fols 223r–232r)'.

Editions

Hochgürtel (2008); Esposito (1915, 452–56, excerpts from book 1); Walther (1965, 112–21, books 2–3)

Literature

Browne (1954); Kuijper (1966); Trombi (2003)

Meditatio de Magdalena

INC. Osculetur me osculo oris sui. [Song 1:1] Ad mensam spiritualis refectionis recumbente sapientia. uenerabilis uirtutum cetu stipata: pulsat ad ostium penitentia. causam aduentus ostiarie prudentie uidelicet. manifestans humiliter.

EXP. In celo cum cristo regnans: leta tuis nuntia. que in terris agens: leticie nuntia fuisti.

Manuscript

- Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.i.2, fols 131ra–42rb) (s. xiiiː Gloucester, 'Liber Thome de Bredone abbatis Gloucestrie' [1223–8])

TITLE Meditatio magistri Alexandri de magdalena.

Excerpts in Sol meldunensis, which refers to it as Tractatus super admirabili conuersione beatissime Magdalenes.

Records

- Bale (1902, 25)

Edition

Bestul (1999)
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Tractatus super Mulierem fortem

INC. BOOK 1 (MARY MAGDALENE) Mulierem fortem quis inueniet? Procul et de ultimis finibus pretium eius.


EXP. BOOK 1 Faueat ceptis sapientia. que in beata uirgine edificauit sibi domum decoris: septem gratie columnis munitam.


EXP. BOOK 2 Remuenerabor egregie: si pro me apud serenissimum iudicem digneris intercedere.


EXP. BOOK 3 Et ecce iam opus consummauimus in laudem domini nostri cui honor et gloria per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

INC. ENVOI Fortasse tuo liber superstes eris alexandro.

EXP. ENVOI pro me affectuose dominum exorabit ihesum cristum qui cum patre et spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat deus per infinita seculorum secula: Amen.

Manuscripts

- Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 528 (SC 2221), fols 1r–53v (s. xiii: Reading). Inscription and list of contents now a flyleaf (fol. i) in Bodleian, Auct. D.4.18 (SC 2094)
- Oxford, Jesus College, 94, fols 79ra–125ra (s. xiii in: Cirencester)


Records

- Augustinian Canons, Mottisfont: Henry de Kirkestede, Catalogus, c.1360 (Rouse and Rouse 2004, K4.5)
- Benedictines, Bury: Henry de Kirkestede, Catalogus, c.1360 (Rouse and Rouse 2004, K4.5)
- Benedictines, Dover, St Martin’s: John Whitfield’s catalogue, 1389 (Stoneman 1996, BM1.198b)
- Benedictines, Reading: Registrum Anglie, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.3) = Bodley 528
• Carthusians, Witham: *Registrum Anglie*, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.3)

**Edition**

Mahoney (1971, bk. 1 only)

**Cross-References**

- *Super cantica* (Jesus College 94, fol. 99vb)
- *Meditatio de Magdalena* (fol. 79ra)

**Tractatus super parabolas Salomonis**

Stegmüller (1950–1980), no. 1164

**Inc. Proem** Meditatio humana nunc in ipsum hominem reflectitur. nunc in ceteras transit creaturas: nunc in auctorem rerum dirigitur.

**Exp. Proem** Set quid? Apicula cum aculeo destitui ceperit: mellificare desinit.


**Exp.** [discussing Prov. 3:27] Ne audias a domino cum phariseis. Ipsi non introistis: et eos qui introibant prohibuistis.

**Manuscript**

- Oxford, Jesus College, 94, fols 57ra–74rb (s. xiiiin)

  **Title** Incipit tractatus magistri Alexandri abbatis cyrenc’ super parabolas salomonis.

Numerous excerpts in *Sol meldunensis* and a brief passage in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 102 (SC 4051), fol. 200v.

**Records**

- Augustinian Canons, Cirencester: Leland, c.1536–40 (Webber and Watson 1998, A9.*1*) = Jesus College, 94
- Dominicans, Lincoln: Leland, c.1536–40 (Humphreys 1990, FD5.1)
- Carmelites, Hulne: Catalogue, 1366 (Humphreys 1990, F15.1)
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Dating

Alexander had begun the work by the time he wrote Speculum speculationum 3.81.1 (fol. 68va): ‘Memini autem me aliqua proposuisse super hoc in ingressu tractatus quem institui super parabolas.’

Speculum speculationum

Inc. prol. Paradisum uoluptatis subdiuidit
Exp. prol. sub breui uerborum forma perstringantur.
Inc. text Si duo essent prima rerum principia
Exp. text libertati liberi arbitrii enucleande.

Manuscript

- London, British Library, Royal 7 F. i, fols 1ra–94ra (s. xiii)

Rubric Incipit speculum speculationum magistri Alexandri canonici Cirecestrie. (fol. 1ra)

Excerpts in Sol meldunensis: fols 7or, 143v.

Records


Dating

Written after 1201, as indicated by a quotation of Innocent III (Thomson 1988, ix). Presumably begun before Alexander became an abbot in 1213, as rubric on fol. 1ra names him a canon.

Edition

Thomson (1988)

Literature

Davenport (1997); Hudry (2011); Marrone (2004); Oguejiofor (1995, chap. 4)

Cross-References

- Gloss on the Psalter (1.32.2)
- Super cantica (4.6.1)
- Corrogationes Promethei (1.15.5, 3.13.3)
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- *De laudibus divinae sapientiae* (3.13.3)
- *De naturis rerum* (1.1: 1.prol.11; 3.5.2: 1.6: 3.13.3. 1.8: 2.1.6. 1.20: 2.13.4. 2.prol: 2.1.6)
- *Sacerdos ad altare* (3.1.3)
- Serm. 95 (1.3.3)
- *Super mulierem fortem* (1.2.10)
- *Suppletio defectuum* (3.82.2)
- *Commentarium in Parabolas* (1.2.10, 3.81.1)
- Verse (4.15.2)

Corrogationes novi Promethei

INC. MS: Induet abbatem qui plus optabit amari

as conjectured by Gärtner (2011): Quid decet abbatem qui plus optabit amari

EXP. (NOT MADE CLEAR IN MS; TWO POSSIBILITIES) Que candore caro lilia uincit erit. (line 1624)

delirus ridiculusque senex. (line 1630)

Manuscript

- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 11867 (s. xiii). two versions, one at fol. 216ra–va (lines 1–127 only, tit. ‘Incipiunt metrice corrogaciones noui Promothei’), the other at fols 231va–238ra (tit. ‘Incipiunt metrice prorogaciones noui Promothei’)

  a. fol. 216ra–va, lines 1–127

    **rubric** ‘Incipiunt metrice corrogaciones noui Promothei’ (fol. 216ra)

  b. fols 231va–8ra, lines 1–1622 (s. xiii)

    **rubric** ‘Incipiunt metrice prorogaciones noui Promothei’ (fol. 231va)


Five verse passages are quoted by Robert Holcot in his commentary on Proverbs that do not otherwise survive (Damon 1957).

Records


Dating

Refers to the death of William de Montibus in 1213 (Hunt 1984, 27; Goering 1992, 6–7); one manuscript refers to Alexander as a canon, but the text seems to have been finished after his journey to Rome (Wedge
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Edition
Cropp (1991)

Literature
Damon (1957); Gärtner (2011); Esposito (1915, 457–9); Walther (1962)

Laus sapientie diuine

INC. Gloria maiestas deitas sapientia uirtus
EXP. Cum sis ingenii gloria magna mei.

Manuscripts

- Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, 372 (621), fols 66r–140v (s. xv); text lacks 3.593–734 (fol. 92v)

rubric Incipit liber magistri Alexandri de laude diuine sapiencie
EXP. origo fuit/ [10.322]

- Cambridge, Trinity College, R.3.1 (580), fols 1ra–30v (s. xviii)

rubric Incipit liber magistri Alexandri abbatis Cirenestrie qui inscribitur Laus sapiende diuine
EXP. placere uiro/ [10.286]

- London, British Library, Royal 8 E. ix, fols 1r–88v (s. xvii; Merton priory); manuscript used by Wright (1863), which divides the work into ten rather than seven parts: no. 3 is the equivalent of 3.1 to 3.964; no. 4 of 3.965 to the end of 4; no. 5 = 5; no. 6 = 6–8; no. 7 = 9–10. See summary in Rigg (1992, 119).

- Madrid, Real Biblioteca, II.468, fols 30r–179v; 189r–203v (s. xiv)

- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 11866, fols 40r–87v (s. xvii); ends at 2.868

- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 11867, fols 189vb–214va (s. xiii2)

TITLE Incipit liber magistri Alexandri canonici cyrenecestrie qui inscribitur laus sapiencie diuine.

Records

- Bale (1902, 26) = Biblioteca de Palacio II.468
- Benedictines, Hyde: Leland, c.1536–40 (Sharpe et al. 1996, B51.1)
- Benedictines, Peterborough: Catalogue, late 14th cent. (Friis-Jensen and Willoughby 2001, BP21.301a)
- Benedictines, Reading (recorded in London, British Library, Harley 979, fol. 1v)

Edition

Wright (1863, 357–503); Berry (1978, bks 1, 2.1–216, 2.405–84, 4.252–435)

Literature

Covington (1925); Engelbrecht (2008); Gamboa Jiménez (1986); Haye (1997); Rigg (1982); Sharpe (1984)

Sacerdos ad altare

inc. Sacerdos ad altare accessurus
exp. clausus puscula muniatur.

inc. gloss Sacerdos ut dicit Priscianus est nomen compositum
exp. gloss ad ipsum finaliter tendere debemus.

Manuscript

- Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, 385 (605), pp. 7–61 (s. xiii)

Literature


Dating

Refers to Gerald of Wales, Gemma ecclesiastica, finished after 1201 (McDonough 2010, ix; Bartlett 1982, 218).

Edition

McDonough (2010)
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Literature

Copeland and Sluiter (2009); Copeland (2011); Gumbert (2011); Haskins (1909); Haskins (1927); Hunt (1991); Kantorowicz (1937); McDonough (2005); Záhora (2013)

Cross-References

- Laus sapientie divine
- Corrogationes Promethei
- Gloss on the Psalter
- De naturis rerum
- Commentary on the Song of Songs

Suppletio defectuum

INC. Ornatu uario mundus depingitur artis
EXP. Compositus finem principiumque tenet.

Manuscript

- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 11867, fol. 218va–31va (s. xiii²)

TITLE Incipit suppletio defectuum operis magistri Alexandri quod deseruit laudi sapiencie diviue.

Excerpt in Sol meldunensis (fol. 70v = 2.547–8); two quotations by Holcot (Damon 1957, 101–2).

Dating

Refers to death of King John (October 1216).

Editions

McDonough (1999, bk. 1); Hochgürtel (2008)

Literature

Bisanti (2005); McDonough (2001)

Hymns and Minor Verses

List in Hunt (1984, 141–45). To this should be added the hymn closing Sol meldunensis (Cambridge, University Library, Gg.6.42), De passione salvatoris (fol. 237r–v), beginning ‘Splendor patris. fons. sol. ares’:
see above, chapter 5.

Literature

Browne (1954); Esposito (1915); Hochgürtel (2008; cf. reviews in Gärtner 2009a; Thomson 2011); Kuijper (1966); Trombi (2003); Walther (1965)

Sermons


Manuscripts

- Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 217 (s. xiii: Worcester); contains nos. 1–2, 4–18, 21–2, 26–7, 29, 32–3, 35–6, 41–2, (96); two further sermons rejected by Hunt (1984, 151): Cum immundus spiritus (fol. 134v–135r) and Veni sancte spiritus (fol. 120r)

- Cambridge, Peterhouse, 255, fols 157vb–158rb; 159rb–vb; 169ra–170va; 171va–173vb (s. xiii). Contains nos. 2, 4, 8, 18, 37, 81–6, (97). The folios appear to have been renumbered since the publication of the catalogue (which Hunt reproduces).

  - 157vb: Que est ista que ascendit de deserto ... Spicas licet legere post manus messorum booz, et mel cum sumitate urige Ionathe degustare. ... [158rb] ... sequatur et massa. Quod nobis p. dig. qui ui. et r.
  - 159rb: Dulce est lumen et desiderabile est oculis uidere solem. Qui detmentur lucto doloris appropinquante die saltem aliquo reficuntur solatio ... [159vb] ... ad hanc uisionem ad hanc comprehensionem perducat nos ille qui est uera lux. Qui cum patre et spiritu sancto ui. et r.
  - 169ra: Debilitata est fortitudo portantis, et nimia est humus, et nos non poterimus edificare murum. Viri fratres portare debetis alter alterius onera, ut quilibet uirum alii compaciatur. ... [169va] ... expellat et desiderium celeste uobis conferre dignetur. Qui cum patre et filio et spiritu sancto, etc.
  - 169va: In quadragesima. Operamini opus uestrum ante tempus, et dabit uobis mercedem uestram in tempore suo. Vt sciretis et intelligeretis, quod sit opus uestrum, opus hominum, opus christianorum. ... [170va] ... qui obediens fuit usque ad mortem, ut cum eo in celeste regum feliciter permanere possitis, ipso aduante qui u. et r.
  - 171ra: Cantate domino can. no. quia mi. fecit. Fratres sanctus Dauid prophetarum maximus nos ... [171va] reuelet in maiestate sua. Vt sum intermissione ei canticum nouum cum sanctis cantare possimus, quod n. p.
• Cambridge, University Library, ii.1.24, fols 123ra–7va, 140rb–2vb: rejected by Hunt (1984, 22, 151); also contains no. 28: fols 141r–142vb

• Canterbury, Cathedral Library, Lit. B. 13 (57, iii), fols 47ra–71rb (s. xiii: Christ Church, Canterbury). Contains nos. 1–3, 7, 18, 24, 27, 39, (103), (104) and a letter from Walter de Melida (see above, 'Walter’s edition of Alexander’s sermons’)

• Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.i.2, fols 147v–149r (s. xiii: Gloucester). Contains no. 98 only. See Hunt (1984, 146)

• Lambeth, Palace Library, 481, fols 88r–91r (s. xiii); contains nos. 31–33

• Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 102 (SC 4051), fols 135r–v, 201r–v (s. xiii: Hereford, Franciscans); contains excerpts from nos. 8, (99)–(101)

• Oxford, Bodleian Library, Lyell 8, fol. 119va–vb (s. xiii: Cistercians, Fountains); contains no. 16

• Oxford, Bodleian Library, Wood empt. 13 (SC 8601) (s. xiii: owned by St Augustine’s, Canterbury)

• Oxford, Merton College, 180, fols 159rb–62vb (s. xiii); contains nos. 2, 11, 13, (10S)–(104)

Records

• Augustinian Canons, Lanthony: Catalogue, late 14th cent. (Webber and Watson 1998, A16.*229z) = Lambeth 481


• Augustinian Canons, Leicester: Catalogue, 15th cent. (Webber and Watson 1998, A20.469a)

• Benedictines, Bury: Henry de Kirkestede, Catalogus, c.1360 (Rouse and Rouse 2004, K.4.17), ‘de annunciatione sermones 6’

• Benedictines, Canterbury, St Augustine’s: Catalogue, 15th cent. (Barker-Benfield 2008, BA1.1575c)

• Benedictines, Canterbury, St Augustine’s: Catalogue, 15th cent. (Barker-Benfield 2008, BA1.*675) = Wood empt. 13

• Benedictines, Canterbury-Christ Church: Prior Eastry’s catalogue, not after 1331 (James 1903, BC.4.994 = Canterbury, Lit. B. 13 (57, iii)

• Benedictines, Crowland: Select list, early 14th cent. (Sharpe et al. 1996, B2.4.95)

• Benedictines, Peterborough: Catalogue, late 14th cent. (Friis-Jensen and Willoughby 2001, BP21.104g), ‘decem sermones Alexandri Nekham’

• Benedictines, Peterborough: Catalogue, late 14th cent. (Friis-Jensen and Willoughby 2001, BP21.89a)

• Benedictines, Peterborough: Catalogue, late 14th cent. (Friis-Jensen and Willoughby 2001, BP21.90g, BP21.92e,k)
• Benedictines, St Albans: *Registrum Anglie*, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.9)

Literature
Russell (1932); Thomas (2014)

Lost Works

*De nuptiis Mercurii*

*Epistola magistri Alexandri ad quemdam discipulum*

**inc.** Sibi predilecto quondam discipulo

Manuscript

• Oxford, Magdalen College, 168, fol. 51r, no. 28 (reference in table of contents, but leaf removed: see Hunt 1984, 153).

*Passio sancti Albani*

All that survives is one couplet in the *Distinctiones Monastice* (Hunt 1984, 28).

Collections

Geoffrey Brito, *Sol meldunensis*

Manuscript

• Cambridge, University Library, Gg.6.42 (1246–60, Cirencester)

Literature

Binski and Zutshi (2011); Bisanti (2002); Bisanti (2010); Braunholtz (1927); Cropp (1991); DiTommaso (2008); Esposito (1915); Ferruolo (1985); Froehner (1862); Reeve (2007); Hunt (1984, 147); Hochgürtel (2008); Hunt (1991); Klein (1998); McDonough (2004); McDonough (2005); Öberg (1965); Rigg (1977); Russell (1932); Wilmart (1938); Wollin (1998)

Madrid Anthology


Manuscript

- Madrid, Real Biblioteca, II.468 (s. xiv)

Paris Anthology


Manuscript

- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 11867 (s. xiii²)

Literature

Damon (1957); Hampe (1898); Öberg (1965); Saxer (1976); Shooner (1981)

Spurious Attributions

The following is an update of the list Hunt made for his thesis (R. Hunt 1936a, 176–84 in his annotated copy, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hunt 102; based on Esposito 1915, 464–69), most of which was omitted from the published version.

Commentary on Ecloga Theoduli

See McDonough (2008); Quinn (1971).

Concordantiae bibliorum

inc. Primus liber agit de his que per(tinent)
Attributed to Alexander by Leland and Hall (1709, 1:242) and Bale (1902, 27). The work has also been attributed to Robert Holcot (Stegmüller 1950–1980, no. 7410).

**Correctiones biblie**

** INC.** Pupplica collegi cupiens prodesse pusillis

Attributed to Alexander in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 460 (also includes a version of Corrogationes Promethei), fol. 1r, by a sixteenth-century hand. It cannot be his work, as Alexander himself is quoted (e.g. at fol. 9r and 11r). Leland, visiting the Carmelites at London, listed 'Alexander Necham super correctiones Bibliae' (Humphreys 1990, FC5.27). Attributed to Robert Grosseteste in Canterbury, Cathedral Library, Lit. D. 16 (58); anonymous in Oxford, Merton College, 234.

**Cur filius incarnatur**

** INC.** (Kirkestede) Operis

(Bale 1557–1559, 1:273) Operis immensi quoniam Deus

Attributed to Alexander in Henry de Kirkestede, Catalogus, c.1360 (Rouse and Rouse 2004, K4.15), 'Cur Deus homo, uel cur Filius incarnatus tract. 1': *Mariale* fol. 23r. Unidentified.

**De desponsatione beatae Mariae**


**De natiuitate beatae Mariae**

** INC.** [Kirkestede] Egredietur

(Bale 1557–1559, 1:273) Egredietur uirga de radice


**De fide spe et caritate**

This may be part of Hugh of St Victor’s *Summa sententiæarum*, sometimes known by this name (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, 191). Attributed to Alexander in two sources:

- Benedictines, Peterborough: Catalogue, late 14th cent. (Friis-Jensen and Willoughby 2001, BP21.112a), ‘tractatus A. N. de tribus uir(u)bus anime’
- Benedictines, Reading: *Registrum Anglie*, early 14th cent. (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.4) = Henry de Kirkestede, Catalogus, c.1360 (Rouse and Rouse 2004, K4.8)


**De humilitatis gradibus**

INC. Augustinus: uera humilitas est nullis

Attributed to Alexander in Bale (1902, 24); the work is unknown. The quotation appears to be a modification of Prosper of Aquitane, *Liber sententiarum* 83: 'Vera fidelium humilitas est'.

**De praeceptis decalogi**

Listed 'ex registro librorum Glasconiensis monasterii' by Bale (1902, 513). Unidentified.

**De professione monachorum**

A manuscript is recorded at Glastonbury in the fourteenth century (Carley and Coughlan 1981, 502). Unidentified.

**De puritate Marie**


**De rebus creatis in specie**


**De uirtutibus**

Listed by Bale, from the Benedictines at Glastonbury c.1550 (Sharpe et al. 1996, B45.7). May be the same as *De fide spe et caritate*.

**De uita Cristi**

INC. Desere nunc anima lectulum soporis

The author identifies himself as 'Alexander peccator', leading to a suggestion that this might be Alexander Neckam in the description for Cambridge, University Library, Ee.6.28 (Hardwick and Luard 1856–1867, 2:269: 'Are not many of the other pieces ascribable to him?'). Called *Meditacio bona de vita Salvatoris* in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 537, fol. 32v; printed in Trench (1886, 136–37: no. 21).
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De uita monachorum / De uita monastica

Walther (1969), no. 15778

INC. Quid debeat monachum uel qualis debeat esse

Attributed to Alexander by Leland ([1715] 1774, 4:31), and printed under his name in an edition by Wright (1872, 2:175–200). The work’s authorship is not known; it was often attributed to Anselm of Canterbury (as PL 158:687-706).

This may be the same as the De officio monachorum noted in a Glastonbury catalogue (Bale 1902, 513; Bale 1557–1559, 1:273).

Dictionarius metricus / Duodecim decades

INC. Olla patella tripes coclear lanx fuscina cratis

EXP. Allux articulus calx tallus tibia poples.

‘Explicit Alexander Nequam’ found in Metz, Bibliothèque municipale, 169 (s. xv: destroyed in 1944); probably the work of John of Garland (Paetow 1927, 132–33).

Distinctiones uerborum

INC. Amor est appetitus rei propter se

Attributed to Alexander by Bale (1902, 24). R. Hunt (1936a) lists the following manuscripts:

- Oxford, Balliol College, 230, fols 122va–vb (s. xiii²)
- Oxford, Bodleian Library, Greaves 53 (SC 3825), fols 13ra–21rb (s. xiii²); a seventeenth-century hand adds, ‘Distinctiones Alex. Nequam, ut videtur.’
- Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 101 (SC 4048), pp. 333–344 (s. xiii²)

Exhortatio ad religiosos

INC. Tedia nulla chori tibi sint

A work by Serlo of Wilton, Exhortatio bona ad religiosos (Öberg 1965, 159–62). Attributed to Alexander by Bale (1902, 27), based on his manuscript now in Madrid, fols 8r–9v (not challenged by Hunt 1984, 54, 146).

Exorcismus siue Baptisterium / Super exorcismo baptismi

Expositio de anima

INC. Interrogasti me honoret te deus

Bale (1902, 27, cf. 478); a commentary on Aristotle’s De anima by Alexander of Alexandria, according to Glorieux (1971, 81, no. 19b).

Festiuale

Attributed to Alexander by Henry de Kirkestede, Catalogus, c.1360 (Rouse and Rouse 2004, K4.16), ‘Liber qui dicitur Festiuale’: Mariæ fol. 2r. Leland ([1715] 1774, 1:243) associated this with the text of this name by Alexander of Ashby.

Historia britonum versificata


Hymnarium glosatum

The catalogue of Peterborough Abbey lists a ‘Ympnarius glosatus secundum Alexandrum Nekham’ (Friis-Jensen and Willoughby 2001, BP21.220h); Hunt suggests this was from a conjunction of a glossed hymnary with De utensilibus, as London, British Library, Harley 683, fols 38r–54v and 55r–62v.

In metamorphosin Ouidii

Bale (1557–1559, 1:272); Esposito (1915, 469) suggests that this was the commentary of Pierre Bersuire, sometimes pared with the Mythographus tertius.

Lectiones scripturarum

Bale (1557–1559, 1:272); unidentified.

Magnum doctrinale

The 1382 catalogue of the York Austin Friars provides an entry ‘Magnum doctrinale Alexandri Nequam’; this is presumably the work of his contemporary, Alexander of Villa Dei (Humphreys 1990, FA8.480a).

Moralia super Evangelia/Moralia euangeliorum

INC. Intentioni quator euangelistarum
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Mythographus tertius

INC. Fuit uir in Egypto nomine Sirophanes
EXP. proinde pingitur semihomo semiequus.

Attributed to Alexander in several manuscripts; see Esposito (1915, 466–68). Leland and Bale also attribute a ‘Mythologicon’ or ‘Mithologiam’ to him, visiting the Franciscans at Reading (Humphreys 1990, F10.†3, F10.†41). Robert Holcot quotes ‘Alexander Nequam in scintillario poetarium’ (Ryter 1586, 540). This may be the work Bale describes as De fabulis poetarum, and might have been attributed to Alexander through confusion with his commentary on Martianus (Hunt 1984, 21). Alberic of London is likely responsible for at least one recension of the text (identified by Rathbone 1941; disputed by Burnett 1981).

Regule theologice

INC. Omnis scientia suis nititur regulis

A work by Alan of Lille. Also called Regule in theologiam and Exposiciones rerum theologicarum. Attributed to Alexander by a sixteenth-century hand in Cambridge, University Library, Gg.1.5, fol. 113r: ‘Regulae Theologiae, Alexandro Nequam (ut uidetur) autore’ (cf. Hardwick and Luard 1856–1867, 3:18); the Registrum also lists a ‘Regule super theologiam’ as belonging to the Cistercians at Buildwas and Merevale, as well as the Cluniacs at Wenlock (Mynors, Rouse, and Rouse 1991, R42.7).

Repertorium uocabulorum

INC. PROL. Licet nonnulli circa uocabula biblie
INC. TEXT Abba secundum Papiam

Attributed to Alexander by Bale (1902, 25). R. Hunt (1936a) argues that the work is by a regular canon, but that it cannot be Alexander because it uses a later system of biblical references, and a citation of Balbus, Catholicon shows that it is a much later work. List of manuscripts in Thomson and Wilson (2009, 13).

Sermons

Many sermons attributed to Alexander are not his work: see Hunt (1984, 150–53).

Super Aue maris stella

Schneyer (1969–1990), nos. 81–86
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Inc. prol. Petisti amice in Cristo michi dilecte

Exp. prol. et laudantibus iocunda.

Inc. text ‘Aue maris stella’. In hoc uersu continetur laus uirginis quadripartita

Exp. text et sic uidentes semper colletemur.

Attributed to Alexander in Durham, Cathedral Library, B.IV.30, fols 1r–12r (s. xiv): ‘Sermones VI siue tractatus Alexandri Necham super Aue maris stella’ (rubric, fol. 1). Cambridge, Peterhouse, MS 255 (s. xiii), which also contains some sermons of Alexander and is the only witness to the prologue, is anonymous; as is Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 410 Helmst. (445). London, British Library, Royal 8 A. x, fols 36r–53v (c.1300), an expanded text, is attributed to Stephen Langton (Lacombe and Smalley 1930, 185).

Super Ezechielem


Super utrumque testamentum

Inc. In precedentibus premissa descriptione originis et distinctionis artium

Attributed to Alexander by Bale (1902, 26), omitting ‘in precedentibus’. Found under the name of Peter Comestor in Cambridge, University Library, Dd.1.16 (Hardwick and Luard 1856–1867, 1:15); transmitted with the Scholastica historia in Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 39.1 Aug. 2º, where it is entitled Allegoriae super hystorias.
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Manuscripts from Cirencester

Most of Cirencester’s manuscripts have been identified through the specific colophons found in many books; the directory below collects and augments earlier handlists1 and modern catalogues,2 checked against the originals wherever possible. It should be noted that the ‘Liber sancte Marie de Cirecestr’ inscriptions are all written in the same hand (possibly that of Walter de Melida), and have been added at the same time, rather than when the manuscripts were first produced.

1. Cambridge, Pembroke College, 30 (s. xiii 1/4, matches style of Oxford, Magdalen College, 139 and Jesus College, 94, with corrections that appear to be by Walter de Melida; owned by Bury St Edmunds)

FOLS 1R–149R Robert of Cricklade, Homilie super Ezechielem (inc. ‘Sanctissimus pontifex et papa gregorius’)

2. Cambridge, University Library, Gg.6.42 (1246–60; copied in part from Oxford, Jesus College, 94)

FOLS 3R–212V Alexander Neckam ‘florilegium’ (inc. ‘Sol meldunensis’)

FOLS 213V–222R Geoffrey of Monmouth, Prophetia Merlini/De gestis Britonum 110–117 (‘Coegit me alexander ... et sonitum inter sidera coficient.’)

---
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Fols 223r–237v  Verse anthology, including poems on wine by Peter of Blois, Robert de Beaufeux, Alexander Neckam; Nouus Auianus; see above, chap. 5, ‘The verse ‘anthology’ (gatherings 23–24, fols 223–237)’

3. Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.i.3 (s. xii; fol. 2r, ‘Liber ecclesie sancte Marie de Cyrencestr’)

Fols 3r–68r  Gregory the Great, Regula pastoralis (inc. ‘Pastoralis curæ me pondéra fugere delitescendo voluisset: benigna frater karissime’)
Fols 69r–118v  Palladius of Galatia, Historia Lausiaca (inc. ‘In hoc libro quem de uita sanctorum patrum scripturi sumus: descripta est’)
Fols 118v–127r  Autpert Ambrose, Libellus de conflictu uiitorum atque uirtutum (‘Liber de conflictu uiitorum et uirtutum beati pape Leonis. Apostolica uox clamat per orbem’)

4. Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.i.6 (1131–49; fol. 89v, ‘Hunc librum D’ Iocelinus canonici dedit deo et ecclesie beate Marie de Cyrecestre, D’ Serlone ibidem tunc Abbate primo.’)

Fols 1r–41v  Julian of Toledo, Prognosticorum futuri saeculi libri tres (inc. ‘Sanctissimo ac pre çeteris familiarissimo michi domino idalio’)
Fols 41v–43r  Idalius of Barcelona, Epistula 1, to Julian (inc. ‘Sanctissimo et pre çeteris peculiari domino iuliano’)
Fol. 43r–v  ?Anselm of Canterbury, Sententia de motione altaris (inc. ‘Quod de altari et de ecclesia quesiquistis’)
Fols 43v–70v  Sermons of Caesarius of Arles and Eusebius ‘Gallicanus’ (inc. ‘Dominis sanctis et in christo desiderandis fratribus in blagiacensi monasterio constitutis’)
Fols 70v–76r  Gerlandus, De abaco (inc. ‘Nonnullis arbitrantibus multiplicantoci diuidendique scientiam’)
Fol. 76r  Note on use of a fraction table (inc. ‘Habet iste triangulos ex omni latere’)
Fol. 76r  First commentary on Gerbert, De abaco, 2.2 (inc. ‘Qui et quare sint digitii. Digitii autem nuncupantur minores numeri’)
Fols 76r–78r  Regulae rithmimachiae (inc. ‘Quinque genera inequalitatis regulam ex equalitate’)

4 Mynors and Thomson, Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Hereford Cathedral Library, 7; on the collection, see Lisa Kaaren Bailey, Christianity’s Quiet Success: The Eusebius Gallicanus Sermon Collection and the Power of the Church in Late Antique Gaul (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010).
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FOL. 78R Verses on the names of Arabic numerals (inc. ‘Ordine primigeno nomen iam possidet igin’)

FOL. 78V Diagrams demonstrating the use of an abacus

FOLS 79R–89R Miscellany of extracts on the cloistered life

5. Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.i.10 (1131–49; fol. 98v, ‘Hunc librum D’ Iocelinus canonicus dedit deo et ecclesie beate Marie de Cyrencestr’, D’ Serlone ibidem tunc Abbate primo.)

FOLS 91R–98R Gregory the Great, Dialogorum libri iv (inc. ‘Quadam die nimis quorundam secularium tumultibus depressus’)

6. Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.ii.4 (s. xii; fol. i, ‘Liber magistri Aluredi’, as Oxford, Jesus College, 26 and Oxford, All Souls College, 82)

FOLS 91R–152R Gilbert de la Porrée, Commentaria in Epistulas s. Pauli, ‘Glossa media’ (inc. ‘Sicut prophete post legem … Paulus. More scribentium epistulas’)

7. Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.iii.10 (s. xii; apparently the author’s working copy of the text, produced at St Frideswide’s, Oxford: the prologue, fol. 1r, includes the line ‘Ego autem Robertus cricheladensis. omnium hominum minimus. prior ecclesie sancte frideswide oxenefordie’, written over an erasure, and refers to ‘Reinalde prior de Gresileia’, i.e. Reginald, prior of Church Gresley, recorded in documents from 1151–1157 and 1170; the manuscript can likely be assumed as having later belonged to Cirencester through its ownership by John Prise, a record of this work by Leland, and the integration of the corrections to this copy with Cambridge, Pembroke College, 30)

FOLS 91R–217V Robert of Cricklade, Homilie super Ezechielem (inc. ‘Sanctissimus pontifex et papa Gregorius uere ue\ne/randus et admirabilis doctor’)

8. Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.xi.10 (1147–76; fol. iir, ‘(L)iber sancte Marie de Cirecestr’. D’ Andree abbatis secundi tempore scriptus per manum D’ Serlonis canonici D’ Gilleberto primo tunc Cantore;)

FOLS 91R–160R John Cassian, Collationes 11–24 (inc. ‘Cum uirtutem perfectionis uestrę’)


9 List in Mynors and Thomson, Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Hereford Cathedral Library, 7–8.


11 Knowles et al., Heads of Religious Houses, 1:159, 1:278.

9. Hereford, Cathedral Library, Ov.14 (1149–76; fol. 146v, 'Liber sancte Marie de Cirecestr'. D' Andree abbatis secundi tempore scriptus per manum D' Odonis canonici D' Adam de la More tunc cantore.'); a variant on a standard collection of sermons attributed to John Chrysostom.¹³

FOLS 1r–21v John Chrysostom, De compunctione cordis (inc. 'Cum te intueor beate demetri')
FOLS 21v–35v John Chrysostom, Quod nemo laeditur nisi a se ipso (inc. 'Scio quod crassioribus')
FOLS 35v–59r John Chrysostom, De reparatione lapsi (inc. 'Quis dabit capiti meo aquam')
FOLS 59r–75r John Chrysostom, De psalmo quinquagesimo (inc. 'Pictores imitantur arte naturam')
FOLS 75r–85r John Chrysostom, De confessione et penitentia peccati (inc. 'Videte frater karissime superiore die dominico')
FOLS 85r–88r John Chrysostom, De elemosinis (inc. 'Tria sunt que in misericordie opere optanda')
FOLS 88r–89v John Chrysostom, De expulsione sua (inc. 'Multi quidem fluctus est unde'
FOLS 89v–90v John Chrysostom, De regressione sua ('Incipit sermo eius cum regressus est. Quid dicam? Quid loquar? Benedictus deus')
FOLS 90v–93r John Chrysostom, Sermo quando reedit ex Asia (inc. 'Moyses magnus illae dei famulus')
FOLS 93r–98v John Chrysostom, De cena domini (inc. 'Paucis hodie necessarium est')
FOLS 98v–104v John Chrysostom, De passione domini (inc. 'Hodierna die noster dominus perpendit in cruce')
FOLS 104v–108r John Chrysostom, De cruce domini extra ciuitatem (inc. 'Quid dicam? Quid loquar? Quid ubis nomen imponam')
FOLS 108r–114r John Chrysostom, De ascensione domini (inc. 'Quando de cruce nostra processit oratio')
FOLS 114r–119r John Chrysostom, De decollatione s. Iohannis Baptistae ('Incipit sancti iohannis de muliere mala. Heu me quid agam?')
FOLS 119r–146r John Chrysostom, De laudibus beati Pauli apostoli, serm. 1–7 (inc. 'Domino sancto euangelo presbitero anianus. Recenti experimento didici quam snit utilia')

10. Hereford, Cathedral Library, Ov.i.10 (1131–49; fol. ir, 'Liber sancte Marie de Cirecestr’ abbatis primi Serlonis tempore scriptus per manum D’ Ade postea abbatis inceptus D’ Gilberto primo tunc Cantore.')

FOLS 1r–100r Augustine, De Genesi ad litteram (inc. 'Omnis diuina scriptura bipertita est')
FOLS 100r–113r Augustine, De praedestinatione sanctorum (inc. 'Dixisse apostolum scimus')
FOLS 113r–127v Augustine, De dono perseverantiae (inc. 'Iam de perseverantia diligentius disputandum est')

11. Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.i.12 (1131–49; fol. ir, 'Liber sancte Marie de Cirecestr', abbatis primi
Serlonis tempore scriptus per manus canonicorum Deodati et Fulconis postea prioris sub Gilberto
primo tunc cantore.)

FOLS 1R–45R Augustine, *Enchiridion* (inc. ‘Dici non potest dilectissime fili laurenti’)

FOLS 46R–118R Augustine, *In Iohannis epistulam ad Parthos tractatus* (‘Aurelii Augustini liber de caritate
incipit. In hoc volumine continetur Aurelii Augustini in epistola s. Iohannis apostoli omelię decem.
Meminit sanctitas uestra’)

12. Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.i.17 (s. xii–xiii; fol. ir, ‘Liber ecclesie beate Marie Cirecestr’; possibly a
later addition to the library, since the last three words are written over an erasure in a fifteenth-century
hand)

FOLS 1R–103R Aldhelm, prose *De virginitate* (inc. ‘Reuerentissimis cristi uirginibus’)

FOLS 104R–110V Ailred of Rievaulx, *De institutione inclusarum* (inc. ‘Iam pluribus exigis a me soror’)

FOLS 112R–149V Bernard of Cluny, *De contemptu mundi* (inc. ‘Domino et patri suo P’)

abbatis secundi tempore per manum D’ Symonis /Cornubiensis/ canonici scriptus D’ Adam de la
Mora tunc cantore.’)

FOLS 1R–78R Augustine, *De baptismo contra Donatistas* (inc. ‘In libris quos aduersus epistolam
parmenian’)

FOLS 78V–129V Augustine, *De baptismo paruulorum* (inc. ‘Quamui in mediis et magis curarum
estibus’)

FOLS 129V–139V Augustine, *De unico baptismo* (inc. ‘Respondere diuersa sentientibus’)

14. Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.ii.15 (s. xii; fol. ir, ‘Liber ecclesie sancte Marie de Cyrencestr’)

FOLS 1R–146V Ivo of Chartres, *Epistolae* (inc. ‘Vranus episcopus ... Nos quidem tum pro beate
Marie semper urginis’)

FOLS 147R–161R Fulbert of Chartres, *Epistolae*14


15. Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.iii.7 (1147–1176, or after 1168 if the canon Alexander mentioned in the
Oseney Abbey cartulary can be identified with that mentioned here;15 fol. ir, ‘(L)iber sancte Marie de
Cirecestr’. D’ Andree Abbatis secundi eiusdem ecclesie tempore scriptus per manum D’ Fulconis
postea prioris D’ Alexandro de Weleu tunc cantore.’)


Augustine, collection of twenty-five sermons: 60, 36, 38, 2, 22, 170, 348, 91, 341, app. 65, 382, 13, 365, 15, 48, 49, 147, 151, 349, 85, 92, 94, 107, 393, 347 (inc. 'Omnis homo in tribulatione'); this is possibly what Registrum 1.151 and 1.294, 'Omelie' and 'Sermones', refer to, but it also has separate entries for sermons. 60 and 393, which are part of this collection

'Omelia in ueteri testamento et nouo': most by Caesarius (inc. 'Sicut dicit evangeliista abstinuuisse dominum'); a standard collection usually known as 'Collectio biblica de mysteriis ueteris testamenti (B)'

Augustine, De Genesi contra Manicheos (inc. 'Si eligerent manichei quos decipere')

Robert of Cricklade, De connubio patriarche Iacob (inc. 'Domino et amico uere uenerabili fratri laurantio monacho winchelcumbensi')

Hugh of St Victor, De sacramentis christianae fidei (inc. 'Magne sunt in scripturis sacris spiritualium sensuum profunditates.')

Hereford, Cathedral Library, Piv.8 (s. xiiª; fol. 1r, 'Liber ecclesie sancte Marie Cyrencestr'.)

Hereford, Cathedral Library, Piv.9 (s. xiiª; fol. iv, 'Liber Ecclesie Sancte Marie de Cyrencestr'.)

Hereford, Cathedral Library, Piv.3 (1131–49; fol. iir, 'Liber sancte Marie de Cirecestr’ abbatis primi Serlonis tempore scriptus per manum canoniconorum D’ Ade postea abbatis et Fulconis postremo prioris sub Gilberto tunc Cantore primo.’)

Hereford, Cathedral Library, Piv.4 (1147–76; fol. ir, '(L)iber sancte Marie de Cirecestr’ D’ Andree abbatis secundi tempore scriptus per manum D’ Fulconis canonici postea prioris D’ Adam de la Mora tunc Cantore.’)

Hereford, Cathedral Library, Piv.9 (s. xiiiª; fol. ii, ‘Hunc librum habuimus de Magistro Nicholas de Preston’ una cum v. marcis in recompensacione cuiusdam debiti, et unam cuppam deauratam ponderis sex marcarum que est in sacristaria.’)

Notes and memorial verses on canons

Pseudo-Augustine, De spiritu et anima (inc. 'Quoniam dictum est michi ut me ipsum cognoscam')

De septem uitiis requirendis in confessione (inc. 'Vicium est actus interior uel exterior debito fine priuatus')
FOLS 12V–19V William of Auvergne, *De claustro animae* (inc. ‘Ortus conclusus soror mea ... Istud ad uniuersalem ecclesiam’)


FOLS 37R–47V Hugh of Fouilloy, *De claustro animae* (‘Exceptiones ex tractatu magistri huginis de .xi. abusionibus claustri. Locuturus de hiis que ad edificationem claustri multa pertinent’)

FOLS 48V–65V Augustine, *Enchiridion* (inc. ‘Dici non potest diletissime fili laurenti’)

FOLS 66R–73R Augustine, *De bono coniugali* (inc. ‘Quoniam unusquisque homo’)

FOLS 73R–84R Augustine, *De adulterinis coniugis* (inc. ‘Prima questio est frater diletissime pollenti’)

FOLS 84R–94V Augustine, *De sancta uirginitate* (inc. ‘Librum de bono coniugali’)  

FOLS 95R–119V Augustine, *Retractiones* (inc. ‘Iam diu istud facere cogito’)

FOLS 119V–133R Augustine, *De gratia noui testamenti* (inc. ‘Quinque michi proposuisti’)

FOLS 133R–142V Augustine, *De utilitate credendi* (inc. ‘Si michi honorate unum’)

FOLS 143R–169V Augustine, *De baptismo paruuolorum* (inc. ‘Quamuis in mediis et magnis’)

FOLS 170R–172R *Interrogationes biblice* (inc. ‘Quid est quod in libro Exodi legitur’)

FOLS 172R–181V Augustine, *De gratia et libero arbitrio* (inc. ‘Propter eos qui liberum hominis arbitrium’)

FOLS 182R–195R Augustine, *De spiritu et littera* (inc. ‘Lectis opusculis que ad te nuper’)

FOL. 195R Augustine, *De pastoribus/sermon 46* (inc. ‘Spes tota nostra quia in cristo’)

FOLS 195V–210V Augustine, *De uera religione* (inc. ‘Cum omnis uite bone ac beate’)

FOLS 211R–216R Augustine, *De bono uiduitatis* (inc. ‘Ne petitioni tue’)

FOLS 217R–220V Autpert Ambrose, *Libellus de conflictu uitiorum atque uirtutum* (inc. ‘Apostolica uox clamat per orbem’)


FOLS 2R–356V Alan of Tewkesbury, *Collectio epistolaram sancti Thome Cantuariensis*16


FOLS 2R–130V Pseudo-Isidore Mercator, *Decretales*, excerpts (‘Clemens iacobus in ea epistula. Notum tibi facio. Symon petrus in ipsis diebus quibus uitę finem sibi imminere presensit. ... et executionis suę instantia ad effectum quę fuerint iudicata perducat;’)17


17 Lotte Kéry, *Canonical Collections of the Early Middle Ages* (ca. 400-1140): A Bibliographical Guide to the Manuscripts and Literature,
23. London, British Library, Royal 3 A. XII (1147–76, or after 1168 as Hereford P.iii.7; fol. 15, ‘(L)iber sancte Marie de Cirecestre’. D’ Andree Abbatis secundi tempore scriptus per manum D’ Fulconis canonici postea prioris D’ Alexandro de Weleue tunc Cantore.’)\textsuperscript{18}

FOLs 1r–106v Bede, \textit{In Ezram et Neemiam libri iii} (inc. ‘Cunctis legentibus liquet domum siue templum domini’)

24. London, British Library, Royal 5 E. xviii (s. xvii; ‘Cirenestrie’ written at top of fols 5r, 40r, 50r, 72r, 92r, 102r)

FOLs IV–IV Accounts of tithes, 16th cent.

FOL 5r–6r Isidore of Seville, \textit{Epistula ad Massonem episcopum de lapsis} (inc. ‘Veniente ad nos famulo uestro uiro religioso nicetio.’)

FOLs 6v–8r Isidore of Seville, \textit{Sententiae} (inc. ‘Quod deus summus et incommutabilis sit.’)

FOLs 8v–9v Quodduultdeus, \textit{Aduersus quinque hereses} (‘Aurelii augustini liber contra quinque hereses incipit. Debitor sum frateres fetaore non necessitate.’)

FOLs 93r–106r \textit{Tractatus de septem gradibus confessionis} (‘Tractatus de .vii. gradibus confessionis. Quam magna res sit confessio. et omni necessaria generi humano: et ratio ipsa presentis ereditaratis commendat. et diuinæ auctoritatis scriptura in omni fere sui pagina euidenter declarat. … quë dominus iam in operario mundo a uitiis et peccatis. spiritu sancto dignabitur demonstrare.’)

FOLs 107r–113v Fragment of a missal containing the offices for St Augustine and the beginning of those for St Thomas of Canterbury (s. xiv)

25. London, British Library, Royal 7 F. 1 (annotations by Walter de Melida)

FOLs 1r–94r Alexander Neckam, \textit{Speculum Speculationum} (inc. ‘Paradisum uoluptatis subdiuidit’)

26. London, British Library, Royal 7 F. vi (once contained an inscription reading ‘Liber est [probably a misreading of sancte] Marie de Cirecestre. D’ Andree abbatis secundi eiusdem loci tempore scriptus per manum Walteri Canonici et Diaconi D’ Adam de Lamora tunc Cantore.’)\textsuperscript{19}

FOLs 1r–178v Paterius, \textit{Liber testimoniorum ueteris testamenti} (inc. ‘Dum beatissimi atque apostolici gregorii’); with Bruno's supplement\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{18} Watson, \textit{Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts, c. 700–1600, in the Department of Manuscripts, the British Library}, no. 864.

\textsuperscript{19} Recorded in David Casley, \textit{A Catalogue of the Manuscripts of the King’s Library: An Appendix to the Catalogue of the Cottonian Library} (London, 1734), 136; Warner and Gilson, \textit{Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and King’s Collections}, 1:200–201; see also Watson, \textit{Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts, c. 700–1600, in the Department of Manuscripts, the British Library}, no. 879; Gullick, ‘From Scribe to Binder: Quire Tackets in Twelfth-Century English Manuscripts’, 4, 27.

\textsuperscript{20} Guglielmetti, \textit{La tradizione manoscritta dei commenti latini al Cantico dei cantici (origini-XII secolo)}, 119 (no. 462).
27. Longleat House, Marquess of Bath, 38b (s. xiiª; written in part by Walter de Melida)\textsuperscript{21}

\textbf{FOLDS 1R–7V} Fragmentary cartulary, with copies of 27 charters\textsuperscript{22}


\textbf{FOLDS 1R–10R} Virgil, \textit{Ecloga} ('\textit{Publii.V.Maronis Bucolicon incipit. Titire tu patule recubans sub tegmine fagi}')

\textbf{FOLDS 10R–35R} Virgil, \textit{Georgica}, preceded by Pseudo-Ovid \textit{Argumentum} ('\textit{Prefacio. Quid faciat letas segetes quo sidera\lue s/eruet ... [10v] Publii.V.Maronis georgicon incipit. Quid faciat segetes quo sidere terram}')

\textbf{FOLDS 37R–150V} Virgil, \textit{Aeneis}, preceded by Pseudo-Ovid \textit{Argumentum} (inc. 'Aeneas primo libie depellitur oris')

\textbf{FOLDS 150V–151V} Miscellaneous verses attributed to Augustus, Virgil, and Ovid\textsuperscript{23}


\textbf{FOLDS 1R–140V} John of Salisbury, \textit{Policraticus} (inc. '(Si michi credideris. lin)guam cohibebeis. et aule')

\textbf{FOLDS 141R–144R} Moses of Bergamo, \textit{Expositio in grecas dictiones quae inueniuntur in prologis sancti Hieronymi} (inc. 'Preteriere iam plures anni postea quam literis suis quisidam clerucus nomine paganus.')\textsuperscript{24}

\textbf{[LOST]} Proba, \textit{Cento} (recorded in table of contents on fol. ir)\textsuperscript{25}

30. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 284 ('Cirencestrie' written at top of fol. iiir, 32r, 70r, 119r, 153r, 237r, 255r, 276r, 294r, 304r; originally two volumes)


\textbf{FOL. 296R–V} Alphabetical index of psalm incipits added in a sixteenth-century hand, providing folio and page number ('\textit{pa. 1}' = recto, '\textit{pa. 2}' = verso)


\textsuperscript{21} Gullick, 'Letters of Thomas Becket', 8–9.

\textsuperscript{22} Calendared in Baddeley, \textit{A History of Cirencester}, 111–17.

\textsuperscript{23} Incipits and citations in Watson, \textit{Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval Manuscripts of All Souls College, Oxford}, 173.


FOL 306r–307r Commentary on the Athanasian Creed, an anonymous abbreviation of Alexander Neckam (inc. ‘Caput aquile uisum ab ezechiele eminentius erat tribus ceteris capitis. Per quod designatur quia fides est supra rationem et memoriam et intellectum.’)

31. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Dep. c. 392 (s. xiii–xiv)

FOL 1r–202v Cirencester cartulary, ‘Register A’

32. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Dep. c. 393 (s. xiv)

FOL 1r–223r Cirencester cartulary, ‘Register B’

33. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Lat. 17 (s. xii3/4; letters largely concerning Cirencester added at the back, s. xii1/4, some probably in the hand of Walter de Melida)

FOL 1r–200r Glossed Psalter, ‘parua glosatura’ (inc. defective, on Ps. 15:9: ‘Insper etc. Sicut supra. insper et usque ad noctem increuerunt me. ut pro meo molestiarum: sint modo gaudia humanitatis celestia.’)

FOL 200v–210v Glossed Canticles 1–6, ‘parua glosatura’ (inc. ‘Quod ualet .xv. in ordine singulorum: hoc .cl. in ordine denariorum. et mille quingenti. in ordine centenariorum’)

FOL 211r–214r ‘Stavelot Commentary’ on the Athanasian Creed (inc. ‘Hic beatus athanasius liberum arbitrium posuit sicut dicit in psalmo.’)

FOL 214r–v, 223r Excerpts from the church fathers on the nature of psalms

FOL 215r–222v Litany and prayers for the dead with some music (addition, s. xiii2)

FOL 223r–224v Letters of proxy, appeal, commission, etc. (inc. ‘Viris uenerabilibus etc. E. dictus prior Cirec’ et Eiusdem loci Conventus salutem etc. Quamuis hac instanti die iouis coram uobis apud Winton’)

34. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson B. 326 (SC 11665; s. xv–xvi)

FOL 1r–69r Register of abbey livings, 1421–1539 (‘Incipit regestrum iesum anno domini millesimo ccccmo xxmo xxio’).

26 Contents in Ross and Devine, Cartulary of Cirencester Abbey, 1:xxv–xvi.


35. Oxford, Jesus College, 3 (the rubrics to the works of Ambrose and Gregory of Nazianzus in this manuscript match those used in the *Registrum Anglie*, which reports copies at Cirencester; their structure also reflects the misattribution in the *Registrum* of the ‘Expositio baptistarior’ to Gregory, correctly Leidrad, *De sacramento baptismi*)


38. Oxford, Jesus College, 48 (fol. 1r, ‘Liber Galfr’ quondam Vicarii de Auebyri quem \(\text{\textbackslash}text{dedit/ deo et Ecclesie Sancte Mar’ de Cyrencestr’ anno dominice incarnationis mº ccº xxxº viiiº …’}

**FOLS 2R–18V** Commentary on Paul (inc. ‘Sicut ad antiquum populum erudiendum: post fundamentum legis in qua mandata dei plenarie continebantur propheticus paries fuit necessarius’)\(^{35}\)

**FOLS 18R–57V** : Robert of Tumbalena, *Commentariorum in Cantica canticorum libri duo*\(^{36}\)

**FOLS 58R–65V** Augustine *De disciplina christiana* (inc. ‘Locutus est ad nos sermo dei. et promtus est ad exhortationem nostram: dicente scriptura.’)

**FOLS 66R–85R** *Speculum ecclesie* (‘Incipit speculum ecclesie quod abbas sancti uictoris ex dictis sanctorum patrum compilauit. De sacramentis ecclesiasticis ut tractarem. eorundemque misticam dulcedinem uobis exponerem. uerba rogauit dilectio.’)

**FOL. 85R** excerpt from Peter Lombard, *Sententiae* 4.32.2–3 and verses on circumstances

39. Oxford, Jesus College, 52 (fol. 1v, ‘(L)iber sancte Marie De Cirecestr’. D’ Andree Abbatis secundi tempore scriptus per manus D’ Alexandri postmodum Cantoris et Radulpi \(\text{\textbackslash}text{de pulleham/ cuiusdam scriptoris D’ Adam de lamora tunc Cantore.’}

**FOLS 2R–77V** Bede, *De tabernaculo* (inc. ‘Locuturi iiuante domino de figura tabernaculi’)

**FOLS 77V–131V** Bede, *De templo* (inc. ‘Hortatur nos uas electionis’)

40. Oxford, Jesus College, 53 (1147–76, or after 1168 as Hereford P.iii.7; fol. 159v, ‘Liber sancte Marie De Cirecestr’. D’ Andree Abbatis secundi tempore scriptus per manum D’ Fulconis canonici postea prioris D’ Alexandro de Weleu tunc cantore’)

**FOLS 1R–135V** Bede, *In primam partem Samuelis libri iv* (inc. ‘Studium nobis frequentiamque legendi ac meditandi’)

---
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41. Oxford, Jesus College, 62 (fol. 1r, ‘Liber Ecclesiæ Sanctæ Marie de Cirenecest’)

**FOLS 3R–142V** Orosius, *Historiarum adversum paganos libri vii* (inc. ‘Praeceptis tuis parui beatissime pater Augustine’)

42. Oxford, Jesus College, 63 (fol. 3r, ‘(L)iber sanctæ Marie de Cirecest’. D’ Andree Abbatis secundi tempore scriptus per manum Radulphi de pulleham/ scriptoris D’ Adam de lamora tunc Cantore.’)

**FOLS 4R–161V** Josephus, trans. Pseudo-Hegesippus, *De excidio Iudeorum* (inc. ‘Quatuor libros regnorum quos scriptura complexa est sacra’)

43. Oxford, Jesus College, 67 (fol. iii, ‘(L)iber sanctæ Marie De Cirecest’. D’ Andree abbatiss secundi tempore scriptus per manum D’ odonis de Wica/ canonici D’ Adam delamora tunc Cantore.’)

**FOLS 1R–115V** Bede, *In Marci euangelium expositio* (inc. ‘In expositione euangelii secundum marcum’)

44. Oxford, Jesus College, 68 (1147–76, or after 1168 as Hereford P.iii.7; fol. 1v, ‘(L)iber sanctæ Marie De Cirecest’. D’ Andree Abbatis secundi tempore scriptus per manum D’ Fulconis Canonici postmodum prioris D’ Alexandro de Weleue tunc Cantore.’)

**FOLS 1RA–40VA** Bede, *Expositio actuum apostolorum* (inc. ‘Domino in cristo desiderantissimo et uere beatissimo acca episco: beda perpetuam in domino salutem.’)

**FOLS 40VA–44VA** Bede, *Nomina regionum atque locorum de actibus apostolorum* (inc. ‘Aceldemach ager sanguinis’)

**FOLS 44VA–69RB** Bede, *Retractatio in Actus apostolorum* (inc. ‘Scimus eximum doctorem’)

**FOLS 69VA–118VA** Bede, *Explanatio Apocalypsis* (inc. ‘Apocalipsis sancti iohannis’)


**FOLS 2RA–100VA** Bede, *In epistulas septem catholicas* (inc. ‘Iacobus dei et domini nostri ihesu cristi seruus: duodecim tribubus que sunt in dispersione salutem. Dixit de hoc iacobo apostolus paulus.’)

46. Oxford, Jesus College, 94, part I s. xii, II–III s. xiii (fol. 1r, ‘Liber sanctæ Marie Cirencestris’, added s. xiv)

---
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FOLS 1RA–56VB Alexander Neckam, Glose super psalterium

Prologue:

[1r] Glose magistri Alexander abbatis cyrencestrie. super psalterium. [slightly later addition, s. xiii] De orto deliciarum paradisi ... [1v] nulla discordia. nec postulatio. qualis sit inuia.

Psalms 1 to 37:

Beatus uir qui non abiit. etc. Licet psalmus iste exponatur a quibusdam de ioseph ab arimathia. ... [38v] cum de operibus misericordie disceptaturus dices. esuriui etc. [catchword: sitium etc.]

Four gatherings missing, followed by Psalms 92 to 119:

[39r] Bonum est. etc. Neemias precept filiis israel ut quolibet ... [56v] domine uiuifica me iuxta uerbum tuum

FOLS 57R–74R Alexander Neckam, Tractatus super prouerbia Salomonis

Proem:

Incipit tractatus magistri alexander abbatis cyrenc' super parabolas salomonis. [57ra] ¶


Book 1:

[59va] Incipit liber primus. Capitulum .i. Parbole salomonis filii dauid regis israel. ad sciendam sapientiam et disciplinam. et ad intelligenda uerba prudentie et suscipiendam eru-
ditionem doctrine. iustitiam et iuditium et equitatem. ut detur paruulis astucia ado-


Commentary breaks off at Prov. 3:27.

FOLS 74V–77V Two sermons attributed to Alexander Neckam: incorrectly, according to Hunt43

FOLS 74VA–75VA Peter Comestor, Sermon 3544

[74va, bottom margin] Sermo magistri Alexandri abbatis Cyrencestr'. Feria Vª Domin-

ice quinquagesime. [but guide for rubricator reads Feria Vª Dominice quinquagesime]

43 Schools, 22–23.
44 Schneyer, Repertorium, 4:638 no. 35, 1:275 no. 59.

FOLS 75VB–77VB A sermon also found in London, British Library, Harley 325, where it is without attribution


FOLS 79R–125R  Alexander Neckam, Tractatus super Mulierem fortem

Book 1 (on Mary Magdalene):


Book 2 (on the Virgin Mary):


Book 2 (on the Church):


Envoi:

[125ra] Fortasse tuo liber superstes eris alexandro. ... pro me affectuose dominum exorabit ihesum cristum: qui cum patre et spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat deus per infinita seculorum secula: Amen.

47. Oxford, Magdalen College, 139 (identified with Cirencester by Michael Gullick in the forthcoming catalogue by Ralph Hanna; given to the college in 1489 by John Mower)

45 Schneyer, Repertorium, 1:275, no. 60.
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Fols 1r–135v  Alexander Neckam, *De naturis rerum* (inc. ‘Forma decens admiratione’)

The index to the Hereford Cathedral Library catalogue suggests that O.iii.6 might also be from Cirencester, but no evidence is presented in the entry.46 Surviving from the chapel of St Mary in the church of St John the Baptist in Cirencester is Oxford, Bodleian Library, Dugdale 42 (s. xv), with copies of some deeds from the abbey.47 There is also some evidence of diplomatic sources that are now untraced.48

Works available at Cirencester

Cirencester has no surviving library catalogue, but an idea of the works available at the abbey can be gleaned by combining the surviving manuscripts listed above with the listings in the *Registrum Anglie*49 and by Leland.50

The attribution of items marked † is considered spurious by modern scholars.

**AELRED OF RIEVAULX**  *De Iesu puero duodenni* (Leland)

*De institutione inclusarum* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.i.17)

**ALAN OF TEWKESBURY**  *Collectio epistolarum sancti Thome Cantuariensis* (London, British Library, Cotton Claudius B. 11)

**ALDHELM**  *De uirginitate* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.i.17)

**ALEXANDER NECKAM**   Commentary on the Athanasian Creed (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 284 [SC 2339])

*Laus diuine sapientie* (Leland)

*De naturis rerum et super Ecclesiasten* (Oxford, Magdalen College, 139)

Gloss on the Psalter (two copies: Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 284 [SC 2339]; Oxford, Jesus College, 94; Leland)

*Speculum speculationum* (Leland; London, British Library, Royal 7 F. 1)

*Super cantica canticorum* (Leland)

*Super mulierem fortem* (Oxford, Jesus College, 94)

*Super parabolas Salomonis* (Oxford, Jesus College, 94)

**AMBROSE**  Commentary on Luke (*Registrum* 3.11)

† *Sermo de observantia episcoporum/Libellus de dignitate sacerdotali* (Oxford, Jesus College, 3; *Registrum* 3.1)

---


AUTPERT AMBROSE  *Libellus de conflictu uitiorum atque uirtutum* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.i.3 and P.v.9; *Registrum* 28.4)

ANSELM OF CANTERBURY  *Similitudines*, ed. Robert de Braci (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.v.9)
Letters (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.ii.15)

AUGUSTINE  *Ad inquisitiones Ianuarii (epp. 54–55)* (*Registrum* 1.47)
Collection of twenty-five sermons (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.iii.7; *Registrum* 1.151 and 1.294)
*Contra Faustum* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.v.4)
*Contra Maximinum haereticum* (*Registrum* 1.279)
*De adulterinis coniugiis* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.v.9)
*De baptismo contra Donatistas* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.ii.14)
*De baptismo paruorum* (two copies: Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.ii.14; Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.v.9; *Registrum* 1.60)
*De bono coniugali* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.v.9; *Registrum* 1.49)
*De bono uiduitatis* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.v.9)
*De dono perseverantiae* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.vi.10; *Registrum* 1.102)
*De fide et symbolo* (*Registrum* 1.17)
*De Genesi ad litteram* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.vi.10; *Registrum* 1.51)
*De Genesi contra Manicheos* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.iii.7)
*De gratia et libero arbitrio* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.v.9; *Registrum* 1.95)
*De gratia noui testamenti contra Honoratum (ep. 140)* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.v.9; *Registrum* 1.63)
*De pastoribus (serm. 46)* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.v.9; *Registrum* 1.155)
† *De poenitentibus (serm. 393)* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.iii.7; *Registrum* 1.137)
*De praedestinatione sanctorum* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.vi.10)
*De sancta uiginitate* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.v.9; *Registrum* 1.50)
*De sermone Domini in monte* (*Registrum* 1.19)
† *De spiritu et anima* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.v.9; *Registrum* 1.64)
*De spiritu et littera* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.v.9; *Registrum* 1.161)
*De trinitate* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.v.3)
*De uera religione* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.v.9)
*De unico baptismo* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.ii.14; *Registrum* 1.61)
*De utilitate credendi* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.v.9)
† *Dialogus questionum LXV* (*Registrum* 1.200)
*Enchiridion* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.ii.12; Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.v.9)
*In Ioannis epistulam ad Parthos* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.ii.12)
*Liber florigerus* (*Registrum* 1.295, *Augustini florum*)
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Retractiones (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.v.9)
Sermo ad iuuenes (serm. 391) (Registrum 1.250)
Sermo de lapsu mundi et auaritia (serm. 60) (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.iii.7; Registrum 1.191)
Sermo de ouibus (serm. 47) (Registrum 1.316)
Sermo de periurio (serm. 180) (Registrum 1.247)
Sermo de excidio urbis Romae (Registrum 1.251)
Sermones de uerbis Domini et apostoli (Registrum 1.103)
Speculum Quis ignorant (Registrum 1.121)
† Tractatus de oboedientia (Registrum 1.315, ‘Sermo de obediencia’)

Bede
Commentary on Acts (Oxford, Jesus College, 68, Registrum 7.5)
Commentary on the Catholic Epistles (Oxford, Jesus College, 70)
Commentary on Ezra and Nehemiah (London, British Library, Royal 3 A. xii; Registrum 7.21; Leland)
Commentary on Revelation (Oxford, Jesus College, 68; Registrum 7.14)
In libros Regum quaestiones XXX (Oxford, Jesus College, 53; Registrum 7.18)
Commentary on Mark (Oxford, Jesus College, 67)
Commentary on Samuel, ‘Liber ... expostionis allegoricæ super Samuelem’ (Oxford, Jesus College, 53; Registrum 7.12)
Commentary on Tobit (Registrum 7.7)
De tabernaculo (Oxford, Jesus College, 52)
De templo Salomonis (Oxford, Jesus College, 52; Registrum 7.19)

Bernard of Clairvaux
Sermones super Cantica canticorum (Registrum 34.21)

Bernard of Cluny
De contemptu mundi (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.i.17)

Caesarius of Arles
Homiliae X ad monachos (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.iii.7, ‘Omelia in ueteri

Bernard of Clairvaux
Sermones super Cantica canticorum (Registrum 34.21)

Bernard of Cluny
De contemptu mundi (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.i.17)

Caesarius of Arles
Homiliae X ad monachos (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.iii.7, ‘Omelia in ueteri

Chrysostom
De ascensione domini (Hereford, Cathedral Library, Ox.14; Registrum 9.19)

De cena domini (Hereford, Cathedral Library, Ox.14)
De compunctione cordis (Hereford, Cathedral Library, Ox.14; Registrum 9.8)
De confessione et penitentia peccati (Hereford, Cathedral Library, Ox.1; Registrum 9.26)
De cruce domini extra ciuitatem (Hereford, Cathedral Library, Ox.14; Registrum 9.18)
De decollatione Ioannis Baptistae/De muliere mala (Hereford, Cathedral Library, Ox.14; Registrum
9.20, ‘De muliere mala’)
De elemosinis (Hereford, Cathedral Library, Ox.14)
De expulsione sua (Hereford, Cathedral Library, Ox.14)
De laudibus Pauli (Hereford, Cathedral Library, Ox.14; Registrum 9.25)
De misericordia (Hereford, Cathedral Library, Ox.14; Registrum 9.12)

De passione domini (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.v.14)
De proditione Iudae (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.v.14; Registrum 9.16)
De psalmo quinquagesimo (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.v.14; Registrum 9.9)
De regressu Asiae (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.v.14; Registrum 9.15)
De regressione sua (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.v.14)
De reparacione lapsi (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.v.14; Registrum 9.7)
'Omelie' (Registrum 9.1)
Quod nemo laeditur nisi a se ipso (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.v.14)
Sermo quando rediit ex Asia (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.v.14; Registrum 9.14)

CYPRIAN  Epistulae (Registrum 21.1)
De opere et eleemosynis (Registrum 21.17)

FALTONIA BETTIA PROBA  Cento Vergilianus de laudibus Christi: ‘Opusculum ... ad testimonium et noui testamenti uersifice compositum’ (recorded in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barlow 48, fol. ir, but no longer part of the volume)

FULBERT OF CHARTRES  Epistolae (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.ii.15)
GERBERT  Regulae abaci (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.i.6)
GERLANDUS  De abaco (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.i.6)
GEOFFREY BARIO DE LA LOUXOUX  Commentary on Matthew (Leland)
GILBERT DE LA PORÉE  Epistula Pauli cum glossa (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.ii.4)
Gloss on the Psalms (Registrum 56.3)

GREGORY THE GREAT  Dialogi (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.i.10)
Regula Pastoralis (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.i.3)

GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS  Orations, a collection including the Apologeticus, with a preface by Rufinus (Oxford, Jesus College, 3; Registrum 18.2, 18.13)

HUGH OF FLEURY  Historia ecclesiastica siue Chronicon (Registrum 35.2, attrib. Ivo of Chartres, ‘Cronica’)

HUGH OF FOULLOY  De claustro anime (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.v.9)

HUGH OF ST VICTOR  De arca Noe morali et mystica (Registrum 97.4, ‘De archa Noe’)
De beatae Mariae urginitate (Registrum 97.5, ‘De incorrupta urginitate matris Domini’)
De sacramentis christianae fidei (Hereford, Cathedral Library, Piv.9; Registrum 97.17)
De sapiencia animae Christi (Registrum 97.27, ‘De anima Christi’)
Expositio in Regulam S. Augustini (Registrum 97.23)
Homilies on Ecclesiastes (Registrum 97.12)
Soliloquium de arra animae (Registrum 97.9, 97.10)

IDALIUS OF BARCELONA  Letter to Julian (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.i.6)

ISIDORE OF SEVILLE  Epistula ad Massonem episcopum (London, British Library, Royal 5 E. xviii)
Sententiae (London, British Library, Royal 5 E. xviii; Registrum 8.11, 8.12, noting separately Books 2, ‘De sapiencia’, and Book 3, ‘De flagellis Dei’)
IULIANUS POMERIUS  *De uita contemplatiua* (Registrum 23.6, attrib. Prosper, *De uita actiua et contemplatiua*)

IVO OF CHARTRES  *Decretum* (Registrum 35.6)
   *De ecclesiasticis sacramentis* (serm. 1–5) (Registrum 35.1)
   *Epistolae* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.ii.15; Registrum 35.3)
   *Panornia* (Oxford, Jesus College, 26)

JEROME  *Apologia adversus libros Rufini* (Registrum 6.16, 6.17, ‘Ad Pammachium et Marcellum in defensione sui’ and ‘Ad Rufinum’)
   Commentary on Daniel (Registrum 6.73)
   Commentary on Jeremiah (Registrum 6.71)
   † Commentary on Mark (Registrum 6.77)
   Commentary on Matthew: (Registrum 6.76)
   *Commentum super alphabetum Hebraicum et Graecum* (Registrum 6.24)
   *Contra Vigilantium ad Riparium et Desiderium presbyteros*: (Registrum 6.55, ‘Contra Vigilancium de induracione cordis Pharaonis’: *De induracione cordis pharaonis* is a work of Pelagius)
   *De situ et nominibus locorum hebraicorum* (Registrum 6.28, ‘Super libros Regnorum’, and 6.37, ‘De distanciis locorum secundum ordinem alphabeti Greci’)
   † *De nativitate sanctae Mariae* (Registrum 6.21, ‘De ortu et uita s. Marie’)
   *Dialogi contra Pelagianos* (Registrum 6.97, ‘Dialogus Ieronimi contra Pelagianos’)
   *Liber quaestionum hebraicarum in Genesim* (Registrum 6.79, ‘De hebraicis questionibus’)

JACOBUS DE VORAGINE  *Legenda sanctorum* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.v.13)

JOHN CASSIAN  *Collationes* 11–24 (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.v.10)

JOHN OF SALISBURY  *Policraticus* (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barlow 48 (SC 6428))
   *Vita sancti Thomae Cantuariensis archiepiscopi* (London, British Library, Cotton Claudius B. 11)
   Excerpts from John of Salisbury’s letters concerning Thomas Becket (London, British Library, Cotton Claudius B. 11)

JULIAN OF TOLEDO  *Prognosticon furturi saeculi* (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.i.6)

JOSEPHUS, TRANS. PSEUDO-HEGESIPPUS  *De excidio Iudeorum* (Oxford, Jesus College, 63)

LANFRANC  Letters (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.ii.15)

LEIDRAD  *De sacramento baptismi* (Oxford, Jesus College, 3, where there is not a specific attribution; attrib. Gregory of Nazianzus in Registrum 18.14)

MOSES OF BERGAMO  *Expositio in graeicas dictiones* (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barlow 48)

ODO OF MORIMOND  *Analytica ternarii*, from his *De numerorum significatione* (Leland)

ORIGEN  *Epithalamium super Cantica canticorum* (Registrum 10.5)
   Homilies on Exodus (Registrum 10.19)
   Homilies on Ezekiel (Registrum 10.23)
   Homilies on Isaiah (Registrum 10.10)
   Homilies on Jeremiah (Registrum 10.7)
Homilies on Joshua (Registrum 10.11)
Homilies on Judges (Registrum 10.21)
Homilies on Leviticus (Registrum 10.20)
Homily on 1 Samuel (Registrum 10.22)
† ‘Super epistolae Pauli’ (Registrum 10.32)
Super uetus testamentum (Registrum 10.3)

Orosius Contra paganos (Oxford, Jesus College, 34 and Oxford, Jesus College, 62)
Palladius of Galatia Historia Lausiaca (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.i.3)
Paterius Liber testimoniorum ueteris testamenti ex opusculis sancti Gregorii (London, British Library, Royal 7 F. vi); with Bruno’s supplement
Peter Comestor Sermon 35 (Oxford, Jesus College, 94)
Quoduultdeus Aduersus quinque haereses (London, British Library, Royal 5 E. xviii)
Robert of Cricklade De connubio Iacobi (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.iv.8; Leland)
Homiliae super Ezechielem (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.iii.10 and Cambridge, Pembroke College, 30; Leland)

Robert of Tumbalenae Commentariorum in Cantica canticorum libri duo (Oxford, Jesus College, 48)

Thomas Becket see Alan of Tewkesbury

Virgil Aeneis (Oxford, All Souls College, 82)
Ecloga (Oxford, All Souls College, 82)
Georgica (Oxford, All Souls College, 82)
† Misc. verses (Oxford, All Souls College, 82)

William of Auvergne De claustro anime (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.v.9)

William of Malmesbury De floratio Gregorii
De miraculis beatae virgini Mariae
Commentary on Lamentations

Anonymous De septem uiciis requirendis in confessione (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.v.9)
Early papal correspondence (London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian A. xv)
Excerpts from legal and patristic texts (Oxford, Jesus College, 26)
Gloss on the epistles of Paul, inc. ‘Sicut ad antiquam populam erudiendum’, Stegmüller 10179 (Oxford, Jesus College, 48)
Gloss on the Psalter and Canticles, Stegmüller 11801 (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Lat. 17)
Interrogatio on biblical questions (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.v.9)
Litany and Prayers for the Dead (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Lat. 17)
Misc. letters and sermons (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.i.6)
Monastic florilegium (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.i.6)

Robert of Cricklade, De connubio patriarche Iacob 2.12 indicates that he had copies of William of Malmesbury’s books made for Cirencester: see Hunt, ‘English Learning in the Late Twelfth Century’, 31–32; Thomson, William of Malmesbury, 74.
Notes on the canons (Hereford, Cathedral Library, P.v.9)
Regulae rithmicahiae (Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.i.6)
Speculum ecclesiæ quod abbæ sancti Victoris ex dictis sanctorum patrum compilauit (Oxford, Jesus College, 48)
‘Stavelot Commentary’ on the Athanasian Creed (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Lat. 17)
Tractatus de septem gradibus confessionis (London, British Library, Royal 5 E. xviii)
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