STUDIEN UND TEXTE
ZUR KELTOLOGIE

Herausgegeben von
Erich Poppe

Band 12

Wolfram R. Keller, Dagmar Schlüter (eds)

"A fantastic and abstruse Latinity?"

Hiberno-Continental Cultural and Literary Interactions in the Middle Ages

ISBN 978–3–89323–622–0
ISSN 1431–3049

Specimen

Wolfram R. Keller, Dagmar Schlüter (eds)

"A fantastic and abstruse Latinity?"

Hiberno-Continental Cultural and Literary Interactions in the Middle Ages

Nodus Publikationen
Münster

Elizabeth Boyle

The Twelfth-Century English Transmission of a Poem on the Threefold Division of the Mind, Attributed to Patrick of Dublin (d. 1084)[1]

1. The Question of Authorship

This essay offers a new perspective on Anglo-Irish cultural relations in the late twelfth century through the study of a Latin poem, its probable Irish authorship, and its English transmission. The poem beginning "Constet quantus honos humane condicionis" states that man, in possessing the faculty of reason, stands apart from the rest of creation. The poem explores the nature of the human mind, as proof of man's exalted status, and uses the doctrine of the Trinity to explicate a threefold division of the mind into intellect (*intellectus*), will (*uoluntas*), and something which the author calls *mentio*, the meaning of which I shall explore below. Its authorship has been attributed by modern scholars to Patrick, bishop of Dublin (d. 1084). The purpose of the present study is to examine briefly the reasons for this attribution to an eleventh-century Hiberno-Norse bishop, to analyse some aspects of the poem in detail in order to ascertain whether this can provide us with any new evidence regarding the intellectual and cultural context within which it was composed, and to elucidate the nature of its transmission, which is confined exclusively to late-twelfth-century England.

The poem survives in two manuscripts which date from the last decades of the twelfth century: one, British Library MS Cotton Titus D. xxiv, from Rufford Abbey in Nottinghamshire (henceforth *O*); the other British Library Additional MS 24199, from Bury St Edmund's in Suffolk (henceforth *S*).[2] In *S*, the poem forms part of a

1) Some of the ideas contained in this chapter were presented in November 2010 at the Tionól, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, and at the Oxford Celtic Seminar. The research for this chapter was undertaken during the course of a Leverhulme Early Career Fellowship, funded by the Leverhulme Trust and the Isaac Newton Trust. I am grateful to Dr Fiona Edmonds and Professor Paul Russell for useful bibliographical suggestions.

2) J. Mozley, "The Collection of Mediaeval Latin Verse in MS. Cotton Titus D. xxiv," *Medium Ævum* 11 (1942), 1–45; André Boutemy, "Le recueil poétique du manuscrit Additional 24199 du British Museum," *Latomus* 2 (1938), 30–52. For ease of reference, I have retained the

Wolfram Keller, Dagmar Schlüter (eds): "A fantastic and abstruse Latinity?", 102–116
 ISBN 978–3–89323–622–0

Specimen

Latin miscellany, which since the Middle Ages has been bound together with a beautifully illustrated eleventh-century copy of Prudentius's *Psychomachia*.[3] Although I have referred to "the poem," in *S* it is copied as five separate anonymous poems: previous editors have attributed this division to metrical changes within the poem,[4] but the changes in metre do not coincide neatly with the division of the poem into five distinct compositions (most of the five sections are mixtures of leonine and rhymed hexameters), so another explanation for this division must be sought. The first editor of the poem(s) from *S*, André Boutemy, noted that the five sections were textually and thematically linked and probably originated as a unitary composition.[5] This supposition appears to be confirmed by *O*, in which the poem is copied as a single unit. *O* is also a Latin miscellany, compiled around the same time as *S*. The different arrangements of the poem(s), that is, in *S* as five distinct compositions, in *O* as a single composition, would suggest that they do not share an immediate common exemplar. An important further difference between *S* and *O* is that the copy of our poem in the latter manuscript contains an attribution of authorship: at the beginning of the poem is a heading which states "Versus Sancti patricii episcopi."[6] Other poems in the same manuscript are similarly attributed.[7] Aside from "Constet quantus honos," *S* contains none of the other poems attributed in *O* to "Patricius." However, there is some overlap between the two manuscripts in regards to the other identifiable authors represented: both manuscripts, for example, contain a number of works by poets such as Marbod of Rennes (d. 1123) and Hildebert of Lavardin (d. 1133), and both manuscripts display an interest in misogynistic texts and in male love. However, these are common enough themes in twelfth-century Latin miscellanies, and Marbod and Hildebert were very popular authors at that time, so this overlap can be taken to indicate that both manuscripts are representative of a type of standard monastic miscellany from the late twelfth century, which was in no way exceptional. Paradoxically, its conventionality is itself noteworthy: that our poem is preserved in such unexceptional circumstances is reflective of its subject matter, and mode of expression, being entirely acceptable to a twelfth-century, English monastic readership.

manuscript sigla assigned by Aubrey Gwynn in his edition of the poem: Aubrey Gwynn, S. J., ed. & trans., *The Writings of Bishop Patrick, 1074–1084*, Scriptores Latini Hiberniae 1 (Dublin, 1955), pp. 41, 45 (for discussion of the relevant manuscripts), 72–77 (for edition and translation). In the following discussion of the poem, I give line numbers from Gwynn's edition.

3) M. R. James, *On the Abbey of Bury St. Edmund's* (Cambridge, 1895), p. 71; F. Wormald, *English Drawings of the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries* (London, 1952), p. 66.

4) Boutemy, "Le recueil poétique," p. 32, n. 24–29, and p. 40; Gwynn, *The Writings*, p. 45.

5) Boutemy, "Le recueil poétique," p. 40.

6) London, British Library MS Cotton Titus D. xxiv (= MS *O*), f. 61v.

7) The introductory hexameters beginning "Qui celum terrasque regis pelagusque profundum" (f. 64r), which precede the allegorical poem, "Mentis in excessu" (ff. 64–74), have a title reading "Inuocacio scriptoris huius libelli," to which is added a marginal note stating ".i. Patricii episcopi." An explicit on f. 80v states "Finiunt uersus sancti Patricii episcopi de mirabilibus Hibernie," and, although displaced, appears to belong to the poem beginning "His ita prodigiis signisque per omnia dictis" (ff. 74–78). The poetic invocation, "Perge carina," has introductory hexameters which are introduced with the title "Inuocacio sancti Patricii episcopi" (f. 87r). The poem "Occidet heu cicius pictor quam pagina picta" has interlinear glosses identifying the author as a "Patricius" (f. 78).

It is evidence of at least some literature of Irish origin being considered theologically sound, aesthetically pleasing, and of sufficient value to be read and copied in England in the years immediately following the Anglo/Cambro-Norman invasion of Ireland, and is thus a useful corrective to the rhetoric of the colonial Othering of Ireland in twelfth-century England which continues to be a popular topic in modern scholarship.[8]

In 1955 Aubrey Gwynn published editions and translations of a number of Latin texts, the authorship of which he attributed to Patrick (Lat. "Patricius"; Ir. "Gilla Pátraic"), the bishop of Dublin whose death by drowning is recorded in Irish annals for 1084.[9] The texts which he attributed to Patrick of Dublin included "Constet quantus honos" and the other poems attributed to "Patricius" in *O*, in addition to a sermon or treatise known as *De tribus habitaculis animae*, some copies of which also contain attributions of authorship to a "bishop Patrick," but whose manuscript transmission is almost wholly separate from that of the poems.[10] It had long been accepted that, if the attributions of authorship have any basis in fact, the notion that they refer to Saint Patrick could not be sustained. Therefore another Patrick, or other Patricks, had to be identified. Gwynn constructed his argument identifying the Patrick to whom the poems are attributed in *O* with the eleventh-century bishop of Dublin on the basis of a number of factors, none of which is conclusive, but which cumulatively provide us with a plausible possibility: it is worth briefly taking the time to set out the evidence behind Gwynn's hypothesis. First, Gwynn noted that none of the manuscripts containing texts attributed to "Patricius" dates from earlier than the end of the eleventh century: the earliest is a copy of *De tribus habitaculis* written at Salisbury *c*. 1100.[11] Second, he noted that two of the poems in *O* contain interlinear glosses which not only identify their author as "Patricius," but also mention a "Wulfstan," and identify the recipient of one of the poems as an "Aldwin."[12] Gwynn noted that, in a twelfth-century addition to the Durham *Liber Vitae*, a list of

8) Whether or not the poem is actually of Irish authorship, in attributing it to Patrick the scribe of *O* clearly considered it to have Irish connections. The fundamental study of the textual barbarisation of Ireland in the twelfth century and its political context is John Gillingham, *The English in the Twelfth Century: Imperialism, National Identity and Political Values* (Woodbridge, 2000).

9) Gwynn, *Writings*. For the death of Patricius/Gilla Pátraic see AU 1084: "Gilla Patraic espoc Atha Cliath do bathadh"; "Annals of St Mary's," ed. Gilbert, in *Chartularies of St Mary's Abbey Dublin*, ii (London, 1884), p. 250: "Patricius Dublin episcopus cum sociis in Britannie oceano vi Idus Octobris fuit submersus."

10) A poetic invocation with interlinear glosses preserved in *O* is used, without the glosses, as a preface to *De tribus habitaculis animae* in one manuscript copy (of some hundred extant copies), namely Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 1562. This is the only overlap between the poems, which had a relatively limited manuscript transmission, and the prose text which, due to its misattribution to Augustine of Hippo, enjoyed a very wide circulation.

11) Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Bodley 392. *O* is the only manuscript to attribute poems to *sanctus Patricius episcopus*, but a number of twelfth- and thirteenth-century manuscripts attribute the prose text *De tribus habitaculis animae* to him using the same wording: see Elizabeth Boyle, "The Authorship and Transmission of *De tribus habitaculis animae*," *Journal of Medieval Latin* 22 (2012), 49–65.

12) Gwynn, *Writings*, pp. 84, 100, 102, 104.

members of the Worcester community includes Saint Wulfstan, abbot, and later bishop, of Worcester, as well as an Aldwin and a Patrick.[13] Given that many eleventh- and twelfth-century bishops of Hiberno-Norse towns were trained in English Benedictine houses,[14] Gwynn argued — not unreasonably — that Patrick had been trained at Worcester, alongside Aldwin and under Wulfstan, before being made bishop of Dublin and that he had composed these texts, along with the interlinear glosses, and had dedicated them, and sent them, to his former monastic brothers.[15]

The theory is an attractive one: it is, as I have said, plausible but not conclusive. However, Martin Brett has cast some doubt on the identification of Patrick of Dublin with the Patrick whose name is found in the Durham *Liber Vitae*.[16] In a brief note, Brett argued that the names that were added to f. 25r of the Durham *Liber Vitae* must represent monks who were still alive in c. 1104, and that the Patricius listed there cannot be the Patricius, bishop of Dublin, who died in 1084. If Brett is right, then the Patricius mentioned in the interlinear glosses in *O* cannot be the eleventh-century bishop of Dublin either; therefore it would be highly unlikely that Patrick of Dublin was the author of our poem. Unfortunately, Brett's argument is not conclusive either, since there is evidence for the names of dead people being added to medieval *libri vitae*.[17] Thus it is not possible either to confirm or disprove Gwynn's argument at this stage. Looking at the totality of evidence, one can only say that Gwynn relied heavily on the few manuscripts which attribute the texts to a "Patricius" (and it would seem from the phrasing of the manuscripts that the scribes intended Saint Patrick), giving less weight to those which give the texts anonymously, particularly in the case of the poems, or — as in the case of the earliest manuscripts of *De tribus habitaculis* — misattribute the text to a variety of well-known figures, including Augustine of Hippo, Caesarius of Arles, and Eusebius of Emesa. More fundamental research needs to be undertaken, for example, to establish what proportion of the corpus of texts attributed to Patrick of Dublin is, in fact, the work of a single author. Examining each of the texts in detail may yield useful contextual information, which can help us to establish whether it is likely that they were composed by a single Irish author in the late eleventh century, and will certainly allow a fresh consideration of the material, unconstrained by Gwynn's inconclusive attribution of authorship. This is particularly important because the few modern scholars to have engaged with the texts in the corpus have accepted the attribution without question;

13) London, British Library MS Cotton Domitian A. VII, f. 25r: *The Durham Liber Vitae: London, British Library, MS Cotton Domitian A.VII*, ed. David Rollason & Linda Rollason, 3 vols (London, 2007), vol. 1, p. 104.

14) Marie Therese Flanagan, *The Transformation of the Irish Church in the Twelfth Century* (Woodbridge, 2010), pp. 6–7. See also Mark Philpott, "Some Interactions between the English and Irish Churches," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 20 (1997), 187–204.

15) Gwynn, *Writings*, pp. 1–11.

16) Martin Brett, "Canterbury's Perspective on Church Reform and Ireland, 1070–1115," in *Ireland and Europe in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Damian Bracken & Dagmar Ó Riain-Raedel (Dublin, 2006), pp. 13–35, at pp. 33–35.

17) Harmut Hoffmann, "Anmerkungen zu den Libri Memoriales," *Deutsches Archiv* 53 (1997), 415–59, at pp. 433–34, 444. I am grateful to Dr Levi Roach for raising this point in conversation with me.

and the narrative of Patrick of Dublin's career proposed by Gwynn has influenced their understanding and reading of the texts.[18]

In the case of the *De mirabilibus Hiberniae*, proving Irish authorship is relatively straightforward: the subject matter and its relationship with vernacular sources make Irish authorship extremely likely.[19] Much less straightforward, but still possibly an Irish composition, is *De tribus habitaculis animae*.[20] Whether *De mirabilibus* and *De tribus habitaculis* are by the same Irish author is another matter entirely: the stylistic differences between the two texts (*De mirabilibus* can charitably be described as inelegant), and the incompatibility of the intellectual approaches underlying the Neoplatonic *De tribus habitaculis*, with its emphasis on the filth and falseness of the material world, and *De mirabilibus*, with its celebration of God's wonder as manifested in the material world, would suggest that they are not. In the allegorical poem "Mentis in excessu," there is much which can be seen to operate within an Irish textual tradition, and I think a case can be made for Irish authorship: I will touch on some aspects of that text later in this essay. The remaining two poems — "Occidet heu cicius pictor quam pagina picta" and "Constet quantus honos" — display no obvious Irish characteristics, but the latter of the two, which is the focus of this study, may perhaps be linked to an Irish milieu on circumstantial grounds. In the following section, I shall examine the structure, content, and language of the poem, in order to adduce some limited evidence for a possible connection to Irish intellectual circles.

2. The Trinity and the Threefold Mind

The poem begins with the statement that should one wish to know (*scire*) the extent of the honour of the human condition, one can see it (*uidere*) from the sequence of reasoning which follows (ll. 1–2). The poet goes on to outline the creation of man, stating that, unlike the rest of creation, man was not formed solely by the word of God.[21] Rather, man is said to be made of a compound nature, comprising both "sense" (in common with all other living creatures) and "reason" (something which, among creation, man alone possesses).[22] This compound nature suggests the belief, ultimately derived from Aristotelian thought, that "sense perception" and "intellection" are separate forms of cognition, intellectual thought being distinct from — and superior to — sensation.[23] The primary concern of our poet thereafter is with the "intellective soul" (as defined by Aristotle, *De anima*).

18) Thus, for example, Leslie Lockett, *Anglo-Saxon Psychologies in the Vernacular and Latin Traditions* (Toronto, 2011), pp. 430–34, in which she takes *De tribus habitaculis animae* and "Constet quantus honos" as evidence of the nature of learning in eleventh-century Worcester.

19) Elizabeth Boyle, "On the Wonders of Ireland: Translation and Adaptation," in *Authorities and Adaptations: The Reworking and Transmission of Textual Sources in Medieval Ireland*, ed. Elizabeth Boyle & Deborah Hayden (Dublin, 2014), pp. 233–61.

20) Boyle, "The Authorship and Transmission."

21) "Non hominem uerbo solo deus effigiauit/ Quem facturus erat sic quomodo cunta creauit" (ll. 3–4).

22) "Compositum tali mortalem conditione/ Conditor instruxit sensu simul et ratione" (ll. 11–12).

Our author states that man has been made in God's image. As Anna Williams has noted in relation to Augustine, the notion of man as the *imago Dei* "is such a commonplace of classical Christian theology that it is easy to forget its import: if rationality is a key attribute of God and we somehow mirror God, rationality must be a key attribute of humanity as well. Augustine follows the tradition before him in locating the image, not only in the human soul, but specifically in the mind."[24] As swiftly becomes clear, our author follows that same tradition: after declaring the extent of man's honour, which derives from his capacity for reason, the author states that man is made from, and will return to, "slime" or "mud";[25] this is suggestive of a distinct separation of the conception of the physical body and the intellective soul. However, it is significant that the reminder that man is made of slime, comes in the line following the declaration that man is made in God's image:[26] this juxtaposition emphasises that the *imago Dei* is to be seen in man's intellective soul, and not in his physical body.

We then have a set of lines about God as the animating force of creation governing life and movement, whole and indivisible in all places equally. These lines are mirrored by the lines immediately following, which represent the relationship between the human spirit (*spiritus humanus*) and the human body as a microcosm of the relationship between God and creation. Thus, man's spirit animates his mortal body giving it life and movement, whole and indivisible in each limb of the body equally. We can see the deliberateness with which this idea of man as microcosm is constructed in the almost exact repetition at lines 27 and 33. Of God animating creation, the poet states: "Viuificando mouens et cunta mouendo gubernans" (l. 27: "giving life and movement, and ruling all by movement"); of man's spirit animating the mortal body, the poet states: "Viuificando mouens et membra mouendo gubernans" (l. 33: "giving life and movement, and ruling the limbs in movement"). The idea of the soul as the principle of movement in bodies derives ultimately from Plato (*Phaedrus* 245), but may come to our poet via Augustine (*De Trin.* 8.9).[27]

From this greater parallel — that is, man as a microcosmic representation of God's relationship with his creation — the poet moves to the specific parallel between God and man which will dominate a large proportion of the rest of the poem. He signals this shift at line 39: "Est etiam domino mens nostra simillima trino" ("Our mind is also much like the threefold Lord"). The poet states again that man is separate from creation, for this reason: "he wills, understands and meditates / feels and desires, and later recalls in memory."[28] Of these faculties, he selects intellect, will, and *mentio*, as the three fundamental aspects of the soul which reflect the Trin-

23) Deborah L. Black, "The Nature of Intellect," in *The Cambridge History of Medieval Philosophy: Volume 1*, ed. Robert Pasnau (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 320–33, at p. 320.

24) A. N. Williams, *The Divine Sense: The Intellect in Patristic Theology* (Cambridge, 2007), p. 149.

25) "Ut limo factus mortalis eoque redactus" (l. 23).

26) "Que sit imago dei conformes et deceamus" (l. 22).

27) Gerard O'Daly, *Augustine's Philosophy of Mind* (London, 1987), pp. 20–21.

28) "Scilicet id: quod uult intelligit ac meditatur, / Sentit et affectat, quod post memoranda retractat" (ll. 45–46); for "post memoranda retractat," cf. *mentio*, below pp. 109–11.

ity: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. It is worth noting that the poet uses "soul" (*anima*), "mind" (*mens*), and "spirit" (*spiritus*), interchangeably to refer to the greater animating life-force within which intellect, will, and *mentio* reside. The poet uses the vocabulary of Trinitarian doctrine to explicate the nature of the human mind. He states: "Sic sic res multas substancia denotat una: / Mens intellectus, mens mentio, mensque uoluntas" (l. 62–63: "So indeed does one substance signify many things: / Our intellect is mind, our *mentio* is mind, our will is mind"). The idea of one substance signifying many things draws directly on debates about the nature and substance of the Trinity, as does this threefold division of the mind into *intellectus*, *mentio*, and *uoluntas*. The motif of vestiges of the Trinity being observed in the human soul is a common one in Christian thought, and it is worth briefly tracing the development of this idea, in order to establish where our author stands within the wider tradition.

Already in his *Republic*, Plato had suggested a tripartite division of the soul into reason, spirit, and desire.[29] Plato acknowledged that these faculties often operate in conflict with one another: for example, our reason may tell us that more wine would be bad for us, but our desire insists that we pour ourselves another glass. This Platonic threefold division (mediated through the Neoplatonism of Plotinus and others) was picked up by Augustine in his *De Trinitate*, in which he outlines a number of *vestigia Trinitatis*, or "vestiges of the Trinity," which were certain triads observable in the natural world, such as "love, the lover, that which is loved," or, significantly for our purposes, "intellect, will and memory." However, unlike the Platonic model, by suggesting that these three components of the mind are analogous to the Trinity, the implication of Augustine's scheme is that the faculties of mind must work harmoniously and conjointly, rather than opposing each other.[30]

One significant author — contemporary with Patrick of Dublin, if we consider him to be the author of this poem — to develop this Augustinian theory of the human mind being analogous to the Trinity, was Anselm (c. 1033–1109), archbishop of Canterbury from 1093, who, while he was prior of Bec,[31] composed his *Monologion* (1076), his soliloquy on the nature of God.[32] Anselm does not specifically quote Augustine (the purpose of the *Monologion* was to explore the nature of God through pure reasoning, without recourse to patristic authorities), but his argument owes much to the psychological images of *De Trinitate*. Anselm evoked some of the Augustinian *vestigia* in his elucidation of the divine essence, but he focused on love (both divine love and self-love) as an important element in his reasoning. For example, Anselm dwelt extensively on the interconnection between the mind's "love, understanding, and consciousness of itself."[33] Unlike Augustine or Anselm, our poet

29) Plato, *Republic*, IV.

30) Williams, *Divine Sense*, p. 166.

31) He became abbot of Bec in 1078.

32) F. S. Schmitt, ed., *Anselmi Opera Omnia*, 6 vols. (Rome, 1938–68), vol. 1.

33) For example, "Nam si mens ipsa sola ex omnibus quae facta sunt, sui memor et intelligens et amans esse potest: non video cur negetur esse in ille vera imago illius essentiae, quae per sui memoriam et intelligentiam et amorem in trinitate ineffabili consistit. Aut certe inde verius esse illius se probat imaginem, quia illius potest esse memor, illam intelligere et amare.": Anselm, *Monologion*, §67: ed. Schmitt, *Anselmi Opera*, vol. 1, p. 78.

does not emphasise love as an important reflection of God in ourselves.[34] Why does he choose "intellect, will and *mentio*" as opposed to any of the other *vestigia*, such as "mind, love, knowledge," or "memory, understanding, love," or "the lover, being loved, love"?

The explanation can perhaps be found in the significant fact that — contrary to Augustine and Anselm — the author of "Constet quantus honos" is not primarily using the mind to explain the Trinity, but rather is using the Trinity to explain the mind. For Augustine, the *vestigia Trinitatis* are ways in to conceiving of the Trinity, and his primary concern is not natural philosophy.[35] Augustine understands Genesis 1:26 (the statement that man is made in God's image) to imply that through introspection the human mind can attain by analogy understanding of God's nature.[36] For Anselm, he is meditating on the divine essence to show that God has left his footprints in the minds of rational creatures in order that they may find their way to him through contemplation of their own nature.[37] However, the Irish poet is taking belief in the Trinity as a given, and using the motif of the "vestiges" of the Trinity in the human mind better to understand the human condition. He does not expound on the nature of divine love, because he is not seeking first and foremost to understand the divine; rather, he is concerned, as he states in his opening lines, with the extent of the honour of the human condition, as represented by man's capacity for rational thought.

So, what does our author tell us about his conception of the human mind? He outlines three faculties of the mind, and tells us that "Et tria sunt eadem substantia mensque uocatur" (l. 66: "And these three are one substance which is called mind"), but he also tells us that "Hec tria sunt anime que carnis uita uocatur" (l. 70: "These three belong to the soul, which is called the life of the body"). Thus, the mind (*mens*) is merely a part of the soul (*anima*), which is itself the life-force of the mortal body (*carnis vita*). The first faculty of the mind, according to our author, is the intellect (*intellectus*). This he equates with God the Father. The second faculty is will (*uoluntas*), which he equates with God the Son. He then states that the third faculty is *mentio*, which is here equated with the Holy Spirit. Gwynn translated *mentio* as "memory," without comment, presumably following the Augustinian model of "intellect, will, memory." But I think it is worth examining this in greater detail, in order to understand why our poet does not use *memoria*, which would be the obvious choice of word for "memory."

34) It is worth noting that one of the few scholars to have written on the prose treatise *De tribus habitaculis animae*, Walter Delius, argued (on the basis of no concrete evidence whatsoever) that the text was, in fact, the work of Anselm of Canterbury: "Die Verfasserschaft der Schrift de tribus habitaculis," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 108 (1937–38), 28–39. Although Delius's conclusions are implausible, some of the Anselmian aspects of the text, which led Delius astray, are also present in "Constet quantus honos."

35) Williams, *Divine Sense*, pp. 165–66.

36) O'Daly, *Augustine's Philosophy*, p. 1.

37) Brian Davies & G. R. Evans, trans., *Anselm of Canterbury: The Major Works* (Oxford, 1998), p. xi.

The word *mentio* primarily means "calling to mind," "mentioning," or "naming."[38] Goetz's *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* gives just two examples of *mentio* appearing in medieval glossaries.[39] The first is a Latin to Greek glossary, in which the word *mentio* is glossed as Greek *anamnesis*, meaning "recollection," the word which Plato uses to explain the process underlying his theory of epistemology, that is, that we can know things because we "recollect" them from the world-soul, or in other words that learning is a process of recovering knowledge which has been lost as a result of our being limited by our physical bodies. Therefore, if we take *mentio* as being equivalent to *anamnesis*, then we should perhaps translate it as "recollection," with all its Platonic resonances. However, the second instance of *mentio* in a medieval glossary is a Greek to Latin glossary, in which *mneme*, the Greek word meaning both "memory" and "calling to mind" is glossed by both words, *memoria* and *mentio* ("μνημη memoriamentio"). Here, then, we have an instance of *mentio* being used to gloss a word meaning "memory." Indeed, it is distinctly possible that later readers might have considered *mentio* to be glossing the Latin *memoria*, rather than the Greek *mneme*. A significant aspect of this particular glossary is that it is preserved in Laon MS 444, a manuscript with strong Irish connections, as it contains misplaced Old Irish quire signatures, and had a close association with Martin Hibernensis (d. 875) and his circle.[40] Although this is an early manuscript, from a Carolingian milieu, it does provide us with an Irish link to the use of *mentio* as equivalent to *memoria* "memory," through the Greek word *mneme*, which carries both meanings.

Looking at the contexts within which *mentio* is used in our text may help us to clarify exactly what is meant by it. Our author states that each of the three faculties — *intellectus*, *uoluntas*, and *mentio* — individually is useless without the other two, but also that the third faculty jointly proceeds from both the intellect and the will. Incidentally, this tells us something about the Trinitarian theology of the author: he implicitly articulates the belief that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son, and not just from the Father.[41] So, *mentio* is an act of the intellect, but it is

38) Charlton T. Lewis & Charles Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1879), p. 1134, s.v. *mentio*. But to a Romance-speaker the primary meaning may have been "lie, deceit."

39) G. Goetz et al., eds., *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, 7 vols. (Leipzig, 1888–1923), vol. 2, 128.54, 327.19. Ludwig Bieler (in Gwynn, *Writings*, p. 49) suggests that "mentio" could be an "indirect Graecism."

40) Paul Russell, "*Graece...Latine*: Graeco-Latin Glossaries in Early Medieval Ireland," *Peritia* 14 (2000), 406–20, at pp. 413–15; Carlotta Dionisotti, "Greek Grammars and Dictionaries in Carolingian Europe," in *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks: The Study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages*,edited by Michael W. Herren and Shirley Ann Brown (London, 1988), pp. 1–56; J. Vendryes, "Les mots vieil-irlandais du manuscrit de Laon," *Revue celtique* 25 (1904), 327–81; and E. Miller, "Glossaire grec-latin de la Bibliothèque de Laon," *Notices et extraits des documents de la Bibliothèque nationale* 29, no. 2 (1891), 1–230.

41) This was one of the central issues which led to the eleventh-century schism of the Western and Eastern Churches: see, e.g., A. Edward Siecienski, *The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy* (Oxford, 2010), pp. 112–15. However, we cannnot use this as a dating criterion for the poem, since belief in the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son had been expressed in the Creed in western Europe since the Councils of Toledo (589) and Aachen (809), although it was not integrated into the Creed of the Roman liturgy until the early eleventh century.

equally an act of the will. If we privilege the Augustinian reading of our poem, this would support the idea of *mentio* as "memory": for example, hypothetically speaking, if you were reading the present essay and you were not finding it particularly interesting, you would read my words, because your base perception sees the words in front of you, but afterwards you would not remember anything you had read, because it requires an act of will (*uoluntas*) to concentrate sufficiently to commit these words to your memory (*mentio*).[42] Our author's conception of the mind would thus coincide with Augustine's division of "intellect, will and memory," which emphasises that these three elements of mind are interdependent and each faculty must work harmoniously with the others.

The ending of the poem, however, suggests that the author's conception of *mentio* may be a little more complex: our author rejects the opportunity of exploring his conception of the mental faculties any further; and neither does he move to an exploration of the divine, as one might perhaps expect. Rather, we can observe a shift at line 74, where the author moves from one triad, "intellect, will, *mentio*," to another, "thought, word and deed." The shift signals the beginning of the final section of the poem, which is didactic and moralising. The author tells us that "holy Scripture teaches us doctrines that are full of life,"[43] and that, if we do not obey, with service and good living and good conduct, we will not obtain the fullness of our likeness to God.[44] Indeed, in the final lines of the poem the author states that he regards the impure life as erasing (*delere*) the likeness of God in ourselves, but that living according to divine commandment will free mortal man from his physical body.[45] This idea of freedom from the physical body leading to union with the divine, attaining the fullness of man's likeness to God, is unmistakeably Platonic: in Plato's epistemology *anamnesis*, "recollection" is achieved through *katharsis*, freedom from the physical body which is the source of error.

I would argue that this conclusion to the poem suggests that our author was aware of the ambiguity of the word *mentio*, and that he may consciously have been playing on its double meaning: *memoria*, "memory," in an Augustinian sense, and *anamnesis*, "recollection," in a Platonic sense. Additional weight is perhaps given to this Platonic reading by the author's use of Greek terminology elsewhere in the poem: *plasmator* and *plasma* at line 20, *dogmata* at line 76. This vocabulary may tie us into a milieu which is drawing on the kind of learning seen in our Carolingian Graeco-Latin glossaries. Leslie Lockett has noted some parallels between "Constet quantus honos" and the poem by Alcuin, "Qui mare, qui terram."[46] Although there

42) See Augustine, *De Trin.*, XI.6–9.

43) "Pagina sacra docet nos uite dogmata plena" (l. 76).

44) "Hec, homo, uera dei, cui conformaris, imago/ Est: nunc attendas que sit simi plena litudo/ Moribus ipsa bonis cognoscitur atque gerendo" (ll. 84–86).

45) "Sic igitur uiuat mundo mortalis in isto / Ut Christo placeat, iam corpore liber ad isto./ Nam quicumque dei speciem delere uidetur/ Vivens impure, miser ha!, miser hic morietur" (ll. 104–107).

46) Lockett, *Anglo-Saxon Psychologies*, p. 431 n. 15. There is other evidence that Irish authors in the eleventh and twelfth centuries were engaging with Carolingian sources, such as Oxford,

are, as Lockett admits, no verbatim quotations, the correspondences are noteworthy, and perhaps hint at further connections with Carolingian intellectual culture.

Although this shift at the conclusion of the poem is slightly disappointing from an intellectual standpoint, in that the author resists fully working out his philosophical stance in favour of pulling the material round to his didactic message, this shift is also perhaps where we may find an element of authorial intention which supports the attribution of this text to the same author who wrote at least some of the other texts in the corpus attributed to Patrick of Dublin. For example, the shift away from a purely intellectual sphere toward an emphasis on the importance of doctrine and right action mirrors the allegorical poem "Mentis in excessu," where the allegory is always resisted by the didacticism of the interpretive glosses. Indeed, there are other parallels with "Mentis in excessu": the use of Greek vocabulary, for example.[47] The influence of the "thought, word, deed" triad[48] is another point of connection between the two poems: in the glosses on "Mentis in excessu," the glossator explains the image of women giving birth through their mouths as signifying their words, "because what the mind conceives is given birth to openly by mouth or by deed."[49] Furthermore, the conjunction of "seeing" (*uidere*) with "knowing" (*scire*) in "Mentis in excessu," already witnessed in "Constet quantus honos," suggests fundamental similarities in the intellectual approach underlying the two poems.[50] Above, we noted the possible role of the Greek word *mneme* in acting as an intermediary for the use of *mentio* to mean "memory" in "Constet quantus honos"; given the allegorical nature of "Mentis in excessu," it is therefore interesting that, in Greek literature, *Mneme* was the muse of memory. The author may have been conscious of this personification of memory when choosing to use *mentio* in place of *memoria*. In "Mentis in excessu," however, "memory" is allegorised as one of the Hesperides, Medusa (along with Egle, "studiousness"; Esper, "intellect"; and Arethusa, "eloquence"), in accordance with Fulgentius's *Expositio Virgilianae Continentiae*.[51] Close reading across other poems attributed to Patrick, particularly the poem beginning "Occidet heu cicius pictor quam pagina picta," may reveal further points of contact which support the idea that they are indeed by a single author.

Ultimately, this poem is not a philosophical treatise: it is a poem, and a didactic poem at that. It does not present a fully articulated psychology of mind, nor does it acknowledge the tensions caused by ambiguities in its physiological, psychological,

Bodleian Library MS Auct. F. III. 15, which is a twelfth-century Irish manuscript containing, amongst other things, an epitome of Eriugena's *Periphyseon*.

47) In "Mentis in excessu," we find: *psalterium*; *cosmi*; *odas*; *ymnos*; *polis*; and *craxare* (a Hibernicised form of *caraxare*). See the comments of Bieler in Gwynn, *Writings*, p. 49.

48) On the earlier history of this triad in Irish religious thought, see Patrick Sims-Williams, "Thought, Word and Deed: An Irish Triad," *Ériu* 29 (1978), 78–111.

49) "Ore: i. dicto. quod enim concipit mens id foras ore uel opere parturit." (Gwynn, ed., *Writings*, p. 93).

50) Gwynn, ed., *Writings*, p. 88 (ll. 63–73).

51) Rudolf Helm, ed., *Fabii Planciadis Fulgentii V. C. Opera* (Leipzig, 1898), pp. 83–107, at p. 98: "quattuor enim Esperides dictae sunt, id est Egle, Esper, Medusa et Aretusa, quas nos Latine studium, intellectus, memoria et facundia dicimus, quod primum sit studere, secundum intellegere, tertiam memorari quod intellegis, inde ornare dicendo quod terminas."

and metaphysical schemes (for example, it alludes to the Augustinian and the Platonic, but does not directly reference either). However, just as it argues that the human mind is a microcosm of its creator, so the poem is a microcosm of medieval Christian thought on the intellective soul and its constituent faculties. As such, it is certainly worthy of study, and it is to be hoped that such study will cast further light on a neglected, but significant, corpus of medieval Latin literature. We have no explicit independent evidence that Patrick of Dublin was the author of any poetic works, although perhaps we can take note that Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury, described him as "deeply versed in sacred learning" ("scientia diuinarum litterarum strenuissime eruditem"):[52] if "Constet quantus honos" is indeed the work of Patrick of Dublin, then Lanfranc's praise — not lightly given — seems particularly fitting. However, the evidence seems to suggest otherwise, and we must therefore explore other possibilities which might account for the attribution of this poem, in one of its two surviving manuscript-witnesses, to a "holy bishop Patrick" or "Saint Patrick the bishop."

3. Transmission in Twelfth-Century England

As noted at the outset, both manuscripts which preserve this poem are of English provenance and late-twelfth-century date. There are further similarities between the two manuscripts, in terms of the form of the manuscripts — both are monastic miscellanies — but also in terms of the authors whose works have been selected for inclusion, and the thematic concerns of their poetic works. However, to the readers of *O*, the poem would have been understood to have had Irish connections through the attribution of the poem to Patrick, whereas this is not the case for readers of *S*, in which the poem is presented anonymously. In what remains of this study, then, I wish to explore the extent to which we can or should read this poem as an "Irish" composition, given the ambiguities of the attribution of authorship and the nature of its known manuscript transmission. Although the case for the attribution of this poem to Patrick of Dublin is significantly weaker than Gwynn admitted, the transmission of the poem can be seen rather as evidence of a more diffuse and widespread engagement with Irish culture in late-twelfth-century England. Such engagement is particularly witnessed in Cistercian houses.

It has long been noted that a body of Latin literature originating in the Celtic-speaking countries was preserved in Sawley, a Cistercian house in Lancashire, in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries,[53] and that the Cistercian house of Rievaulx nurtured interests in Irish textual culture during the twelfth century.[54] We might

52) Helen Clover & Margaret Gibson, eds, *The Letters of Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury* (Oxford, 1979), no. 9, l. 32.

53) David N. Dumville, "Celtic-Latin Texts in Northern England, c. 1150 – c. 1250," *Celtica* 12 (1977), 19–49. For the present purposes, we might particularly note the evidence for an interest in St Patrick, and perhaps access to an otherwise unattested Life of that saint, discussed at pp. 30–33.

54) Denis Bethell, "English Monks and Irish Reform in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," *Historical Studies* 8 (1971), 111–35, at pp. 123–24.

additionally note the composition in the 1180s, by H. of Saltrey (now Sawtrey, Cambridgeshire), at the Cistercian abbey of St Mary's, of the *Tractatus de Purgatorio Sancti Patricii*. Furthermore, Jocelin of Furness provides yet another witness to Cistercian interest in Ireland generally, and St Patrick specifically, in the form of his *Vita sancti Patricii episcopi*, datable to the period 1180x1201. Therefore, we should perhaps read our manuscript *O*, given its date of composition and its attribution of a corpus of poetry to a *sanctus Patricius episcopus*, in the light of this intense interest — spread across a broad geographical swathe of England, but focused on Cistercian houses — in a Patrician textual tradition. The tradition was a diverse one, encompassing hagiographical items concerning the saint, texts whose authorship was misattributed to him, and a tract which locates an eschatological experience at a cult site with a toponymic link to him. This interest can hardly be unconnected to the introduction and rapid growth of the Cistercian order in Ireland in the second half of the twelfth century,[55] and this may provide the conduit whereby the most substantial collection of poetry attributed to Patrick (and thus a collection of poetry which was clearly considered to be of Irish origin) came to be in Rufford Abbey. Aubrey Gwynn's argument that the poetry in the Rufford Abbey manuscript was copied from a lost book of the library at Rievaulx cannot be substantiated, notwithstanding the aforementioned Rievaulx interest in Irish and Irish-related material, and the fact that Rufford was a daughter-house of Rievaulx.[56]

Of our two manuscript copies of "Constet quantus honos," it is *O*, from a Cistercian abbey, which contains the attribution to Patrick. *S*, a manuscript of Benedictine provenance, presents the poem anonymously. We can make two suggestions: perhaps the Cistercian manuscript preserves an authentic record of the poems having an Irish connection (whether that be a false attribution to St Patrick, or a genuine attribution to another bishop called Patrick) and the Benedictine copy, or its exemplar, has removed that attribution, considering it to be of little interest. Or the Benedictine manuscript preserves the authentic record, that is, the author is unknown, and the Cistercian scribe has falsified an attribution to Patrick. The former seems the more likely, as the other poems in the manuscript which are also attributed to Patrick seem to form a coherent group and contain numerous mentions of Patrick's name, in interlinear glosses, titles, and within the texts proper. It seems unlikely that all of these things have been fabricated. Therefore, some book containing verses attributed to St Patrick (or a "holy bishop Patrick") must have been the source for the Rufford Abbey manuscript.

While some of the poems may well be by the same author — "Mentis in excessu" and "Constet quanto honos," for example — others seem unlikely to be the product of the same mind: *De mirabilibus Hibernie* is very unlike the other poems, in terms of quality, style, subject matter, and worldview. It is interesting, however, that this latter poem, the authorship of which is also attributed to Saint Patrick in *O*,

55) Roger Stalley, *The Cistercian Monasteries of Ireland: An Account of the History, Art and Architecture of the White Monks in Ireland from 1142–1540* (New Haven, Conn., 1987); Aubrey Gwynn & R. Neville Hadcock, *Medieval Religious Houses: Ireland* (London, 1970).

56) See Emilia Jamroziak, *Rievaulx Abbey and Its Social Context, 1132–1300: Memory, Locality, and Networks* (Turnhout, 2005), particularly pp. 82–84.

contains the topos of Ireland being free from snakes and other venomous creatures.[57] In Jocelin's "Life of Saint Patrick," this fact is attributed to the miraculous powers of Patrick himself, who is said to have expelled a plague of venomous beasts which was afflicting the people of Ireland, but the miracle is not found in Patrician hagiography before the twelfth century.[58] Perhaps we might tentatively suggest that this poem attributed to Patrick, which discusses Ireland's lack of serpents, could have been an intermediary step towards Jocelin's attribution of the miracle to St Patrick: the poems may, then, have been circulating in other Cistercian houses aside from Rufford Abbey. Certainly the Irish Cistercian houses could have provided the conduit for the transmission of the poems to England, and from there individual poems could have been picked up by scribes compiling monastic miscellanies in houses of other religious orders, hence the appearance of the poem in *S*.

To conclude, let us return to the question of whether or not we might read "Constet quantus honos" as an Irish composition, and therefore use it as evidence of Irish learning before the late twelfth century. Leslie Lockett, in her discussion of "Constet quantus honos," considers the poem to be evidence of the nature of learning in eleventh-century Worcester. She states that the reason why Patrick "does not stand out as major figure on the eleventh-century English intellectual landscape … is … testimony to the rapid advance of Platonist-Christian doctrines on the soul" in post-Conquest England.[59] However, as we have seen, the evidence suggests that any link between the author of our poem and the "Patricius" listed in the Durham *Liber Vitae* among the Worcester community is at best problematic. Rather than looking to eleventh-century England for evidence of Patrick's education, in the absence of any certainties about the poem's authorship or date of composition, we should shift our focus to its reception and transmission in late-twelfth-century England, and consider the reasons for our poem's inclusion in monastic miscellanies. Towards the end of the twelfth century, the rise of so-called "scholastic humanism," and the renewed interest in Platonic thought, can account for the inclusion of the poem not only in *O*, but also in *S*.[60]

The poems attributed to (Saint) Patrick must perhaps remain anonymous compositions (where the author names himself, in other poems in the corpus, as "Patricius," this is as likely to be a poetic persona — a pseudonymous Saint Patrick — as a genuine identification). However, there is some circumstantial evidence to suggest that they may originate in Ireland and have come to England via Cistercian founda-

57) Gwynn, ed., *Writings*, pp. 66–68: "De ipsa Hibernia in qua non uiuunt serpentes."

58) Jocelin of Furness, *Vita S. Patricii*, §§148–50, ed. *Acta Sanctorum Martii XVII*, pp. 536D–77D, (http://acta.chadwyck.co.uk/all/fulltext?ALL=Y&WARN=N&PRINT=YES&ALL=Y&warn=N&ACTION=byid&ID=Z400058102&FILE=../session/1325689467_634&PRINT=yes — last accessed 4 January, 2011). See also Helen Birkett, *The Saints' Lives of Jocelin of Furness: Hagiography, Patronage and Ecclesiastical Politics* (York, 2010), pp. 31–34.

59) Locket, *Anglo-Saxon Psychologies*, p. 434.

60) R. W. Southern, *Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1995); R. N. Swanson, *The Twelfth-Century Renaissance* (Manchester, 1999); Winthrop Wetherbee, *Platonism and Poetry in the Twelfth Century: The Literary Influence of the School of Chartres* (Princeton, N.J, 1972).

tions. Other extensive but diffuse connections existed between Ireland and England at this time, which might also have provided potential routes of transmission.[61] Certainly, at least one of the scribes who preserved these poems (that is, the scribe of *O*) considered them to have an Irish connection, and the presence of *De mirabilibus Hibernie* among them provides some support for this supposition. There is much about these poems and their transmission which deserves to be studied in greater detail; at present, the poems should only be used with great caution as evidence for the nature of learning in either England or Ireland before the end of the twelfth century.

61) For some brief remarks on Irish connections with Savigniac houses see Jean-Michel Picard, "Early Contacts between Ireland and Normandy: The Cult of Irish Saints in Normany before the Conquest," in *Ogma: Essays in Celtic Studies in Honour of Próinséas Ní Chatháin*, ed. Michael Richter & Jean-Michel Picard (Dublin, 2002), pp. 85–93, at pp. 92–93. On the potential significance of the Benedictine order as a route of transmission between Ireland and England, see Flanagan, *Transformation*, p. 14. We might note, for example, the abbot of Burton-Upon-Trent securing a *codex ex Hibernia* which ensured the survival of a Life of Monenna by the Irish hagiographer Conchobranus in an English manuscript (*Transformation*, p. 16).