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The Addenda et Corrigenda are arranged in the order of the original article (CTC 6.175–84) and comprise additional material for the Fortuna and Bibliography.

FORTUNA

p. 176b3–24. Replace with:

The Anglo-Saxon Bede (d. 735) included anonymous borrowings from the Epitoma rei militaris in several of his works; he stands as the first medieval author known to have used Vegetius.1 Two generations later, Alcuin (d. 804) wove a passage from the Epitoma into a letter addressed to Charlemagne.2 In the ninth century, the Epitoma came into prominence on the Continent owing to the Carolingian cultural renewal. Vegetius gave men of letters a chance to show the relevance of booklearning to secular pursuits.

In 838/839, Bishop Frechulf of Lisieux (d. ca. 850) addressed an edition of the Epitoma to the West Frankish king, Charles the Bald (823–877). During the mid- and late 820s, Frechulf had compiled a World History offered in 829/830 to Empress Judith as an ethico-historical primer for her son, the young Charles, then seven years old. Frechulf’s edition of Vegetius marked a continuing effort by the bishop to cultivate and influence the Carolingian prince. Echoing the subscriptio eutropiana of 450 A.D., a defining characteristic of Lang’s ε-class branch of the transmission of the Epitoma, Frechulf’s prologue to Charles introduced a textual recension responsible for an important sub-group of class ε. Frechulf thereby distinguished himself as the first medieval editor of the Epitoma and the first writer to refer by name to the “libellos Flavii Vegeti Renati De re militari”.

An early surviving copy of Frechulf’s recension is found in Paris, Bibliotheque Nationale de France, lat. 7383. The Caroline script of the codex is the work of several ill-practiced, heavily corrected Neustrian hands datable on palaeographical grounds to not later than 850 (confirmed by Bernhard Bischoff, letter of 14 January 1990). Hence the manuscript is contemporary with the Carolingian editor. Frechulf’s prologue appears in truncated form on a singleton (fol. 1) different from the ensuing leaves (fol. 2–66) but similar to those of the final gathering (fol. 67–74). The initial singleton and the final gathering share a layout of twenty-one ruled lines struck on identical springy, cream-colored parchment (goatskin). These leaves contrast with the intervening stiff, yellowish membrane (sheepskin) ruled and written with twenty-four lines (fol. 2–66). The codex, now slightly altered from the original disposition, has the following collation: I^1, II^1+10, III^1, IIII–VI^10, VII–VIII^6. The Vegetius content is complete apart from the normal lacunae of the ε-class text that Frechulf reedits; the Epitoma proper begins on fol. 2r. The initial singleton stands in


the place of the excised cover leaf of quire I, itself originally copied as an authentic quinion marked “I a” (fol. 10v, center lower margin). The stub of the excised leaf is now turned back over the fold of the ensuing gathering, and its conjugate (fol. 10) stands at the head of quire II, to make II10. Textually, the supplied singleton contains the bulk of Frechulf’s prologue about his recension of Vegetius.

Considered together, the palaeographical, physical, and textual features of Parisinus lat. 7383 mark the codex as an idigraph of Frechulf’s recension which mirrors the process of preparing the new text. Decisively, the quality and ruling of the parchment change with the final gathering (quire VIII), and this shift in writing stock permits a partial account of how Frechulf concluded his work as reflected by the codex. After emending the Epitoma, the editor drafted a dedicatory prologue that both echoed and superseded Europius’ subscription of 450 which followed the ε-class text used for the recension. Frechulf omitted the ancient subscription and its disclaimer “emendaui sine exemplario”, only to adopt and embellish the distinctive phrase in his own prologue: “corrigere curaui sine exemplario”. The sequence of the project meant that the bishop and his copyists used a leaf of the springy membrane with twenty-one lines similar to the stock of quire VIII to set down the bulk of the dedicatory prologue. This leaf was affixed as a mismatched singleton to the head of booklet I. Physically and textually, last things become first. The shift in materials and the use of the alternate writing stock for the editorial colophon, i.e., the prologue, place Parisinus lat. 7383 in the editor’s immediate circle. The copy itself is almost certainly the product of Frechulf’s Lisieux scriptorium, the first to be identified as such.

The added singleton received most but not all of the prologue. A tailpiece equivalent to six lines of copy in Parisinus lat. 7383 has now been lost. It probably continued on the cover sheet of the original quinion marked “I a”, so that the codex began with two regular quinions headed by the mismatched singleton (i.e., II10, II10). The cover sheet was perhaps originally left blank as protection for the ensuing text of Vegetius or to hold the later dedication. After receiving the last lines of the prologue, the leaf suffered a common fate of unwritten, or mostly unwritten, parchment. It was excised for other use, but only after the complete prologue with the recension of Vegetius had been propagated.

The codicological evidence placing Parisinus lat. 7383 in Frechulf’s immediate circle is corroborated by the textual tradition of Frechulf’s prologue. Dümmler’s text neatly illustrates the role played by the Paris idigraph. To consider but one example, his edition reports the reading ut poeηa for all five of the collated witnesses. This variant derives from Parisinus lat. 7383, fol. 1r, although the manuscript actually contains ait poeηa. The delicate bow of the notabiliaur Caroline a in ait deceptively recedes against the soil and damp-stained surface of fol. 1r; the letter’s sinuous back-stroke and the adjacent i appear to combine into a majuscule u (of a form otherwise absent in the manuscript), seemingly to give: “ut poeηa, non omnia possumus omnes” (Virgil, Eclogue 8.63). The misreading ut stems from a blemish in the Paris prototype. Easily enough, Dümmler’s collator repeated the mistake of finding ut for ait, first committed by a medieval copyist and subsequently propagated in the wider, southern branch of the tradition. Lang, however, had correctly printed ait (p. xxvii) as the reading of Parisinus lat. 7383, and the peculiar use of ait in initial position is, in fact, a recurrent feature of Frechulf’s generally awkward Latinity. The four late witnesses (s.XIV–XV) cited by Dümmler derive ultimately from the Paris idigraph, as do numerous other known copies of Frechulf’s recension, including a two-member German textual family that preserves the reading ait poeηa. In his recent studies of the transmission of Vegetius, Michael D. Reeve has amply shown the wide-reaching influence of Frechulf’s interventions across much of the later tradition.

It is historically and culturally significant that Frechulf supplied Charles the Bald with an edition of Vegetius, as Rosamond McKitterick suggests. Yet McKitterick’s hypothesis that Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 7230 (at 6. Dümmler, ed., MGH, Epistolae karolini aevi 5.619, l. 8; cf. Allen, ibid., 727 and apparatus.
8. “Charles the Bald (823–877) and His Library: The Patronage of Learning,” English Historical Review 95 (1980) 31 and n. 4.

5. Ibid., vi, xxviii and n. 11; also Allen, ed., Frechulf Lexouiensis Opera, 728, l. 16.
Saint-Denis, s. X\textsuperscript{1}) may be Frechulf's presentation copy is invalid, because the codex transmits the text of an alternate sub-group of class ε. In the manuscript, the Vegetius text precedes Solinus in a continuous transcription by a single hand. The intention of the copyist was to pair these two texts, an interesting combination, but one alien to Frechulf's design.\textsuperscript{10}

The *Epitoma* was copied in the Carolingian age as a general instructional tool. Pointed ethico-educative considerations lay behind the adaptation of books 1 and 2 that Hrabanus Maurus prefixed to his *De anima* and dispatched in late 855 or early 856 to Lothar II, the newly established king of Middle Francia.\textsuperscript{11} Heavily reworked and interpolated by Hrabanus, the fifteen chapters of text depend on an ε-class copy of Vegetius.\textsuperscript{12} Frechulf and Hrabanus both worked from exemplars of the ε-class, and Hrabanus' text seems closest to what is probably an early version of Frechulf's revision (Laon, Bibliothèque Municipale, 428, s. IX med.), which accords with the close personal links between the two men documented in their correspondence.\textsuperscript{13}

The testaments of two contemporary Frankish aristocrats, Ecard of Mâcon (d. after 867) and Eberhard of Friuli (d. 863), also reveal that highly placed laymen owned and no doubt consulted Vegetius' work. Each of the counts bequeathed his personal copy of the *Epitoma* to a lay heir. The chartularies of Fleury and Cysoing preserve, respectively, the wills documenting the bequests.\textsuperscript{14}

A separately transmitted dedicatory poem by Sedulius Scottus reveals that Eberhard's copy of Vegetius was itself a gift from Bishop Hartgar of Liège (840–855).\textsuperscript{15} The poem is based on the twenty-six Vegetius excerpts included by Sedulius in his *Collectaneum miscellaneum*; these excerpts link Hartgar's codex textually to Parisinus lat. 7383 or its near relation, Laudunensis 428.\textsuperscript{16} The presence of Vegetius as well as Frontinus in the *Collectaneum miscellaneum* may suggest that Sedulius' pupils included "someone involved in warfare, such as a prince or nobleman's son."\textsuperscript{17} A consideration of the excerpts highlights the incorporation of three of them in Sedulius' *Liber de rectoribus christianis*, a "mirror of princes" addressed to Lothar II sometime between 855 and 859, with the conclusion that practical ethics rather than military value guided Sedulius' use of the *Epitoma*.\textsuperscript{18}

In addition to the royal and aristocratic readership envisaged by Frechulf, Hrabanus, Hartgar, and Sedulius, the *Epitoma* was studied in the scholarly circle of Lupus of Ferrières (d. after 862). Lupus' critical and scribal methods influenced the execution of the earliest extant copy of the complete *Epitoma* (Lang's class π): Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. lat. 1572 (s. IX med.).\textsuperscript{19} For pal. lat. 1572 stands related to Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 7230A, a ninth-century π-class witness collated by Lang and attributed to Auxerre on the basis of text-critical features reminiscent of Lupus of Ferrières.\textsuperscript{20} Either of these two manuscripts is perhaps the source of the Vegetius excerpts in the *Glossae in Prisciani Partitiones* of Remigius of Auxerre.\textsuperscript{21}

---

10. B. Munk Olsen, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux X\textsuperscript{e} et XI\textsuperscript{e} siècles*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1985), 512–13 (B.79).
14. For a consideration of these wills in a wider discussion of Carolingian booklists, see R. McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the Written Word* (Cambridge, 1989), 245–48 and nos. 120, 123.
17. Simpson, ibid., xxii.
spondent/advisor and as an abbot with military obligations, which the *Epitoma* plainly addressed.

The extant ninth-century catalogue entries reported by Manitius appear to limit the *Epitoma* to libraries in East and Middle Francia (i.e., Constance [recte Reichenau], St. Gall, Lorsch, and Murbach). Nevertheless, the known interest in the work and the origins of surviving Carolingian copies attest to its active presence in West Francia. The *Epitoma* had a noteworthy place in the literary response to the political and military disintegration of the Carolingian order.

Scholarly interest in Vegetius in the late ninth and tenth centuries is also well documented. The e-class Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek, Dc 182, fols. 62–135 (copied at Rheims s. IX) gives a version of Frechulf’s text that was soon fitted with scholia drawn from Paul the Deacon’s abridgment of Festus Pompeius. Although the manuscript suffered severe damage in 1945, the washed-out glosses survive in a transcription. The codex, at Bamberg/Michelsberg in the high and later Middle Ages, appears to be one of those collected by Otto III and later given by Henry II to his cathedral foundation at Bamberg.

An important witness in Beneventan script, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. lat. 909, sheds interesting light on how Vegetius’ treatise was construed as a cultural instrument in the late tenth century. The manuscript contains an early, perhaps authorial copy of the so-called *Historia miscella* of Landolf Sagax, followed by the *Epitoma*. Marginal annotations confirm that Landolf’s reworking of Paul the Deacon’s *Historia romana* was conceived as a *speculum principis* for a South Italian noble. This combination of the *Epitoma* with an ethico-historical compendium interestingly mirrors the literary program of Frechulf of Lisieux.

While Vegetius appealed to a broad spectrum of ninth- and tenth-century readers, his work was prized by men of learning as a tool for the ethical and military instruction of princes. The *Epitoma* served as a tertium quid between the clerical domain of letters (theory) and the secular domain of warfare (practice). Its use as such marked a subtle advance of Christian literacy and book-learning into the formerly alien training ground of the soldier-prince.
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