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Abstract: Ivo’s intention was to present the canon law of the Church as a whole, so as to promote the role and work of ecclesiastical institutions, especially with regard to the care of souls and salvation as the final goal. This endeavor to apply the entirety of canon law might be realized in a variety of ways, and was to be fundamentally linked to the particular features of specific ecclesiastical institutions. Strict paleographical and codicological analyses of Orléans, Bibliothèque Municipal Ms. 222 (194) and Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 393 (455) suggests convincingly that the term «textual families» be used in relation to Ivo’s work.
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Resumen: El proyecto de Ivo de Chartres pretendía una presentación completa del derecho canónico de la Iglesia como instrumento que facilitase el trabajo y la actividad de las instituciones eclesiásticas, con especial atención a la cura de almas y su salvación eterna como objetivo principal. Este planteamiento se podía realizar de diversas maneras, pero dependía fundamentalmente de las peculiaridades concretas de cada instituto eclesiástico. Por otra parte, el análisis detallado de los manuscritos de Orléans, Bibliothèque Municipale 222 (194) y Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 393 (455), muestra que en relación con la obra de Ivo, es mejor utilizar la expresión de «familias textuales».
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The late 11th century is precisely the time when, as a result of the Gregorian Reform, several canonists intended to collect together the whole universal canonical discipline of the Church in order to give clear and detailed description of the canonical system, the ecclesiastical hierarchy, the daily sacramental life of the Church, the supreme authority of the Pope, and the judicial competence and activity of the ecclesiastical tribunals. The best cathedral schools played an important role in disseminating the elementary doctrine and discipline of the Church through their instruction. Among these, the two most remarkable centers in France were Rheims and Chartres. During the time that Ivo was bishop of Chartres (1090-1115), the instruction of the clergy had been well organized, especially regarding the canons of the cathedral chapter. This basic formation included the reading of ecclesiastical texts, decrees, canons, etc., in Latin. Ivo had personal experience of the contemporary level of the theological knowledge of canons, because before his episcopal consecration he was prior of the Canons Regular of St. Quentin in Beauvais. Ivo recognized the importance of promoting more expert erudition in ecclesiastical discipline. His letters shed much light on his intention to compose a canonical collection that would be as complete as possible. His canonical «reading-book» did indeed promote the thorough instruction of the clergy in the Latin disciplinary and doctrinal texts (e.g., IP 6. 20; IP 6. 21; IP 6. 22). But in addition to this main objective, the work lent itself well to the insertion of further supplements and the formation of a rubric system and an inscription system –each along with their own develop-

---

6 «De abiectione et ambitione eius quem duo praesempsuerint ordinare episcopi in vestris provin-
ciis placuit de praesumpserint, ut sicubi contigerit duos episcopos, tertium consecrare, et ipse et auctores damnabuntur, quo cautius ea quae sunt antiquitus statuta serventur». http://knowledgeforge.net/ (24 February 2010).
7 «Episcopus quando ordinationes facere disponit (...) et sabbato qui probati sunt inventi episcopo paesententur». http://knowledgeforge.net/ (24 February 2010).
8 «Quando presbyteri aut diaconi per parochias constituantur, oportet eos professionem episcopo suo facere, ut caste et pure vivant sub Dei timore, et dum eos tali professione obligaverit, sanctam disciplinam retineant». http://knowledgeforge.net/ (24 February 2010).
ment— in order to facilitate the use of this canonical book for different fields of reference.

We have compared several 11th-12th century manuscripts and fragments of the Ivonian canon law collection which are traditionally recognized as three independent works originating from 1093 and 1095 (i.e. *Decretum, Panormia, Tripartita*)\(^9\). The precise paleographical, codicological and textual-critical analysis has improved our considerations on the step by step textual-development which we have already noticed regarding the *Collectio Canonum Anselmi Lucensis*\(^10\). This new result has shown in new light Ivo’s compiling work. Therefore, we do not classify the Ivonian textual versions as three independent works, but rather three textual-families. Through this expression «textual-families» we would like to emphasize that the similarity and interaction of these works, which have different extensions and structures, are much more significant than would be the case among three independent works. The formation or developing process of the Ivonian work is an emblematic example for the proper textual-history of Medieval canonical collections before the late 12th century, especially before 1234. The recent studies concerning the Pre-Gratian canon law collections show well how the earlier meaning of «canonical collection» differs from its classical meaning. The fundamental intention was to summarize the whole of canon law which –as «ius sacrum»— served the daily life of the Church and was useful in every field of the ecclesiastical activity. Here we would like to give an overview of this type of textual formation, based on the Orléans Bibliothèque Municipal Ms 222 (194) and the Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 393 (455).

1. DESCRIPTION OF ORLÉANS, BIBLIOTHÈQUE MUNICIPAL MS 222 (194)

The Orléans Bibliothèque Municipal Ms 222 (194) manuscript\(^11\) is a textual witness of the *Panormia*\(^12\). The cover of the codex, probably from the 19th

---


\(^{10}\) Cfr. S. A. SZUROMI, *Anselm of Luca as a Canonist*. Adnotationes in ius canonicum 34, Frankfurt am Main 2006, pp. 24, 45.


century, is made of wood on both sides and covered with nice leather. The manuscript was written on refined, but not too thin parchments. Some sections of the manuscript have been frequently used, but these parts are clear, and there are only a few greasy pages\(^{13}\). The script style, employing very small letters, indicates the first part of the 12th century\(^{14}\). The quality of the parchments and the script style indicate France as the place of origin.

\(^{13}\) The whole codex, which contains 108 folios, was trimmed up to the punctuation. The codex was made from eight-folio quires, but the last two folios are missing from the end of the manuscript, cfr. Orléans Ms 222 (194), pp. 1a-16b (I); 17a-32b (II); 33a-48b (III); 49a-64b (IV); 65a-80b (V); 81a-96b (VI); 97a-112b (VII); 113a-128b (VIII); 129a-144a (IX); 145a-160b (X); 161a-176b (XI); 177a-192a (XII); 193a-204b (XIII); 205a-216b (XIV). The numeration is by pages, not folios, and the text is organized into two columns throughout the entire codex. The size of the folios is 235 x 120 mm, and the ruling is not too deep. From page 204 to page 216 the folios are smaller because at the foot of these pages, a 10 mm wide stripe is missing from the parchments (cfr. 225 x 120 mm). The iniciales are ornamented with red, blue, green and gold colors.

\(^{14}\) In the headline of page 1 can be read a 15th century inscription: «Summa Canonum Iovis Carnotensis. Liber pron. ff. benedictio flos». There is another note at the bottom of this page by a 19th
The Prologue as an introductory text of the *Panormia* immediately begins on page 1 by the basic hand of the manuscript (nº 1): «Exceptiones ecclesiasticarum regularum partis exemplis romanorum pontificum (...)»¹⁵. This text ends on page 4b where the *tabula librorum* takes place.¹⁶ The description of the contents of Book I is situated right after the Prologue¹⁷, then there is a supplementary rubric and a canon by a contemporaneous hand, but in smaller letters (nº 2): *Quid penitentie et qualiter agere debebunt qui magna crimina committunt*¹⁸. Beginning at page 5b, where Book I begins¹⁹, the original hand (nº 1) returns. We cannot find any numeration of the canons, but from page 5b to page 6b there are one line summaries which introduce every single canon. At the bottom of page 13a the basic script style is ended, and from page 13b a new hand appears (nº 3). This hand indicates the attribution of canons with the same ink as the text itself, which makes it hard to recognize the particular canons. However, the same is also true of the beginning and ending of each book, the indications for which are very inconspicuous. The original hand (nº 1) appears one more time on page 23a, and remains until the end of the manuscript. Pages testify to frequent usage at pp. 20a-b, 36a-b, 64a-65b, 68a-69b. Moreover, the codex was opened several times and got wet at pp. 68a-69b, which is the part that discusses marriage. On page 79a, the text of the *Panormia* ends and a 19th century note signals the beginning of Ivo’s letters: «Epistola Ivonis Carnotensis»²⁰, which section concludes on page 104b²¹. At page 105a, there appears a long

---


¹⁶ Orléans Ms 222 (194), pp. 4b-5a: «Prima pars continet de fide (...) omni genere mendatii».

¹⁷ Orléans Ms 222 (194), p. 5a: «Prima pars istius libri continet de fide (...)».

¹⁸ Orléans Ms 222 (194), p. 5a: (Rubrica) «Quid penitentie et qualiter agere debebunt qui magna crimina committunt»; (Textus) «Quatuor quadragesime deominalibus (...) pauperinco medat uictum quadragesimale».


²⁰ Orléans Ms 222 (194), p. 79a: «Ivo episcopus carnotensis h. archiepiscopo lugdunensis facile est uobis (...)».

²¹ Orléans Ms 222 (194), pp. 101b-104b: «Ivo carnotensis ecclesiae minister Vulgariuo parisiensis archidiacono salutem. (...) ac uenerari profiteor». 

---
patristic theological supplement in two basic parts. The first contains writings of St. Jerome and Origen\textsuperscript{22}, and the second cites St. Augustine’s works\textsuperscript{23}. There is a nice iniciiale, decorated with green, red and yellow colors on page 173b, ten pages before the end of the first patristic section, which testifies to the first part of the 12th century\textsuperscript{24}. The pages which follow this mark are very greasy and got wet sometimes (i.e. pp. 176a-177b). The last third of page 182a and the entirety of 182b are empty. This separates the section of St. Augustine’s texts from the previous part. The manuscript is incomplete, as is indicated by the last sentence which follows the second Augustinian work: «Incipitur tractatio S. Augustinus in libro contra ad usarium»\textsuperscript{25}.

The paleographical and textual peculiarities of the Orléans Ms 222 (194) help to identify the particular place of usage of the codex. It must be a cathedral chapter at some episcopal see. This supposition is supported by the very small letters, the inconspicuous text and the structure, the two basic supplementary materials (i.e. Ivo’s letters, patristic sources), as well as by those frequently used pages at sections that deal with the authority of the Holy See, accusations, grades of consanguinity, and marriage. There is no «arbore consanguinitatis» or detailed commentary on the consanguinity degrees\textsuperscript{26}. Hence, it could not have been used at some parish or ecclesiastical tribunal. This manuscript appears to be composed for very educated readers –such as canons of cathedral chapters– who had profound dogmatic theological knowledge on the Catholic faith\textsuperscript{27}, as evidenced by the placement of Origen’s and St. Augustine’s theological works at the end of the codex.

\textsuperscript{22} Orléans Ms 222 (194), pp. 105a-182a: «Prefatio sancti Hieronymi in Originem. Cognoscende veritatis amore permoti (...)» [p. 105a].
\textsuperscript{23} Orléans Ms 222 (194), pp. 183a-216b: «In hoc uolumine continentur Sancti Augustini scilicet De libero arbitrio libri III. De natura boni liber unus. Cum adhuc Rome demorarem (...» [p. 183a].
\textsuperscript{24} Orléans Ms 222 (194), p. 173b: «His igitur breuiter ad signatis de eo quod (...».
\textsuperscript{25} Orléans Ms 222 (194), p. 216b.
\textsuperscript{26} Orléans Ms 222 (194), pp. 66a-67a.
2. Observations on those materials of Orléans Ms. 222 (194) which were inserted after the body of the Panormia

2.1. The «corpus» of the letters of Ivo of Chartres

The considerable significance of the letters of Ivo of Chartres is indubitable, especially because this rich material is inserted at the end of his canonical collection in a high number of textual witnesses. The letters can be read in printed form in the edition by Jacques-Paul Migne. Ivo’s letters are remarkable not only because they contain much data that assists the reconstruction of Ivo’s organizational activity as bishop of Chartres, but they also give fundamental further information about his work of compiling the canons, especially due to the numerous canonical and patristic sources that he used for his letters and which had influence on his canonical work as well. Nevertheless, this additional data can only shed light on Ivo’s knowledge of canon law, his sources, his technique, and his conception of canon law, but it cannot interpret the most significant elements of the textual and structural development of the Ivonian collection, inasmuch as these are the effects of the different institutional fields of the Church and the concrete places of usage of the particular exemplars.

2.2. Works of patristic authors

The presence of various patristic canons is really remarkable in the developing process of the different canon law collections and textual families. These canons usually supply most of the peculiarities for the particular canonical collections of the 11th and 12th centuries. The most cited patristic authors are certainly St. Augustine and St. Jerome if we take no notice of the letters of Ivo of Chartres.

---

28 Recently, Christof Rolker paid particular attention to Ivo’s letters and explained the detailed results of his research in his PhD dissertation, defended in 2006 at the University of Cambridge, cfr. Ch. ROLKER, Canon law and the letters of Ivo of Chartres, Cambridge 2010.
30 PL 162. 11-290.
ters of Pope Leo the Great and Pope Gregory the Great. This is true of the Ivonian Decretum and Panormia too, in which a remarkable amount of space was dedicated to lengthy passages from patristic sources, particularly St. Augustine’s writings. Furthermore, we can also acknowledge that short, independent part of the Tripartita which quotes patristic authors. St. Augustine’s writings are found in 184 canons of the basic canonical material of the Panormia. Therefore, it cannot be accidental that the Orléans Ms 222 (194) contains the patristic supplement right after the Ivonian material, which occupies half of the whole codex. The reason for the inclusion of this supplementary material is certainly the dogmatic-theological interest of the erudite college of canons at some cathedral.

The first section of the patristic material begins on page 105a with «Prefatio sancti Hieronymi in Originem». This is the whole text of St. Jerome’s Prefatio Rufini librorum quos de graeco transtulit in latinum. Then we can read Rufinus’s Latin translation of the De Principiis from page 125b. This famous theological work of Origen (184-254) uses allegorical interpretation in examining the Bible and the doctrines of the Christian faith. The treatise had significant impact on later theological concepts, and was even suspected of heresy. The original Greek version was composed probably in 229, and in 397 Rufinus made his Latin translation, which is still in our possession.
today\textsuperscript{39}. It is known that Origen’s works began to enjoy favor once again during the time of the Carolingian Renaissance\textsuperscript{40}.

The second section of the patristic material cites two entire fundamental dogmatic-theological works of St. Augustine, namely, the \textit{De Libero Arbitrio libri tres}\textsuperscript{41} and the \textit{De Natura Boni contra Manichaeos liber unus}\textsuperscript{42}. St. Augustine’s basic philosophical work on Free Will\textsuperscript{43} was written between 391 and 395\textsuperscript{44}, and it became one of the most important sources for many medieval canonical collections because its clear conception of morality, conscience, and law could substantiate the disciplinary argumentation of the Church. Among such collections, we can mention the Iovian Decretum, which quotes long passages of this Augustinian work. The \textit{De Libero Arbitrio} is cited four times by the Decretum Gratiani (C. 23 q. 5 c. 41; C. 32 q. 6 c. 6; D. 1 c. 30 de pen.; D. 4 c. 7 de cons.) and these fragments (i.e. \textit{De lib. arb.} I. 3; I. 4; I. 5; III. 23) are found in the Iovian works as well (cfr. ID 8. 104 = IP 7. 19\textsuperscript{39}; ID 10. 101 = IP 8. 38


\textsuperscript{40} G. D’Onofrio, \textit{Storia della Teologia II}, Piemme 2003, pp. 94-97.


\textsuperscript{42} Orléans Ms 222 (194), pp. 214a-216b: «Summum bonum, quo superius non est, Deus est; ac per hoc incommutabile bonum est, ideo uere aeternum et uere immortalis, (...). Tantum enim uelut praepollens misericordia et potestas tua et ueritas Baptismi tui, clausque regni coelorum in sancta Ecclesia tua, ut nec de illis desperandum sit, quamdui in hac terra per tuam patientiam iiuunt, qui etiam scientes quantum malum sit talia de te sentire uel dicere, propter aliquam tempora et terrena commoditatem et tempestates uerumque uult in illa maligna professione detinentur, si ad tuam ineffabilis bonitatem saltem increpati tuis correptionibus fugant, et omni-bus carnalis uita, eilebris coelestem uiam aeternamque praebant». Cfr. \textit{De Natura Boni contra Manichaeos liber unus: Corpus scriptorium ecclesiasticorum Latinorum} 25/2, Vindobonae 1892, pp. 853-889.


\textsuperscript{45} D. 1 c. 30 de pen.: «Si cui etiam non contingat faculta concumbendi cum coniunge aliena, planum tamen aliquo modo sit eum cupere, et, si potestas detur, facturum esse, non minus reus est, quam si in ipso facto deprehenderetur. Item, sicut auctoritas testatur: §. 1. Voluntas remunera-tur, non opus. Voluntas autem in cordis contritione est opus uero in oris confessione». Fried-berg I. 1165; cfr. \textit{De lib. arb.} I. 3.
Extensive theological academic training was indispensable for anyone who would undertake to read this study of St. Augustine. Therefore, this analyzed manuscript must have been used in a theologically ambitious milieu, which is clearly signaled by the insertion of the entire Augustinian work, not only some quotation of it. This ambitious milieu could not be the day-to-day usage at some parish, but it had to be a particular ecclesiastical institution where there was serious ambition for such a theoretical explanation of the faith. We can see again the gradual development of the contents of Ivo’s textual-witnesses and we also have a significant example of how the institution affected the contents: the three basic textual-families (i.e. *Decretum, Panormia* and *Tripartita*), each of which arose rapidly from the same original canonical material (cfr., the «nucleus») with differences among them due to their different usage, could then once again come closer to each other because of the influence of a new and similar institutional milieu. This is also true of the insertion of the other work of St. Augustine on the Nature of the Good, which was composed in 399 and dedicated to explaining the original goodness of all things existing in the created world. Chapter 40 is found not only in ID 14. 9 but also in

---


48 D. 4 c. 7 de cons.: «Illud perscrutari homines solent, sacramentum baptismi Christi quid prosi parulis, cum eo accepto plerumque moriuntur prius, quam ex se quicquam potuerint cogno-scere. Qua in re satis pie recteque creditur prodesse paruulo fides eorum, a quibus consecrandus offeritur. Et hoc ecclesiae commendat auctoritas, ut ex eo quisque sentiat quid sibi prosi fides sua, quando in aliorum quoque beneficio, qui propriam nondum habet potestatem, commoda sit». Friedberg I. 1363; cfr. *De lib. arb.* III. 23.


50 AUGUSTINUS, *De Natura Boni contra Manichaeos liber unus*, 1: «Summum bonum, quo superius non est, Deus est; ac per hoc incommutabile bonum est, ideo uere aeternum et uere immortale. Caetera omnia bona non nisi ab illo sunt sed non de illo. De illo enim quod est, hoc quod ipse est; ab illo autem quae facta sunt, non sunt quod ipse. Ac per hoc, si solus ipse incommutabilis, omnia quae fecit, quia ex nihilò fecit, mutabilia sunt. (...)». PL 42. 551.

51 »Nec Deo noceri potest nec alií, nisi De iusta ordinatione. Quae cum ita sint secundum catholicem fidem et sanam doctrinam, et intelligentibus perspicuum ueritatem, nec naturae Dei nocere potest quisquam, nec natura Dei nocere inuiste cuiquam, uel nocere impune patitur quemquam.
Tr 3. 27 (28) 6 and in the *Decretum Gratiani* (C. 11 q. 3 c. 47)\(^52\). We must mention that some parts of another important dogmatic theological writing of St. Augustine also belong to the patristic material of the Ivonian work, namely the *De Trinitate* (Tr 3. 1. 1 = ID 1. 2 = IP 1. 7\(^53\); Tr 3. 2 [3] 21 = ID 2. 107\(^54\); Tr 3. 7. 4 = ID 4. 71 = IP 2. 120\(^55\)). These canons are inserted into the *Decretum Gratiani* as well.

3. *Description of Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 393 (455)*

The Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 393 (455)\(^56\) is a textual-witness of the *Tripartita*\(^57\), which was copied in the second half of the 12th century in two columns\(^58\). The refined thin and white parchments as well as the

---

\(^{52}\) Friedberg I. 656-657.

\(^{53}\) C. 1 q. 1 c. 95: «Neque enim id potest rite offerri nisi per sacerdotem iustum et sanctum, nec nisi ab eis accipiat quod offeretur, pro quibus offeretur, atque id sine uici o sit, ut pro uiciosis mundandis posit offerri. Hoc certe omnes cupiunt, qui pro se offerri sacrificium Deo uolunt». Friedberg I. 392; cfr. *De Trin.* IV. 19.


\(^{58}\) The whole codex trimmed up to the punctuation (288 x 190 mm) and was basically made from twelve-folio quires (except quire VI and VII): foll. 1ra-12vb (I); 13ra-24vb (II); 25ra-36vb (III);
iniciales and other drawings\(^{59}\) testify to a French origin very similar to Brussels, Bibliothèque Royal Ms 1817 (Panormia)\(^{60}\). On fol. 1r is an inscription of the possessor from the first decade of the 17th century: «Joh. Banister liber ex dono Josiae Lambert Avunculi mei 1608»\(^{61}\). The numeration of the folios was also inserted by the same 17th century hand. The iniciales were decorated with red, blue and green colors and the ruling are not by ruler but in ink. The introductory canon as an opening text begins on fol. 1ra in the basic hand of the codex (nº 1): «Quem quorundam romanorum decretalia pontificum synodalibus (...)», which is headed by rubric: «Excerpta ex decretis romanorum pontificum» as the title to the first part of the canonical material\(^{62}\). The folios are clean, but there are some frequently used pages\(^{63}\), and the whole section about bishops, clerics, monks, and the matrimonial bond were used frequently as well\(^{64}\). The consistency of the parchments is considerable within the Collectio A at a letter of Pope Leo the Great (440-461) on fol. 32vb\(^{65}\) and at a letter of Pope Pelagius I (556-561) on fol. 45ra\(^{66}\). Due to these characteristics, we are able to identify the place of usage of the codex. Among the papal authors, the last is Pope Urban II (1088-1099) whose canon\(^{67}\) is helpful in estimating the date of origin of the composition. From the second part of the first section (cfr. Collectio A, II), which lists the conciliar material, we can find a numeration of canons, but this numeration re-begins at every single listed council. This body of conciliar canons is interrupted by a rubric on fol. 90rb: «De inde sequentur

\(^{59}\) Cfr. Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 393 (455), foll. 11r; 43r; 50v; 51r.


\(^{61}\) Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 393 (455), fol. 1r.

\(^{62}\) Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 393 (455), fol. 1ra: (Rubrica) «Excerpta ex decretis romanorum pontificum»; (Textus) «Quoniam quorundam Romanorum decretalia pontificum synodalibus (...)»; (Rubrica) «In prima epistola Clementis uerba Petri de Clemente»; (Textus) «Trado ipsi Clementi a Domino traditam (...)».

\(^{63}\) Cfr. Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 393 (455), foll. 28ra-29vb; 32va-32vb; 40va-40vb; 45ra-45rb; 109ra-109rb; 145va-147vb; 154va-154vb; 158va-158vb; 171ra-171rb; 177ra-177rb.

\(^{64}\) Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 393 (455), foll. 141vb-168vb.

\(^{65}\) Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 393 (455), fol. 32vb: Leo I, «Necesse autem ut quedam populi pars (...) sedis auctoritas teneret agnouit»; JK 406. Cfr. ID 2. 87; D. 1 c. 51 de cons.


\(^{67}\) Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 393 (455), foll fol. 74va-75vb: «Compatimur infirmitati tue et amminiculum (...) quamuis per se criminosa sit et damnabilis»; JL 5730. C. 35 q. 2/3 c. 11.
and then there can be read some texts by Gregory of Nazianzen, John Chrysostom, and Eusebius of Caesarea. At the theme of baptism, the codex was opened numerous times and the parchment got wet (fol. 128v). The same is true of the concluding folios dedicated to the sacrament of penance. A supplement is situated on fol. 139ra attached to "Constitutio VII Cap. I" by the basic hand. Each theme is projected into the margin in a quadrate by a new but contemporary hand (nº 2). We find throughout the entire manuscript a 14th century hand (nº 3) which sometimes marks notes to the canons (e.g., foll. 1va; 63rb; 63vb; 70va-70vb; 152rb). There is another hand of the late 12th or early 13th century which inserted a short note into the right margin on fol. 128r (nº 4). This script style appears again in the right margin of foll. 142v and 143r. The last supplementary script style, with characteristics clearly of the 13th century (nº 5), can be found on two folios, making comments to the degrees of consanguinity (foll. 167r; 168v). The text concludes with canon 10 of the Rubric De Penitentia. Hence, canons 11-18 and the entire last Rubric (De causis laicorum) are missing.

The narrowly paleographical and codicological analysis of Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 393 (455) supports sufficiently that not only the Decretum (as an ideal canonical reading book), nor only Panormia (due to its logical and systematical structure), but even the Tripartita—perhaps because of its systematically arranged last section (cfr. Collectio B)—could have found its place in the day-to-day usage of some cathedral. This particular textual witness cannot be an official handbook of some tribunal because of the colorful

---

68 Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 393 (455), foll. 90va-92vb: «De sententiis Grecorum doctorum (...) hominis assume».
69 Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 393 (455), foll. 188ra-188vb.
70 Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 393 (455), fol. 139ra: «Nullis sub Romana (...)».
71 Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 393 (455), fol. 128r: «Nam quo intellectu non (...)».
72 Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 393 (455), fol. 142v: «Nouas quod leges (...)»; fol. 143r: «Reuelatione (...)».
73 Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 393 (455), fol. 167r: «Semel consanguinitatis vi. gradibus (...)».
74 Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 393 (455), fol. 167r: «Si presbyter penitentiam abnegauerit (...) in hora ultima confessione»; (ID 15. 43; C. 26 q. 6 c. 12); cfr. M. Brett, Tripartita (Transcription of Paris, BN lat. 3858B) [April 24, 2008: http://knowledgeforge.net/], XXVIII. De penitentia, xi-xviii.
75 De causis laicorum, cann. 1-17; Paris, BN lat. 3858, foll. 300r-331r; cfr. M. Brett, Tripartita (Transcription of Paris, BN lat. 3858B) [April 24, 2008: http://knowledgeforge.net/], XXIX. De causis laicorum, i-xvii (cclxxxiv).
76 L. Fowler-Magerl, Clavis Canonum, note 12, p. 187.
pictures found at the sections of the frequently used themes of this volume. However, it is very probable that this Cambridge manuscript was a consultation book of some chapter of a cathedral where the canons were also involved in the juridical work of the ecclesiastical tribunal.

4. Conclusion

An original canonical textual witness testifies about the circumstances of its origin, and, indeed, about the physical effects which were made on the text during its daily usage: that is, its own entire history. If scientific research wants to reveal these circumstances and effects in order to interpret and adequately evaluate the particular textual-witness, it requires the following systematic study: 1) inquiring sufficiently into the basic paleographical and codicological evidences of the manuscript; 2) using precisely those special scientific auxiliary studies, registers, etc. which are already settled; 3) indentifying the original goal for the creation of the particular canonical collection, investigated by a consideration of the internal and external facts; 4) revealing the possible fields of usage of the manuscript (instruction, Episcopal court, ecclesiastical tribunal, parish, etc.); 5) locating the particular manuscript within the history of the sources, institutions, and science of canon law; 6) finally, forming a perspective on the effect of the textual-witness within the milieu in which the manuscript was used. We must be much more circumspect and keep the precise research method described above in mind when we ask our questions concerning the Ivonian textual-families and the origin of the supplements, rubrics, and inscriptions.

Several questions can arise based on the narrow comparison of the Decretum, the Panormia, and the Tripartita: Who composed the Panormia? Who is the author hidden behind the Tripartita? However, there are no adequate answers for these decisive questions. Nevertheless, there is a much more adequate question concerning the compiler of the Ivonian textual families: Whether the canonical material and the structure of the Decretum, the Panormia, or the Tri-

78 Cfr. ibid.
partita—each of which, in their textual families, appear to us now as independent collections—is closer to the original intention of the theoretical compiler. Based on the detailed comparative textual-critical, codicological, and paleographical analysis of Ivo’s work, it is crystal-clear that the identification of those several concrete authors who had fundamental influence on the canonical material as well as on the structuralization of the text is an impossible task. On the one hand, we would like to draw attention to those numerous supplementary canons which can be examined in the comparison of the manuscripts of the same textual-family, which we have already classified. On the other, we can see several supplementary notes, short explications, inscription systems, each inserted into the particular manuscripts not by the basic hand but by a different contemporary or later script style. Moreover, even the titles of the rubrics or their structure are sometimes altered, too (e.g., Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 393 [455]; Paris, BN lat. 3858). These facts shed light on the independent life of the particular manuscripts, each of which existed under several different influences. Therefore, according to our settled opinion, we can reconstruct only the supposed original intention and the particular segment of clerics whom Ivo of Chartres was addressing when he compiled a canonical reading-book. However, after an extensive research, we are able to list those six basic themes of that original collection, which at times was abbreviated, and at other times was enlarged, and furthermore, into which was inserted a developed inscription or rubric system, step by step, according to the peculiarity of the place of usage. Around these basic themes—as a «nucleus»—further disciplinary or doctrinal texts have been organized in longer or shorter form. Nevertheless, there was certainly no canon enumeration in the original composition of Ivo’s collection. Those textual witnesses of the Decretum, the Panormia, and the Tripartita without any rubric or inscription system are well-known to scientific research. These manuscripts support the Ivonian canonical collection’s original character, because they have partially conserved the peculiarities of the early form of the text, which should have been a canonical reading-book. Through a similar circumspect analysis, we can reconstruct those particular institutions of the contemporary ecclesiastical institutional system where the original Ivonian canonical reading-


book of the cathedral chapter would have been employed as an auxiliary book for the clergy educated by discipline, and where this canonical collection began its own independent life, and where the so called «nucleus» form of the text suffered minor or significant modifications. We must understand that this type of modification at the place of usage merely adapted to the contemporary basic canonical conviction concerning institutionalized ecclesiastical discipline. This conviction was the same as that of Ivo, which motivated him to compose the original collection. Ivo’s concept was the intention to present the entire canon law of the Church, since this presentation would promote the work and activity of the ecclesiastical institutions, particularly the care of souls (cfr. cura animarum) and salvation as a final goal. This endeavor to apply the entirety of canon law could happen in various ways—as we have already explained—and fundamentally, it had a strong link to the peculiarities of the concrete ecclesiastical institutions, namely, to those preferences which were essential to the work of a particular place of usage. All these institutional activities formed a wide panorama of variation in textual families from the original «nucleus» version of the Ivonian collection. Therefore, the later supplements which facilitated the text, according to the interest of the person or institution using it, established the basic peculiarities of the three main versions which became adapted, crystallized canonical handbooks. These versions are those which are recognized by the traditional classification of the science of canonical source history as three independent collections (cfr. theory of «intact literary work»), but we classify them as three textual families represented in the above described institutional and source historical background.

The classical question indeed: «Who is the author who stands behind the three textual families?» As an answer of our considered judgment, we can see that at the beginning, we certainly find St. Ivo of Chartres. However, he is obviously not the immediate author of the single textual families and the further textual and structural modifications which may be identified in many manuscripts. These significant or minor modifications, structuralizations, inscriptions, rubrics, etc., are the effects of the daily application of the ecclesiastical discipline, and they remain witnesses to that gradual crystallization process which had produced settled canonical collections—and their various versions—from a reading book.
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