DO ALL ROADS LEAD TO WATERFORD?
THE CODEX BNF FR. 1822 AND ITS CONTEXT*

1. INTRODUCTION

In French in Medieval Ireland, Ireland in Medieval French. The Paradox of Two Worlds, Keith Busby provides an insightful profile of the Anglo-Norman language and culture in Ireland after the 1169 conquest. The second chapter of the volume deals with the French manuscript production on the island, especially the section All Roads Lead to Waterford: Hospitallers, the Dominican and the Tax-Collector.¹ This section focuses on two manuscripts linked to Waterford, one of the major trading centres in South-Eastern Ireland: mss. Cambridge, Corpus Christi’s College Library, 405 and Paris, BnF fr. 1822. The first manuscript shows undoubted connections with the Hospitallers community of Kilbarry, in the county of Waterford;² as for the second, the question of its origins is debated by Busby. My contribution intends to cover this issue, offering new elements to the study of the BnF manuscript.

Composed at the end of the 13th or at the beginning of the 14th century, the codex represents «un’autentica biblioteca settoriale dei piú importanti e diffusi strumenti didattici affermatisi nel corso del XIII secolo».³ In

---

¹ Busby 2017: 146-67.
³ Strinna 2011: 79. The BnF codex was the main subject of Strinna’s PhD thesis (Strinna 2007). Besides the above-mentioned Sermons edition, see also Strinna 2008. Busby appears to completely ignore Strinna’s significant publications on the subject.

---

* This contribution is part of the 2017 PRIN project ‘Prosopographical Atlas of Romance Literature’ (CUP B88D19002670001). The initial phase of this research has been supported by a bursary from the Anglo Norman Dictionary (Aberystwyth University) and the Arts and Humanities Research Council. I am grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their suggestions, as well as to Lara Alzouabi for her linguistic expertise.

---
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the words of Chantal Connochie-Bourgne, «il met d’emblée le lecteur en présence d’une série de sermons qui le tiennent à l’écart de toute vaine curiosité du monde, il lui offre un savoir antique et moderne, païen et chrétien, retraçant ainsi une histoire de l’homme sous le regard de la Providence».4 The recueil mainly contains gnomic and didactic texts such as a collection of anonymous sermons, the Image du Monde and the Livre de Moralitez. It also constitutes the only complete witness of three French translations composed by Jofroi de Waterford, notably a unique version of the pseudo-Aristotelian Secretum secretorum.5

The figure of Jofroi de Waterford never ceased to spark interest in scholars who studied the BnF codex. A remarkably cultivated Irish Dominican, Jofroi may have been associated with the Waterford priory of St. Saviour (established in 1226). His name is traditionally linked to another figure, “Servais Copale”, who is mentioned in the colophon. The nature of the relationship between the two has been discussed throughout the years. Here, I will not recap the long story of this debate, as it has been effectively summarized by Busby.6 The literature previous to French in Medieval Ireland tends to agree that Servais Copale was simply the scribe of the miscellany, rather than Jofroi’s close collaborator. It is also likely that the codex was compiled in Wallonia since the name Servais Copale appears to be connected to the city of Huy, in some archival documents. Nevertheless, Jofroi’s reference to some exemplaires de Paris (c. 142r) used for his translation incited speculation on Jofroi’s Parisian activity.

French in Medieval Ireland, Ireland in Medieval French proposes a new solution to the problem of the external history of the codex: Busby claims the discovery of eight archival documents mentioning the name “Servais Copale”. According to these records, Servais «was a merchant, supplier of victuals for the king’s war against the Scots, and collectors of taxes (custos) on wine imports» operating in Waterford.7 Busby expresses that the consequences of this discovery are noteworthy: «Servais activities

4 Connochie-Bourgne 2010: 195.
5 The manuscript also transmits the translations of Dares Phrygius’ De excidio Troiae and of Eutropius’ Breviarium ab Urbe vinda.
7 Ibi: 161.
[...] can now be seen as the principal explanation of the apparent originality of chapter [...] *De la diversetez de vin solone les terrages et la region ou les vignes croissent*. The chapter is a part of a wider oenological section which represents one of the main aspects of interest of this version of the *Secretum Secretorum*. Busby contends that «the enthusiastic detail found here is that of the custos and merchant who had doubtless sampled not a few of the imported wines on which he levied the tax and which he sold to the army».9

These ideas are reaffirmed in the introduction of *The French Works of Jofroi de Waterford. A Critical Edition*.10 The volume offers the first complete scholarly edition of the *Gerre de Troi*, the *Regne des Romains*, and the *Secré de Secrês*.11 Here, the works are considered as «a joint enterprise» by Jofroi the Waterford and Servais Copale.12 Moreover, in these pages, Busby has the merit of focusing on an expression found in the prologue of the *Secré de Secrês* and traditionally overlooked by scholars: *A noble bers, prouz et sages, freres Jofroi de Waterford de l’ordene az freres precheors le mendre, salus en Jhesu Crist et santei d’anlme et de cors*.13

Busby argues that the term *mendre* is to be interpreted as «an expression of modesty, meaning the ‘the least’, ‘the least worthy’, or possibly ‘the youngest’», even though the scholars adds that «it is not entirely out of the question that Jofroi was a Franciscan».14 The syntax of the dedication (*le mendre* is clearly referred to *freres*, not to *ordene*), as well as the traditional use of this formula (see below) strongly contrast the idea of a possible affiliation with the Franciscan order.

---

11 Busby 2020: 11-5.
12 Busby 2020: 15.
2. A CLOSER LOOK AT THE CODEX

Busby’s considerations on the BnF fr. 1822’s provenance allows to tackle a long-debated question from a unique perspective. Yet such speculations present many aspects on which a deeper focus is needed. First of all, the identification of the figure found in the documents with the Servais Co-pale mentioned in the BnF codex appears to be debatable.

The hypothesis of a merchant-scribe is surely a fascinating one. In recent years, Lorenzo Tomasin has shed light on the curious case of Bartol de Cavals,15 merchant in Catalonia and compiler of the dedicatory codex for the Valencian version of Valerius Maximus’s *Factorum et dictorum memorabilium libri IX* (1395).16 However, this appears to be an extremely isolated case, which took place in a completely different context from early 14th century Ireland.17 What’s more, the scribal activity of Bartol is accurately documented by a rich collection of letters stored at the Archivio Datini – we even know his preferences regarding the best pens on the market.18 Consequently, there is no doubt that the figure mentioned in the Valeri Màxim’s introduction corresponds with the versatile merchant active in Valencia.

As for Servais Copale, Busby himself acknowledges that there is a possibility that we are dealing with two individuals, given that Copale or Coupelle is not a rare family name (a toponym) and that Servais is a quite common first name in the region19 of Maastricht. I would like to add that the name Servais stems from Latin SERVATIUS: yet the documents discovered by Busby only present the forms *Servasius, Gervasius, Cervasius.*

---

16 Bartol himself brought the manuscript to the Barcelona city council, as we can read in the preface letter: «[…] hauem acordat de trametreus lo dit Valeri aromançat, lo qual vos trametem per Bartol de Caualls, scriva nostre […]»: cf. Antoni Canals (Miquel y Planas): 1 4.
17 The category of “merchant-scribe” is traditionally associated with the circulation of Boccaccio’s *Decameron*: see the classic study in Branca 1961: 69-77.
18 In one of his letters, Bartol asks his addressee to get him Maiorcan pens, «chi sono millor che no sono aquelle che venen de Flandres»: cf. Tomasin 2020: 44.
19 Busby 2017: 164.
course, the variety in rendering personal names in Medieval documents is a well-known phenomenon, and this could be interpreted as a simple trivialization. It is nevertheless undeniable that, on the contrary, the documents placing Servais Copale in Wallonie clearly read “Servatius”, offering a more precise correspondence with the figure emerging from the BnF fr. 1822’s colophon.

In any case, what Busby’s study lacks the most is a careful consideration of the textual and material features of the BnF codex. As showed by Yela Schauwecker in her partial edition of the Secrét, the nature of some mistakes found in the manuscript strongly goes against the possibility of a collaboration between Jofroi and Servais.20 These arguments are not considered particularly convincing by Busby,21 yet they have the merit of being entirely founded on a thorough and impartial analysis of the text itself. Moreover, Schauwecker’s position overlaps with what Françoise Vielliard argues about another translation made by Jofroi. Studying the Estoire de Troie, Vielliard remarks that, although the collaboration of two people in the process of copy is not unusual (notably in the Arabic-Latin context of al-Andalus),

il est ici difficile d’imaginer qu’un dominicain, Jofroi de Waterford, ait eu besoin d’un aide, dont n’est pas précisé dans le colophon l’appartenance ni à un ordre religieux, ni à la «clergie» en général et en qui il est vraisemblable de voir un laïc, pour traduire des textes latins.22

Additionally, the incorrect attribution of the source for the Regne des Romains to Cornelius rather than Eutropius23 appears to be another mistake that contrasts the idea of a close collaboration between Jofroi and Servais. Strictly in ecdoctic terms, such a mistake strongly clashes with the usual features of an idiograph manuscript; it also weakens the possibility of an

23 Ibi: 199. The wrong name has been subsequently erased and corrected. It is now visible only with the help of the Wood’s lamp.
«aural transmission» of the text from the author to the scribe. In short, both Schauwecker and Vielliard offered solid arguments against the scenario presented by Busby, who implies careful supervision of Servais’ activity by Jofroi.

The material aspect of the miscellany represents another clue: in the words of Busby, «fr. 1822 is a professional product», and it exhibits all the features of an atelier product. It is hard to believe that a merchant as active (and whose «business ethics may not have been above reproach») as the Servais Copale mentioned in the archive records could compile a manuscript the like of the BnF codex.

As for the chapter De la diversetez de vin, Busby appears to be subjected to the same mistake made by Gaston Paris, attributing every interpolation found in the pseudo-Aristotelian treatise to Jofroi’s first-hand knowledge. This position has been rejected since George Hamilton’s and Jacques Monfrin’s fundamental studies on the sources of the Secrè de Secrè. Yet Busby plays on his archival discovery to apply the same questionable principle to Servais. As Jofroi himself points out, the source for the oenological section is Isaac Israeli ben Solomon’s Dietis universalibus et particularibus. Hence, it is reasonable to suppose that the accurate section devoted to wine varieties derives either from a more extended version of Isaac’s treatise or from a different, unidentified source. Indeed, this version of the Secrè is known for its extensive reliance on various erudite works. Once again, it is Jofroi himself who clearly acknowledges his debts.

The considerations on Jofroi’s modus operandi seem to be overlooked by Busby in many passages of his critical edition, notably in the textual

24 Busby 2020: 19. In fact, the scholar’s position on the matter is reasonably cautious, and he discusses possible evidence of Jofroi’s dictation in the notes to the three texts.
26 For paleographical considerations, see Schauwecker 2007: 20; Strinna 2011: 71.
27 Paris 1905: 159-60.
28 Hamilton 1910; Monfrin 1964.
29 Busby 2020: 348.
30 Ibi: 191: «Saichiés derechief que sovent i metterai autres bones paroles, lesqués, tot ne soient mie en cel livre, al mains sunt en autre livres d’autorite [...].»
and explanatory notes section. See for example the conclusion of the chapter *De la diversitei du vin solonc le tens qu’il at durei* of the *Secré de Secrés*:\(^{31}\) Busby considers this passage as an interpolation added by Servais Copale;\(^{32}\) yet, Jofroi closes this paragraph with the statement *cum dient ly philosophe*, eloquently suggesting an appeal to authority rather than to the first-hand experience of a wine merchant.

The reliance on diverse sources appears to be closely related to the question of the cultural environment in which Jofroi operated. If we concede that Jofroi composed his translations in Waterford, it is hard to believe that the modest library of St. Saviour priory could have held such a rich collection of manuscripts. Far from being «only a conventional appeal to authority»,\(^{33}\) the reference to Paris mentioned earlier is, in fact, a piece of strong evidence of Jofroi’s connection to the French capital. This assumption seems to be particularly true for the contemporary authors quoted by Jofroi, as Vielliard persuasively pointed out.\(^{34}\)

It is also worth mentioning the discussion animated by «an unidentified theology master, most likely a Franciscan, who publicly debated the *quaestio* “whether Aristotle is saved” at Oxford or Paris in the early fourteenth century».\(^{35}\) Jofroi’s version of the *Secretum Secretorum* is the only French translation that tackles this issue:\(^{36}\)

\[
\text{De lui sunt pluisors merveilhes et grauns et oivres estrangnes, ki trop me seroit a conter ou a escrire, por quoi de sa mort troive l’om escrit diversement, car li uns dient qu’il monta en ciel en semblance d'une flambe. Et de ce ne se doit nus esmervilhier, tot fuist il païens, car toz ceus ki devant la venue ou la naisence Jhesu Crist tindrent la loi de nature, comme Job et pluisors autres, furent savei.}
\]

Jofroi’s stance implies that the friar was fully aware of the contemporary debates which interested the Schoolmen of his time, confirming as well the Dominican’s solid preparation.

\(^{31}\) *Ib* e 259.
\(^{32}\) *Ib* e 370.
\(^{33}\) Legge 1950: 79.
\(^{34}\) Vielliard 1997: 213-4.
\(^{35}\) Williams 2003: 276-7. For further bibliography on this figure, see *ib* e 277, n. 406.
\(^{36}\) Busby 2020: 198.
3. The Sonderredaktion of the Livre de Moralitez

Another element in support of a Continental constitution of the recueil can be found elsewhere in the manuscript. The BnF codex transmits a unique version of the French translation of the Moralium dogma philosophorum, known as Livre de Moralitez. In his scholarly edition, John Holmberg briefly points out that the «Sonderredaktion» we can read in the 1822 codex (marked as L by Holmberg) stands out for frequently embedding Bible citations into the treatise. This peculiarity is shared with the ms. BnF, fr. 25407 (marked as K by Holmberg) and, in the light of my research devoted to the Livre de Moralitez, also with the above-mentioned ms. Cambridge, Corpus Christi’s College Library, 405 (marked Cc in my studies). In addition to the frequent biblical insertions, this version of the moral treatise offers a significantly different reading from the rest of the manuscript tradition and it would require a specific scholarly edition. At the current stage of my research, the mss. K and L appear to be related, not only in textual terms but also from the point of view of their mise en recueil. The following passage, for example, strongly suggests that Cc (which offers the correct reading) can not derive from K and L:

37 The edition of the Latin treatise, alongside with its French and Low-Franconian translations, can be found in Holmberg 1929. I devoted my PhD dissertation to the manuscript tradition of the Livre de Moralitez and its Italian version, commonly known as Libro di Costumanza: Battagliola 2018. A monograph on the subject is soon to be published.

38 Holmberg 1929: 54. The existence of two distinct versions of the treatise, convincingly demonstrated by Holmberg, has been confirmed by my research on the matter: Battagliola 2019: 174–6; I have presented a paper at the conference Lo spazio anglo-normanno: lingua, letteratura, cultura, Università degli Studi di Verona, 24-26th January 2019; see also my post for the Anglo-Norman Dictionary blogger: http://anglonormandictionary.blogspot.com/2018/10/guest-blogger-davide-battagliola.html

39 Pierre d’Abernun of Fetcham (Beckerlegge); Huon de Meri (Bender): 13; Philippe de Thaon (Shields): 28–32; Avril–Stirnemann 1987: §156; White–Le Goff 2006: 30–1.
It seems hard to believe that the scribe of Cc could have written the right variant *beent* (‘strive for’) if its model read *sunt biaus* (a reading probably determined by a total misunderstanding of the verb meaning).

In general, K and L share the same variants, whereas the reading of Cc often appears isolated. See the following examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cc, c. 235v</th>
<th>K, c. 127v</th>
<th>L, c. 220v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mes unes gens sunt atant de pouverté et autres <em>beent</em> plus haut monter.</td>
<td>ynes gens sunt povres e ataint de poverté, autre gens sunt <em>biaus</em> a plus haut monter.</td>
<td>une gens sont povres et ataint de povretez, autre gens sunt <em>biaus</em> al plus haut montez (sic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On a wider perspective, K and L transmit a peculiarly similar collection of works: in both manuscripts, the *Livre de Moralitez* is preceded by a sec-
tion devoted to Marie de France; moreover, they both transmit the *Image du monde* and a French translation of the *Secretum secretorum* (respectively by Jofroi de Waterford and Pierre d’Abernun of Fetcham).

Now let’s focus on the «Sonderredaktion» of the *Livre de Moralitez*. As I will show in the next pages, this unique version appears to stem from an Anglo-Norman model strongly influenced by the Orders. More particularly, the frequent interpolations from the Holy Scriptures can represent a piece of evidence for the 1822 codex’s affiliation with a Dominican rather than a Franciscan framework. We must remember that

> al centro del sistema educativo e della ‘letteratura’ dei Domenicani è la Sacra Scrittura e l’esegesi biblica, mentre l’eredità del pensiero e della poesia degli antichi è usata in subordine, non senza sospetto per le forme più ornate e libere.\(^{41}\)

I would like to add that the expression *le mendre*, found in the *Secrèt*’s prologue (see above, p. 3), represents no evidence for an actual Franciscan connection. For instance, we can find the same expression in the prologue of the French translation of Raymond of Capoue’s *Life of Sainte Catherine of Siena*:\(^{42}\)

> Chi commence le legende sainte Katherine de Sainne, qui fu de la sainte Ordre saint Dominique, qui a esté translatee du latin en rommant par le mendre frere del Ordre des Freres Prescheurs […]

See also the opening of Dominican author Riccoldo da Monte di Croce’s *Liber Peregrinationis* («Cum ego, frater Ricoldus, minimus in ordine predicatlorum […]»), as well as its French translation provided by Jean le Long («Comme je, le mendre de l’ordre des freres prescheurs […]»).\(^{43}\)

The aspect of an influence of the Orders should be explored following another direction. Giovanni Strinna, editor of the anonymous ser-

\(^{40}\) As for L, we can read the *Ysopet*, while K constitutes the only witness of the *Esopgatorum saint Patriz*.

\(^{41}\) Delcorno 2016: 11.

\(^{42}\) Raimondo da Capua (Tylus): 415.

\(^{43}\) Riccoldo da Monte di Croce (Robecchi): 192-3.
mons, not only affirms that the codex has been compiled «nello scriptorium
di un convento dominicano o in un atelier assai vicino all’ordine», but
he also observes strong connections with the Cistercian order. Significant Benedictine echoes can also be found in this particular version of the Livre de Moralitez, as the following examples show.

Holmberg’s edition offers the following definition of fear: Paors est
equant uns hom vuet nuire et il at poor s’il ne l’fait qu’il avera damage. Manuscripts K (c. 131r) and L (c. 222v) replace the word Paors with Peresce (‘laziness’), a vice particularly deprecated by the Benedectine Rule. It is worth noticing that ms. Cc does not only operate this substitution, but it also presents a more consistent definition (yet retaining the element of fear): Perresce si est qant hom devient lent et parceus de ben fere pur pour de terrene damage (c. 240v).

Another (apparently nuanced) difference between the two redactions offers an even stronger proof in favor of a Benedictine influence: while the version edited by Holmberg reads coovistse d’avoir richesces tost (‘prevents’) les vertus, the Sonderredaktion reads coovistse est racine de visces et marastre des vertus. Marastre des vertus appears to be a perfect translation of noverca virtutum, which derives from Bernard of Clairvaux’s sermons; interestingly enough, this expression was also embedded in the Manipulus Florum by Thomas Hibernicus, an Irish master of arts at the Sorbonne between the late 13th century and the early 14th century. Although the Manipulus was probably composed slightly after Jofroi’s activity, this element can give us an idea of the cultural milieu which influenced the texts collected in the BnF codex.

44 Strinna 2011: 84.
45 Strinna 2008; Strinna 2011: 19-21, 60-7. Cistercian connections were claimed for the first time in Zink 1976: 30-1.
46 Holmberg 1929: 132.
47 Ibi: 162.
48 As per the testimony of the ms. K (c. 136r); L presents the incorrect reading maeistre (c. 224r); the passage is missing in Cc.
4. Conclusions

The perplexities on the BnF fr. 1822’s localization proposal do not intend to diminish the importance of Busby’s volumes. A monograph specifically devoted to medieval Ireland was highly anticipated, especially in the field of Anglo-Norman studies, and the complete scholarly edition of Jofroi’s corpus represents a significant result in itself. Yet Busby’s arguments in favor of a Hiberno-Norman provenance of the BnF codex should be put into the right perspective. The probable connections with an Insular cultural environment influenced by the Orders (as shown for the _Livre de Moralitez_) do not necessarily implicate a material constitution of the manuscript in Ireland. It should rather be interpreted as a significant testimony of the widespread Anglo-Norman influence outside the borders of the British Isles.

There are still many aspects of interest related to the BnF codex: for example, I have not tackled here the problem of the illustrations. François Avril and Patricia Stirnemann confidently ascribe them to England.51 It is Busby himself who admits that «there is nothing particularly insular» about the illuminated initials,52 while Strinna suggests that the manuscript could have been decorated in a Wallonian scriptorium by English illuminators.53

A careful stratigraphic analysis of the scripta, which shows both Anglo-Norman and Wallonian traits, might also be of help. In this sense, the usefulness of the linguistic study offered by Busby in the introduction to Jofroi’s critical edition is out of the question.54 Nevertheless, I would like to point out that it is not true that the other texts copied in the BnF codex do not show the Anglo-Norman traits of Jofroi’s works.55 My initial surveys on the language of the _Livre de Moralitez_ transmitted by the BnF fr. 1822 show clear Insular features emerging from the main Wallonian

52 Busby 2017: 167.
53 Strinna 2011: 73.
54 Busby 2020: 19-35.
55 _Ib_ : 20.
scripta: see, for instance, the Anglo-Norman graphy *aun for an* in *aunnvionse* (c. 220r)\(^{56}\) and the occasional use of stressed personal pronouns instead of their corresponding unstressed forms: \(^{57}\) *moi donra* (c. 222r), *toi tiengnt* (c. 221r), *toi vaudroit* (c. 219r), etc.

Much work remains to be done. What I have tried to accomplish in this contribution is to offer new elements to grasp the context of the codex, avoiding speculations on its precise geographical provenance. Although not all roads may lead to Waterford, Busby’s reflections represent a valuable occasion to stimulate further research on the ms. BnF fr. 1822.

Davide Battagliola
(Università degli Studi di Milano)
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