



A Symposium of the RESEARCH GROUP ON MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE

www.manuscriptevidence.org

Friday and Saturday, 16 and 17 May 2014

Lewis Library 138, Princeton University

Recollections of the Past

*Editorial & Artistic Workshops
from Late Antiquity to Early Modernity & Beyond*

Quests to preserve, maintain, comprehend, and recast the legacy of the past take many forms through the ages. This symposium explores the workings of workshops to transmit, analyze, refurbish, or reclaim the past, as revealed through the traces of artists, craftsmen, scribes, authors, editors, patrons, scholars, teachers, and visitors, across a wide range of subjects, regions, and materials, from Late Antiquity onward. We examine how these editorial agents presented, or represented, the materials, whether tangible or intangible, while collecting, recalling, or adapting complex bodies of evidence — often in the process transforming that legacy (sometimes for the better) in its voyage across changing times, aspirations, and beliefs.

Sponsors: Program in Medieval Studies
Index of Christian Art
Department of Art & Archaeology
James Marrow and Emily Rose

Friday 16 May

SESSION 1:30–3:00pm

Opening Remarks

Mildred Budny

(Research Group on Manuscript Evidence)

Session 1. Inscribing, Measuring, Viewing

Moderator: **Sara S. Poor** (Medieval Studies Program and Department of German, Princeton University)

Don C. Skemer (Firestone Library, Princeton University)

“A Renaissance Erasable Notebook in the Old World and the New”

Frederic Clark (Department of History, Princeton University)

“Dividing Time: Collaboration, Conflict, and the Periodization of the Past in the Decades around 1700”

Paul Davis (Department of History, Princeton University)

“The Domestic Grand Tour: Observations from the Diaries of Caroline Lybbe Powys”

BREAK 3:00–3:30pm

Friday 16 May

SESSION 3:30–5:00pm

Session 2. Chasing, Observing, Detecting

Moderator: **Helmut Reimitz** (Department of History, Princeton University)

Martha E. Easton (Department of Communication and the Arts, Seton Hall University)
“Medieval and Nineteenth-Century ‘Courtly Love’ Ivories and the Nature of Authenticity”

Karl F. Morrison (Department of History Emeritus, Rutgers University)
“Witnessing Iconoclasm: Some Recent Collaborative Studies”

Robert A. Kaster (Department of Classics, Princeton University)
“Hunting a Textual Wild Man in Twelfth-Century England”

RECEPTION 5:00–6:30pm

Lobby outside Lewis Library 138

Saturday 17 May

SESSION 9:00–10:30am

Session 3. Building, Shaping, Remembering

Moderator: **Henry Schilb** (Index of Christian Art, Princeton University)

Tom Jacoby (Research Group on Manuscript and Other Evidence, Princeton)
“Recovering the Evidence for Workshop Activities at Qal’at Sim’an”

Catherine Fernandez (Index of Christian Art, Princeton University,
“Inventories, Altars, and Institutional Memory: Carolingian Patronage and the Sculptural ‘Program’ of Saint-Sernin of Toulouse”

BREAK 10:30–11:00am

Saturday 17 May

SESSION 11:00am–12:30pm

Session 4. Recollecting Losses and Analyzing Structures in Books of Hours

Moderator: **James H. Marrow** (Department of Art & Archaeology Emeritus, Princeton University),

Adelaide Bennett (Index of Christian Art, Princeton University),
“Recollections of a Dismembered French Book of Hours of the Early Fourteenth Century”

Gregory T. Clark (Department of Art & Art History, Sewanee: The University of the South),
“Beyond Use: A Digital Tool for the Analysis of Late Medieval Manuscript Books of Hours”

LUNCH 12:30–1:30pm
(provided for participants)

Saturday 17 May

SESSION 1:30–3:00pm

Session 5. Transmitting, Editing, and “Reading” Complex Texts

Moderator: **Charles E. Barber** (Department of Art & Archaeology, Princeton University)

Celia Chazelle (Department of History, The College of New Jersey)

“*Reading the Bible and Editing Bibles at Bede’s Monkwearmouth–Jarrow: The Codex Amiatinus and its ‘Sister Bibles’*”

Mildred Budny (Research Group on Manuscript Evidence, Princeton)

“*Unity & Diversity in Framing the Eusebian Canon Tables of Gospel Concordances: A Study Tool Illuminated*”

Michael T. Davis (Princeton Theological Seminary)

“*What is the the Syriac Cave of Treasures? Issues of Genre, Text, and Transmission*”

BREAK 3:00–3:30pm

Saturday 17 May

SESSION 3:30–5:30pm

Session 6. Reshaping Ecclesiastical and Institutional Histories

Moderator: **Giles Constable** (School of Historical Studies, Institute for Advanced Study)

Helmut Reimitz (Department of History, Princeton University)

“*Recollections of Late Antiquity in the Carolingian Empire: The Creation of a New Church History in the Historiographical Workshop of Lorsch circa 800*”

Madeline McMahon (Department of Classics, Columbia University)

“*Matthew Parker and the Practice of Church History: Reading and Publishing ‘bokes of Antiquite’*”

Antony Grafton (Department of History, Princeton University)

“*John Caius and the History of Cambridge University: A Matthew Parker Product Restored*”

Concluding Remarks

Giles Constable

RECEPTION 5:30–7:00pm
Lobby outside Lewis Library 138

Abstracts (Alphabetical order by Speaker)

Bennett, Adelaide (Index of Christian Art, Princeton University)

“Recollections of a Dismembered French Book of Hours of the Early Fourteenth Century”

When this early fourteenth-century Book of Hours, made in northern France, was sold in 1991 at Sotheby's, London, it remained as a whole codex, though only with two historiated initials extant. In 1996, I had the opportunity to examine this thick octavo. I found it so rich in textual contents, some quite rare, that it took me at least a week to transcribe most of the texts. In great haste at the end, I was able to take only a few photographs of the manuscript. Sometime afterwards, the book was sent for evaluation, but ended up with leaves dismembered for sales. In 2005, I attended the International Congress on Medieval Studies at Kalamazoo, and there at a booth exhibiting rare books and leaves I spotted some folios that had come from the same Book of Hours I had examined nearly a decade before. I bought three folios with figured initials. Occasionally, I would peruse through my textual transcription of the formerly whole codex, realizing each time its importance in text, decoration, and figure style. This Symposium of the Research Group on Manuscript Evidence, organized by Dr. Mildred Budny, now provides me the opportunity to recollect on this book of devotions intended for a female user and illuminated in Picardy, probably Laon, on the basis of its liturgical and stylistic evidence.

Budny, Mildred (Research Group on Manuscript Evidence, Princeton)

*“Unity & Diversity in Framing the Eusebian Canon Tables of Gospel Concordances:
A Study Tool Illuminated”*

Arranged by Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea (circa 314 – 339 C.E.), using a continuous system of chapter (or section) numeration for each Gospel, long before the now-familiar arrangement by chapter-and-verse, the Canon Tables list the concordances between the four canonical Gospels (Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, often in that order), with the aim of manifesting their essential harmony — no matter how divergent or even conflicting their accounts of the life and death of Christ might appear. As Eusebius explained in his epistolary preface to his Tables, Canon I presents the passages common to all four Gospels, Canons II–IV each list those of three Gospels, Canons V–IX each list those of two Gospels, and Canon X lists separately the passages unique to the individual Gospels, in four individual parts. Omitted are two possible concordances (Mark–Luke–John and Mark–John), presumably in order to bring the Canon Tables, and by extension the Gospels themselves, into line with the number Ten, believed to possess perfection.

This unifying approach belongs among the several ambitious attempts in the Early Christian period to make manifest the complex “harmony” or unity of the Gospel texts overall. Rather than, say, recasting the texts into a single and seemingly coherent narrative, as with the *Diatessaron* attributed to Tatian (circa 120–180), the Eusebian Canon Tables instead depend upon numbers as such, with their powers of unique identification and ease of referencing. The Tables set out their lists in varying numbers of columns and in columns of varying lengths, corresponding to the extent of the concordant passages discerned between the specific combinations of Gospels, whether to be viewed in tandem or (in Canon X) on their own. Matching citation marks set alongside the textual passages, at least in theory and often in practice or partial practice in the copying of the Gospels, aimed to implement and facilitate the processes of consultation, study, and comprehension. The Tables themselves acquired many forms of enclosures with frames or arcades, with ample scope for embellishment in many ways through colors, ornaments, illustrations, and other elements.

With examples drawn mostly from the Latin West, this paper explores some ingenious and inspired responses to the editorial and artistic opportunities, in combination, offered by the Eusebian Canon Tables in their widespread adoption and transmission throughout the Christian world, before their abandonment in the rise of a new system of numbering passages in the Bible and, with it, changing approaches to reading and studying its texts. Some outstanding representatives of the genre of framing Canon Arcades express, in their very structures and embellishments alike, a clear recognition of the potential beauty, resonance, and intentions of these lists of numbers in approaches to unity and diversity standing in harmonic presence. An especially notable case appears in the majestic arcades of the large-format 9th-century “Royal Bible” of St. Augustine’s Abbey, Canterbury, which retains many evocations, throughout its surviving script, ornament, and illustration, of Late-Antique models of imperial splendor, perhaps close in certain important respects to Eusebius’s lost Greek archetype — presumably by way, in part, of one of its own models, the lost *Biblia Gregoriana* (“The Bible of Gregory the Great”) owned by the abbey.

Chazelle, Celia (Department of History, The College of New Jersey, Ewing)

“*Reading the Bible and Editing Bibles at Bede’s Monkwearmouth–Jarrow:
The Codex Amiatinus and its ‘Sister Bibles’*”

This paper is based on a book I am writing about the full Bibles produced for Wearmouth–Jarrow and the context in which that enterprise unfolded. Bede (672/673 – 735), a monk of Wearmouth–Jarrow was Anglo-Saxon England’s most famous scholar. His *History of the Abbots*, recently dated circa 717, and the anonymous *Life of Ceolfrid*, probably written a few years later, report that Abbot Ceolfrid commissioned three full Bibles or “pandects.” Bede tells us that the manuscripts contained Jerome’s Vulgate translation of the Bible text. Both narratives imply that the Bibles were completed between the death of Wearmouth’s founder, Benedict Biscop, in 689, and June 716, the period when Ceolfrid governed Wearmouth together with Jarrow, effectively uniting the two houses into a single monastery. In June 716, Ceolfrid left Wearmouth with a party of monks to take one of the Bibles to Rome’s shrine of St. Peter. We now know that their gift was the *Codex Amiatinus*, the only Wearmouth–Jarrow full Bible to survive intact. Sometime before their departure, according to the *Life*, the other two Bibles, commonly known as *Amiatinus’* “sister Bibles,” were placed in the churches of St. Peter’s Wearmouth and St. Paul’s Jarrow.

Full Bibles appear to have been very rare in the Latin West before the Carolingian era. Why were these manuscripts made for Wearmouth–Jarrow, and what light can we shed on the chronology and circumstances of their production? These are questions explored in depth in my monograph that I will briefly address in this paper.

Clark, Frederic (Department of History, Princeton University)

“*Dividing Time: Collaboration, Conflict, and the Periodization of the Past in the Decades around 1700*”

Although it possessed deep roots in the early Renaissance, our ostensibly “modern” method of dividing historical time into those three distinct phases of Antiquity, the Middle Ages, and Modernity was formalized and made conventional in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. This paper examines how historians, philologists, and classical scholars in the decades around 1700 debated the merits of this new tripartite periodization, especially according to the schema outlined in the *Historia universalis in antiquam, medii aevii, ac novam divisa* (*Universal History Divided into*

Ancient, Medieval, and Modern Times) by the German compiler Christopher Cellarius (1638–1707). In addition to Cellarius, this paper also considers the work of other scholars active in the debate, including Peter Lambeck (1628–1680), Jacob Perizonius (1651–1715), and J.A. Fabricius (1668–1736).

Wedge uneasily between our own periodized definitions of Renaissance and Enlightenment, these latest of “late” humanists have suffered undue neglect in traditional accounts of intellectual history. However, through collaborative processes that stretched across print, manuscript, and oral transmission via classroom lectures and student notes, they together participated in a rich (and sometimes polemical) exploration of the nature of historical continuity and change. In doing so, they fixed those turning points that still determine the boundaries of historical epochs today, whether for good or for ill. This paper reconstructs how these often-overlooked humanists worked across the Republic of Letters in order to define the new tripartite periodization — thereby forging new collective recollections of the past through dialogue with both their predecessors and each other.

Clark, Gregory T. (Department of Art & Art History, Sewanee: The University of the South)

“Beyond Use: A Digital Tool for the Analysis of Late Medieval Manuscript Books of Hours”

Over the past 30 years, the study of medieval paintings on wooden panels has been revolutionized by dendrochronological analysis of the supports themselves. The highly objective results have sometimes upheld and at other times upended the dating of the panels on connoisseurial and other more traditional analytical grounds.

While the vellum supports of most late medieval illuminated manuscripts have not yet been subjected to a like scientific analysis, those books do enjoy a context — the accompanying texts — that can be analyzed objectively. The topic of my presentation will be a previously unpublished database of textual variants first developed in the 1970s by John Plummer of Princeton University and the Morgan Library to localize and date late medieval manuscript Books of Hours. His data up to 1981 and all of my data have finally been digitized for a database to be launched online this year.

My recordings over the past 30 years have enabled me better to resolve vexing problems of localization in print already twice. Once the database is available to all, everyone will be able to plumb and benefit from the body of evidence.

Davis, Michael T. (Princeton Theological Seminary)

“What is the the Syriac Cave of Treasures? Issues of Genre, Text, and Transmission”

The *Cave of Treasures*, originally found in Syriac and probably dating from the 6th to 7th centuries C.E., was a very influential work in Middle Eastern Christianity and beyond. Over the centuries it was translated into Arabic, Armenian, Georgian, Coptic, and Ge’ez. Many scholars have seen materials in the *Cave* as influences in the West, found, for example, in Dante and the *Golden Legend*. Though its exact nature is unclear, the *Cave* presents itself as a “re-telling” of the Old and New Testaments, incorporating a vast array of extra-biblical material from both Jewish and Christian exegetical, pseudepigraphical, and legendary sources. However, it is also a work which does not seem to have had either a recoverable Ur-text or a canonical or received form. Therefore, this paper addresses the issues involved in any attempt to work textually with a work of this nature. These issues are especially acute when it comes to preparing an edition of such a work or even a translation. Related issues involving the history of transmission/translation and the composition of the *Cave* will also be briefly discussed.

Davis, Paul (Department of History, Princeton University)

“The Domestic Grand Tour: Observations from the Diaries of Caroline Lybbe Powys”

In the 18th century, young British aristocrats and members of the landed gentry took the so-called “Grand Tour” of Continental Europe, a secular pilgrimage through France and Italy to seek the pleasures of Venice and to observe the classical ruins of Rome and Pompeii. While this educational rite of passage was a distinctively male activity, British women during this period began to engage in long trips to visit ruins within Britain itself. This somewhat less grand, “Domestic Tour” has been much less studied. In this paper, I will discuss the itineraries and activities of one particular woman, Caroline Lybbe Powys (1738–1817), née Caroline Girle, as recorded in her travel diaries now preserved in the British Library. It is my hope that her experiences will help to broaden our understanding of how women during this period engaged with the deep but accessible past.

Easton, Martha E. (Department of Communication and the Arts, Seton Hall University)

“Medieval and Nineteenth-Century ‘Courtly Love’ Ivories and the Nature of Authenticity”

In this project I explore the different ways that medieval ivories are “faked,” and how ideas about model, mimicry, homage, and forgery are applied to this art form. Even the material of ivory itself can be faked. Modern scholarship about medieval ivory carving often seems to privilege elephant ivory, either African or Indian, as the most “authentic,” or at least most prized form of ivory. Many medieval objects were made out of walrus ivory, bone, and narwhal tusk. Theophilus in his treatise on the arts mentions ivory carving only briefly, but gives instructions about how to stain different types without seeming to privilege one sort of material over the other. Although apparently elephant ivory supplies became depleted in the early Middle Ages, it is not clear if the other materials were seen as inferior substitutes, or used to mimic “real” ivory.

Likewise there may be degrees of inauthenticity. These “lesser” materials are still more authentic to our modern eyes than the numerous resin or celluloid objects that were made in the nineteenth century and sold as original medieval objects, as part of the larger revival of interest in all things medieval. Sometimes the material itself was “real,” as carbon-dated medieval ivory was used, or re-used, but the carving itself was done by a nineteenth-century forger. Many museum collections of medieval art contain examples of nineteenth-century “ivories” that entered the collections as authentic objects and have since been relegated to storage. How should we evaluate about such pieces today? Is there a way to rehabilitate them, to think about them as part of a larger discourse of medievalism, say as emulation/homage as opposed to imitation/fraud?

Beyond material, I would also like to focus in particular on secular ivories, so-called “courtly love” objects, which until fairly recently were seldom the subject of scholarly attention, almost as if their frivolous focus on romance and their function as mirror backs, combs, and caskets made them less important than devotional ivory objects, such as plaques with scenes of the life of Christ and Mary or statuettes of the Virgin and Child. The scenes depicted on these objects are often visual euphemisms, so that the falcon hunts, castle-stormings, rabbit chases, and lover-crownings are simply “fake” ways of signifying sex, probably obvious to any medieval viewer but more benign to a modern one. Finally, one of the popular scenes, the unicorn trapped in the lap of a maiden, can connote both a sexual act, as well as thoughts of the narwhal, the source of the “fake” unicorn ivory in the Middle Ages.

Fernandez, Catherine (Index of Christian Art, Princeton University)

“Inventories, Altars, and Institutional Memory: Carolingian Patronage and the Sculptural ‘Program’ of Saint-Sernin of Toulouse”

As one of the great monuments of medieval France, Saint-Sernin of Toulouse occupies an important place in studies of Romanesque art and architecture. Moreover, the basilica has generated an immeasurable body of scholarship on its sculptural programs as well as the artistic originality of its sculptors, notably Bernardus Gelduinus, whose name is preserved in an inscription engraved on the surface of the main altar. Yet this emphasis on late eleventh-century innovation and novelty has obscured the possible medieval perception that Saint-Sernin’s sculptural iconography amplified an older narrative strand of the site’s history.

In this paper, I suggest that the commemoration of Carolingian patronage remains embedded within the fabric of the Romanesque structure. By considering the relationship between a description of the configuration of altars preserved in a 1246 inventory and the capitals that ornament the apse and transept, I assert that the canons of Saint-Sernin deliberately chose themes that reference the relics venerated within the basilica. Taking into account a ninth-century poem by Hrabanus Maurus (circa 780 – 856) that purportedly describes the altars of Carolingian Saint-Sernin and a parchment authentic discovered in 1258 that lists the relics of saints whose cults were promoted by Carolingian monarchs, this paper demonstrates that Carolingian largesse was an integral component of Saint-Sernin’s institutional memory rendered tangible through text, relic, and image.

Grafton, Antony (Department of History, Princeton University)

“John Caius and the History of Cambridge University: A Matthew Parker Product Restored”

John Caius (1510–1573) has a mixed reputation at best in the world of learning. No one doubts his erudition. He mastered Greek and Hebrew at Cambridge and studied medicine at Padua, where he and Andreas Vesalius — another deep student of Galenic anatomy — shared a house. Extensive travel to Italian libraries resulted in detailed collations of a number of Galenic manuscripts and a 1544 edition of seven Galenic texts. But as Vivian Nutton — the principal explorer of Caius’s library and publications — has shown, he also drew without acknowledgement on the work of his principal teacher at Padua, Johannes Baptista Montanus. Two of his works have met with special disapproval: the *De antiquitate Cantabrigiensis academiae* (1568) and the *Historia Cantabrigiensis academiae* (1574). Urged on by his friend Matthew Parker, Caius wrote these to show that Thomas Caius of Oxford had been wrong to argue, in his *Assertio*, that Oxford was the older university. Though bulging with information, these works show little of the critical precision that marked Caius’s medical philology, while revealing some credulity about texts that most scholars with an up-to-date training had rejected as spurious or untrustworthy. Modern scholars — including the present speaker — have often dismissed these works as an early version of the Boat Race. In fact, Caius’s books on Cambridge are less individual products than the results of collaboration with Matthew Parker’s “antiquaries” and with Parker himself. Many of their qualities seem less puzzling when they are treated as products of Parker’s erudite but not always efficient atelier. This talk will explore the sources that Caius drew on, the circulation and reception of his books, and their relation to the scholarly interests and concerns of the Parker circle.

Jacoby, Tom (Research Group on Manuscript and Other Evidence, Princeton)

“Recovering the Evidence for Workshop Activities at Qal’at Sim’an”

Many people have heard about St. Symeon Stylites, the first of the so-called “pillar” saints. However, few know of the building complex that was constructed around his pillar in the fifth century. Known as Qal’at Sim’an, the complex occupies a hill-top in Northwest Syria, not far from Aleppo. It is part of a very large Byzantine pilgrimage center, comprised of two parts: 1) Deir (Dayr) Sim’an in the valley of the Afrin River, with three churches and adjoining monasteries, pilgrim hostels, shops, and other constructions, and 2) Qal’at Sim’an on a hill top accessible from the village below by a clearly-demarcated pathway. All buildings are crafted from locally quarried limestone. My study of this group of monuments draws upon detailed notes and photographs made in 1975 recording features which may since have become damaged or destroyed.

This paper considers questions of workshop practices revealed by part of the rich ornamental repertoire at Qal’at Sim’an, particularly a frieze of acanthus-derived rinceau at the springing of the semi-dome of the great apse of the east basilica in the late fifth-century martyrium. At one end, the frieze reflects a long-established, naturalistic approach to its subject, which gradually transforms into a more abstract, stylized approach at the other end. The transformation across the continuous band of ornament, most likely carved *in situ*, is very unusual in a single location. The blocks, as is the usual practice, were probably roughed out in the quarry before being installed in position, but the anomalies pose challenges for understanding the carving process itself. 1) Did one group of craftsmen start at one end, then resume carving with a somewhat different model, or did two different crews, with different sculptural traditions (say, local and imperial), start at opposite ends and work toward the center? 2) Do the results instead reveal the first steps of the design and its gradual actualization at the hands of various craftsmen, from apprentice, through journeyman, to master sculptors, who completed the final details? 3) Do we witness an abandonment of the project before its completion — strangely in the part of the east basilica closest to the altar where Mass was offered? It is not unusual to have very different column capitals or bases in one building, either built *de novo* or using spoils, or to have different styles of reliefs in one building, but the change of approach in one continuous frieze appears to be unique. Certainly we see evidence for differences in workshop practice, but what else do we see?

Kaster, Robert A. (Department of Classics, Princeton University)

“Hunting a Textual Wild Man in 12th-Century England”

That we know as much as we do about Rome’s early emperors is due in large part to Suetonius’s “Lives of the Caesars” (*De vita Caesarum*); that we know Suetonius’s “Lives” is due to the work of countless, mostly anonymous scribes and readers who worked to transmit the text from the early second century C.E. on. One important strand of that transmission was woven in southern England in the early twelfth century, when the text passed through the hands of a man who can reasonably be described as Suetonius’s most brilliant — and most irresponsible — medieval reader. In this talk I describe his work, explain why he merits those epithets, and describe the steps that allowed me to uncover his identity.

McMahon, Madeline (Department of Classics, Columbia University)

“Matthew Parker and the Practice of Church History: Reading and Publishing ‘bokes of Antiquite’ ”

Archbishop of Canterbury Matthew Parker (1504–1575) and his team of scholars are best known for the collection of manuscripts they amassed, the core of which is still held in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. In addition to collecting medieval texts, they also rearranged their acquisitions, mined manuscripts for evidence that the early English church practiced and believed as they did in important respects, and published editions of some of the texts they read.

This paper seeks to make sense of Parker’s seemingly disparate projects by showing that every aspect was ecclesiastically driven. Parker’s reasons for exploiting medieval books informed, but were also sometimes shaped by, his methods for doing so. Parker’s practices of reading historical texts, exemplified by the annotations in his medieval manuscripts and in particular his circle’s use of The Scheide Library, MS 159 (a 13th-century copy of William of Malmesbury’s *Gesta regum anglorum*), reveal his vision of the continuous existence of the true church as well as his sense of his own religious identity. His reading, in turn, informed his plans for printing editions of many of the texts he read, fashioning his attitudes toward manuscript and print, the Anglo-Saxon and Norman churches, and the practice and promulgation of church history itself.

Morrison, Karl F. (Department of History Emeritus, Rutgers University)

“Witnessing Iconoclasm: Some Recent Collaborative Work”

In recent years, there has been a spontaneous global celebration of iconoclasm, through numerous conferences, exhibitions, and commemorations, ensemble scintillations in the afterglow of numerous head-line events at the turn of the millennium. Many public occasions comprised, or included, scholarly conferences, some of which were designed as workshops for reflections on historical phenomena of iconoclasm. Despite the ill winds blowing over publishing, the planners and participants generally anticipated issuing collaborative results of those symposia (*phrontisteria?*) in print.

My paper amounts to a brief review of two volumes of scholarly articles, souvenirs of gatherings — one of which organized itself first as a network, and then as a workshop, running a course of several years (2009–2013) closely associated by interlocking personnel with major art exhibitions (2001–2003, 2013–2014). The volumes are: Stacy Boldrick, Leslie Brubaker, and Richard Clay, eds., *Striking Images, Iconoclasms Past and Present* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2013); and Kristine Kolrud and Marina Prusac, eds., *Iconoclasm from Antiquity to Modernity* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2014). As it happens, both books were issued by the same publisher, a firm which has in recent years cultivated a formidable list of volumes in the workshop genre, on the subject of iconoclasm.

My title, “Witnessing Iconoclasm,” indicates a connection between the works at hand and visual cognition. The paper has two parts. The first compares the different conditions under which the two sets of collaborators collectively witnessed, and framed their witness of, the notoriously shape-shifting quarry called “iconoclasm.” My organizing metaphor in this part is the camera, an image-forming optical device to be played with *ad libitum* with lenses and filters. The second part concerns the device with which they projected the image they had collectively formed (i.e., the witness they gave in their quite different books). In this section, the organizing metaphor is, quite naturally, another optical device: the projector. I found myself comparing what might be expected from a

gathering of iconologists with the fascinating evidence these books give in other fields about (1) framing mélanges of data into the orderliness of collective witness, and (2) the witness actually given in print.

Reimitz, Helmut (Department of History, Princeton University)

“Recollections of Late Antiquity in the Carolingian Empire: The Creation of a New Church History in the Historiographical Workshop of Lorsch circa 800”

This paper explores the intensified use and reception of Church history in the Carolingian monastery of Lorsch, which had close ties not only to the bishopric of Metz but also to the Carolingian family and court. It will focus on three different Church histories copied and compiled in Lorsch at around 800: the Latin translation and continuation of Eusebius’ *Church History* by Rufinus, Bede’s *History*, and the *Histories* of Gregory of Tours in the oldest Carolingian version, entitled by the compilers at Lorsch as *Historia ecclesiastica*. In this compendium the Lorsch compilers assembled a new version of Gregory’s *Histories*. Building on two different versions of the text that were available at the time, namely the Merovingian six-book version and a complete edition of the text that seems to have been close to how Gregory himself wanted his narrative to be transmitted, the Lorsch compilers constructed a new selection from Gregory’s work, taking their material from all ten books, but they divided the selected chapters into only nine books. The manuscript shares striking parallels in script, layout and conception with the oldest extant manuscript of Rufinus’s translation and continuation of the Church history by the first Church historian Eusebius, as well as with a copy of Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* both written at around the same time. In the case of Rufinus one could regard his text as a model for the compilation of Gregory’s *Histories*.

I suggest that the copying and compilation of Church history be understood as part of the intensified reflection about the relationship of Church and Empire around 800, the time of the renovation of the Roman Empire under Charlemagne. With the expansion of Carolingian rule over half of Europe, the particular Christendom which had been developing in the Frankish kingdoms since the sixth century, was forced, much more intensely than before, to assert itself against other forms and traditions of Christian belief. The editorial work in the historiographical workshop at Lorsch can thus be explored as a window into the intensification of reflections on the compatibility and convergence of past and present Christendoms in the emerging Carolingian empire.

Skemer, Don C. (Firestone Library, Princeton University)

“An Erasable Renaissance Notebook in the Old World and the New”

My presentation relates the origins, technology, production, and use of erasable writing tablets and notebooks, a late medieval invention (related to metalpoint) that had an active life in the 16th and 17th centuries. Most of the manuscript evidence offered is based on the study of a surviving example of circa 1575 in the Princeton University Library.



Information about the activities and publications of the Research Group on Manuscript Evidence appears on its official website: <http://manuscriptevidence.org>. The Research Group welcomes donations for its nonprofit educational mission, including donations in kind, expertise, advice, and contributions to our work, research, scholarly events, and publications.

Please let us know if you wish to join our mailing list, for information about our activities, and if you would like to contribute to them. Please contact director@manuscriptevidence.org with your questions and suggestions.