

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

May 20, 1986

Professor Robert Mathiesen
Department of Slavic Languages
Brown University
Providence, Rhode Island 02912

Dear Bob,

Thank you for the materials and your letter! I compared KSL 131 to my own working edition of Theodulf, which you can see from the enclosed copy does not yet have the variants of all the manuscripts. I went along putting in in pencil KSL 131 variants. There are a few interesting ones, which don't appear in any of the other manuscripts I've seen (on p. 14, tempore instead of corpore; p. 15, superior interior instead of inferior superiorve; donum instead of domum). But especially interesting are the large, intentional omissions. (Theodulf was often considered too lengthy and sophisticated for the simple clerical explanations that were needed by the Carolingian compilers of clerical instructions.) You can see from my notes on pp. 192f. of the enclosed "Handlist" article that Theodulf suffered much editing. There is a possibility that KSL 131 is the same form as Theodulf as R (Rome, Bibl. Naz. Cent. Vitt.-Eman. II, Sessor. LII). I haven't seen this manuscript. I asked for microfilm, but they said they could not reproduce it, as it is a "treasure" volume. Dom Morin simply says R contains an extracted form of Theodulf's baptismal treatise. On the other hand, KSL 131 may be yet another abbreviated form, until your identification undiscovered. R is dated s. XI. I would love to know what Prof. Bischoff says about KSL 131. Would you let me know?

Also, may I cite your identification of this leaf in the Brown University Koopman Collection when I publish a revised version of my doctoral dissertation on the Carolingian baptismal instructions? If I publish a critical edition of Theodulf's text, it would be nice to be able to mention the variants of the Koopman fragment. (I hope it would bring attention to your work and to Brown's manuscript collection).

Thank you, too, for the offprint of your article on a Slavic text of the Apostles' Creed. I was totally unaware of efforts to translate the Creed and Lord's Prayer into written Slavic in the eighth century. I was struck by the translation of Pontius as Pontic, an adjective, because I have read Creed commentaries that explain that Pilate was called Pontius because he came from the area of the Pontus. I have to do some more looking before I can tell you where I've read this (perhaps its very common). I was also interested in the Slavic translation of the last line of the Creed as a translation of the Latin text with in vitam aeternam instead of et vitam aeternam. If you look at my variants on p. 15, line 9, of Theodulf (TEXT 16), Tr1 (Troyes, Bibl. mun. 804) omits et, making it read simply "ad vitam aeternam." It had never occurred to me that the omission of et might be intentional. I'm publishing an anonymous baptismal tract

that immediately follows Theodulf in Tr1 (forthcoming in Revue Bénédictine this year). The creed commentary in this anonymous baptismal tract has several oddities about which I have been very curious. I'd be delighted to have your comments.

Since you say you have ordered Dahlhaus-Berg, I just xeroxed the two pages where she cites the sources of passages in Theodulf, cc. VII-IX, which KSL 131 contains.

Thanks again for taking the trouble to contact me about the leaf and to send me a copy. It is most heartening to hear from other scholars in the U.S.A. interested in Carolingian texts. I am amazed that you were able to identify KSL 131, and that such a fragment has turned up in Providence (how appropriate)!

I hope that I will hear from you again.

Best luck in your work,

Susan
Susan Keefe