

Latin *in situ* Fragments Connected to Iceland

A Survey

TOM LORENZ

1. Introduction

In early modern Iceland, many obsolete Latin parchment manuscripts were dismantled so that their material could be recycled and used for bookbindings of other manuscripts or printed books, e.g. as wrappers or covers, pastedowns, flyleaves, spine linings and reinforcements (Guðvarður Már Gunnlaugsson, 2017). Although many of these fragments were detached from the bookbindings of their host codices in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, several parchment fragments remain *in situ* ('in position'; 'on site') in the bookbindings of manuscripts connected to Iceland.

At the end of the nineteenth century, Kristian Kålund (1888–1892, 1900) and Vilhelm Gödel (1892, 1897) catalogued the major collections of Icelandic manuscripts, the Arnamagnæan Manuscript Collection, today divided between the Arnamagnæan Collection in Copenhagen and the Árni Magnússon Institute for Icelandic Studies in Reykjavík, the Royal Danish Library in Copenhagen, the National Library of Sweden in Stockholm and Uppsala University Library.¹ Both Kålund and Gödel mention *in situ* fragments in the description of the respective host codices. However, in many cases, they identify these fragments only tentatively as “beskrevet pergament fra et latinsk ritualhåndskrift” ('parchment with writing from a Latin litur-

¹ To my knowledge, there are no known Icelandic codices containing Latin *in situ* fragments in their bindings in manuscript collections in Finland or Norway.

gical manuscript’), “pergamentblad efter en messbok” (‘parchment leaf from a liturgical book’) or similar. The Latin *in situ* fragments connected to Iceland in the Royal Danish Library and Uppsala University Library remain incompletely catalogued and identified to this date.

In the twentieth century, most of the *in situ* fragments in the Arnarmagnæan Collection were systematically detached from the bookbindings, assembled in separate fragment collections and meticulously catalogued (Andersen, 2008). Still, a few Latin fragments remain *in situ* and incompletely uncatalogued in the collection. In contrast, the *in situ* fragments in the National Library of Sweden were never systematically detached and many remain *in situ* in their original bookbindings (Springborg, 2000, p. 137). Although the fragments were catalogued by Oluf Kolsrud (unpublished handwritten catalogue preserved in the manuscript Holm U 170) and Lilli Gjerløw (1980), a few of the texts preserved in these fragments remain unidentified.

The smaller number of *in situ* fragments in the National Library of Iceland were catalogued together with their host volumes by Páll Eggert Ólason (1918–1935). Based on this catalogue, Jakob Benediktsson (1959, pp. 23–24) compiled a list of *in situ* fragments in the library.

Despite the increasing interest in the Latin fragments connected to Iceland in recent years (Attinger and Ommundsen, 2013; Attinger, 2017; Guðvarður Már Gunnlaugsson, 2017), the Latin fragments which remain *in situ* have often been overlooked in favour of the more accessible and well catalogued collections of detached fragments, and some of them seem to have never been studied since they were tentatively catalogued in the nineteenth century. As these catalogues in many cases are lacking or erroneous, we have no comprehensive and updated overview of such fragments, neither their number nor where they are kept.

In this article, I provide a survey about the remaining Latin *in situ* fragments connected to Iceland, as a supplement to the existing catalogues of Icelandic manuscripts. This survey is based on archival work which I conducted at the respective manuscript collections in 2022 and 2023. I provide several updates and corrections to obsolete or inaccurate descriptions of Latin *in situ* fragments in the existing catalogues as well as information about newly-identified text in the corpus of Latin *in situ* fragments connected to Iceland. Furthermore, I discuss how the distribution of the remaining *in situ* fragments among the different manuscripts collections reflect different historical archival practices at these collections.

2. Method

2.1 Corpus

In my survey, I included parchment fragments of dismantled liturgical and other Latin manuscripts which remain *in situ* in bookbindings of manuscripts with a known Icelandic provenance and which were there probably dismantled in Iceland. I excluded any kind of *in situ* fragment made of paper, written *in Old Norse or Icelandic, or belonging to a printed book as well as fragments which are in situ* in the bookbindings of printed books or as wrappers for administrative documents.²

I identified the relevant fragments in two steps. In the first step, I compiled a list of manuscripts with an Icelandic provenance which at one point contained Latin *in situ* fragments based on a systematic review of the existing catalogues. In the second step, I verified whether these *in situ* fragments are still part of the bookbindings today or whether they were removed after the publication of the respective catalogues. The second step is based on archival work which I conducted at the respective manuscript collections between spring 2022 and summer 2023. Excluding ÍB 230 8vo and ÍB 346 8vo in the National Library of Iceland (see Section 3.4), I have investigated all manuscripts discussed in this survey in person.

Although these catalogues were compiled meticulously and adhere to a high standard, they do naturally not include any information about *in situ* fragments which were previously hidden in bookbindings and only uncovered later, e.g. the cover of AM 463 4to (see Section 3.3). In the survey, I included any later discovered fragments which I am aware of as well as one fragment which I discovered myself, an inlay preserved in AM 623 4to (see Section 3.1). Still, further so far unknown *in situ* fragment may be uncovered in the future.

² The National Archives of Sweden in Stockholm hold six fragments belonging to the dismantled Latin psalter written in Iceland in the first half of the fourteenth century which were used as wrappers for administrative documents (Guðbjörg Kristjánsdóttir, 1983). Five of these fragments, SRA Fr 878, SRA Fr 879, SRA Fr 943, SRA Fr 944 and SRA Fr 5238 remain *in situ* while the sixth fragment, SRA 28002, was detached. Pictures of the fragments are available in the fragment database of the National Archives (MPO). The respective administrative documents have no Icelandic provenance.

2.2 Classification

The surveyed *in situ* fragments are incorporated into the bookbindings of their host volumes as covers, pastedowns, flyleaves or spine reinforcements.

Roughly half of these fragments are used as covers for hardboard bindings and limp bindings. In hardboard bindings, the book case consists of two boards made of wood or cardboard in the front and back of the book respectively as well as some flexible covering material such as leather, cloth or parchment leaves from dismantled manuscripts (Roberts and Etherington, 1982, p. 47). In a limp binding, the cover consists solely of the flexible covering material (Roberts and Etherington, 1982, p. 160; Springborg, 2000, pp. 134–136). Some Icelandic limp bindings have a lid which can be folded around the book or a thread of leather which can be used to tie the book up to protect the book block from damage.

Moreover, several fragments are used as end leaves (also called end sheets or endpaper) which connect the book block with the bookbinding. A pastedown is an end leaf which is pasted onto the inside of the board (in a hardboard binding) or directly on the cover (in a limp binding) in the front or back of a book to fix the book block to the bookbinding. A flyleaf is an end leaf which is not pasted down on the boards or cover but remains free, protecting the book block by minimising wear and tear (Roberts and Etherington, 1982, pp. 89–92; Ryley, 2022, pp. 79–82).

Besides covers and end leaves, recycled parchment can be used in different ways to reinforce the spine of a book. Spine linings, for example, are thin strips of parchment which extend beyond the spine and are attached to the end leaves or the hardboards of the book case to strengthen the spine and hold the shape of the book while maintaining the flexibility of the binding (Roberts and Etherington, 1982, p. 245). Similarly, an inlay is a larger piece of stiff yet flexible material situated between the wooden boards of the case which strengthen or stiffen the spine (Roberts and Etherington, 1982, p. 139). As such reinforcements are situated between the book block, the sides and the covering material, they are usually not directly accessible without dismantling the bookbinding.

In addition to these common types of *in situ* fragments, I found several unusual cases in which an *in situ* fragment was reinserted behind the book block of its respective host codex after it was detached when the original bookbinding was dismantled. This type of *in situ* fragment is particular to the National Library of Sweden and does not occur in the other surveyed manuscript collections in Denmark, Iceland and Sweden.

2.3 Identification

The dating of manuscript fragments written in Latin and the identification of their origin relies on both palaeographic and codicological features. Attinger and Ommundsen (2013) compiled an overview about the various orthographic, palaeographic and codicological features which may indicate that a Latin fragment was written in Iceland, based on earlier research by earlier scholars such as Gjerløw (1980) and Andersen (2008) as well as their own observations. In my survey, I relied primarily on the various palaeographic features which point to Iceland, especially the use of small capital ‘H’ which is specific to Icelandic Latin manuscripts and which occurs in several of the previously unidentified *in situ* fragments.

Compared to a completely preserved codex, the limited size and often bad condition of a fragment may provide a challenge for its dating, localisation and the identification of the text it preserves as well as the type of book it once belonged too. As several of the Latin fragments in this corpus are very small or in parts illegible, I was in these cases not able to date them or identify their geographical origin or exact type of liturgical book.

However, I identified several Latin texts which Kålund, Gödel, Kolsrud and Gjerløw identified tentatively as fragments of medieval Latin liturgical books or theological treatises. I furthermore identified several *in situ* fragments which belong to the same dismantled liturgical book as catalogued detached fragments in the Arnamagnæan Collection and the Árni Magnússon Institute for Icelandic Studies based on agreement in textual content, script, orthography, layout, decorations and materials. Moreover, I found several cases, in which the description of the *in situ* fragments in a catalogue conflicts with the present state of the *in situ* fragments in the host codex, either because *in situ* fragments were overlooked during the compiling of the catalogue or because the *in situ* fragments were altered when the bookbinding of the host codex was modified or replaced with a new bookbindings. In the following section, I provide an overview about these cases.

3. Survey

3.1 The Arnamagnæan Collection, Copenhagen

In the early twentieth century, the majority of Latin *in situ* fragments in the Arnamagnæan Collection were detached from the bookbindings of their

Tab. 1. Latin *in situ* fragments in Icelandic manuscripts in the Arnarnagæan Collection.

Shelfmark	Description	Dismantled codex	Related fragments	Catalogue
Am 618 4to (end leaf)	1 folio used as end leaf in the front of the codex	Calendar, Wales or Western England 1200–1300 ⁱ		Kålund, 1888–1892, II, pp. 31–32 [no. 1606]
AM 623 4to (cover)	1 folio used as cover for a hardboard binding	<i>psalterium</i> , Iceland ca. 1400	SÁM 60	Kålund, 1888–1892, II, p. 37 [no. 1611]?
AM 623 4to (end leaves 1–2)	2 trimmed folios used as end leaves in the front and back of the codex	<i>graduale</i>		Kålund, 1888–1892, II, p. 37 [no. 1611]?
AM 623 4to (inlay)	1 inaccessible strip situated between book block and bookcase	<i>graduale</i> or <i>antiphonarium</i>		Kålund, 1888–1892, II, p. 37 [no. 1611]?
AM 678 4to (end leaf)	1 trimmed folio used as end leaf in the front of the codex, possibly formerly used as a cover	<i>manuale</i> , 1200–1250		Kålund, 1888–1892, II, p. 95 [no. 1691]; Gjerløw, 1980, pp. 62–65

Note

ⁱ The codex was palimpsested and recontextualised in the second half of the sixteenth century by inserting an Icelandic translation of the psalms, proving that the codex was in Iceland at that time. It remains unknown whether the folio was first repurposed as a flyleaf in Iceland or whether it may have come to Iceland already as part of the bookbinding of AM 618 4to.

host codices. According to Guðvarður Már Gunnlaugsson (2017, 171), there remain ca. 60 manuscripts which contain *in situ* fragments in their bookbindings. However, most of these manuscripts containing Latin *in situ* fragments have no Icelandic provenance, e.g. the Danish law codices AM 12 4to (spine reinforcement, *homiliarium*) and AM 25 4to (pastedown, *missale*) or the Norwegian law codex AM 62 4to (two pastedowns, printed liturgical book).

Based on my own investigation, three of these manuscripts contain Latin *in situ* fragments and are connected to Iceland (see Tab. 1).

AM 623 4to

This codex requires a more extensive discussion as Kålund's description of the *in situ* fragments in the bookbinding differs considerably from the current state of the manuscript. Kålund (1892, p. 37 [no. 1611]) describes the *in situ* fragments in the following way: “Om membranen findes et omslag,

dannet af to sammenhængende perg.-blade af et latinsk ritualhskr. med noder (c. 1300), endvidere er bindet betrukket med perg. fra et latinsk kirke-lig hskr.” The current bookbinding, however, contains not two *in situ* fragments but four.

The first fragment mentioned by Kålund can be identified as the cover of the codex. This fragment belonged to a Psalter with the outside of the cover containing Ps 39,2–12. A major initial which is painted on the other side of the folio facing the wooden boards is visible through the parchment, likely the ‘D’ initial introducing the beginning of Ps 39 *Dixi custodiam*. This psalm is usually marked in Psalters with illuminated initials to divide the psalms into sections for liturgical use. The inside of the cover is thus likely the recto side while the outside is the verso side. Based on the layout and script, the Psalter was written in Iceland. One notable feature pointing to Iceland as place of origin is the use of small capital ‘h’ (see further Section 2.1).

This folio is similar to the psalter fragment SÁM 60, which is today held by the Árni Magnússon Institute for Icelandic Studies in Reykjavík. SÁM 60 contains most of Ps 26 and 27 and is dated to ca. 1400 (Guðvarður Már Gunnlaugsson, 2017, p. 171). The two fragments have not only a similar size, format and layout, but are written by two very similar hands that share specific palaeographic features, such as distinctive long hairlines for the lowercase letters ‘r’ and short ‘s’. One significant difference between the hands of the two fragments is that AM 623 4to (cover) uses small capital ‘h’ (5 instances) in whereas SÁM 60 uses lowercase ‘h’ (4 instances). Nevertheless, the strong similarity between the two hands suggest that they are indeed the same hand and that the two fragments may belong to the same dismantled psalter.³

The other fragment mentioned by Kålund, that is the bifolio of a liturgical book with musical notation used as an additional wrapper, cannot be identified with certainty with any of the other three fragments which are *in situ* in the codex today. This fragment may have been detached from the bookbinding. The Arnamagnæan Collection holds several Latin fragments with an unknown secondary provenance, including sixteen of the liturgical fragments stored under the shelfmark AM accessoria 7 (Andersen, 2008, p. 139). Alternatively, this former wrapper may have been cut in two and repurposed in form of the two flyleaves which are today situated in the front and back of AM 623 4to respectively. These two fragments belong to the same Latin *graduale* and may have formed part of the same non-consec-

³ This assessment was confirmed by Guðvarður Már Gunnlaugsson.

utive bifolio. The first fragment in the front contains the liturgy for Ash Wednesday whereas the second fragment in the back contains the liturgy for Monday of the Second Week in Lent.

Furthermore, I discovered a fourth *in situ* fragment in the binding of AM 623 4to which is used as spine reinforcement. Only a small part of this fragment is visible between the separate quires of the book block. Still, it is possible to make out musical notation as well as text written in two different sizes of script. This layout is typical for liturgical books containing church music, e.g. the *antiphonarium* or *graduale*, with the larger script used for the text of the chants and the smaller script for instructions.

AM 678 4to

In addition to the parchment fragment, the bookbinding of AM 678 4to contains paper maculature used as pastedowns in the front and back of the codex. The paper is evidently printing waste and corresponds to Peter Frederik Suhm's historiographical work *Om de Nordiske Folkes ældste Oprindelse* (pp. 239–240), printed by B. J. Christian and G. C. Berling in Copenhagen in 1770. The current bookbinding of AM 678 4to was therefore probably made in Copenhagen in the 1770s.

3.2 The Royal Danish Library, Copenhagen

In his catalogue of the more than 1000 Old Norse and Icelandic manuscripts in the Royal Danish Library in Copenhagen, Kålund (1900) mentions several codices containing *in situ* fragments of liturgical books in their binding. Most of these *in situ* fragments were detached in the twentieth century while a smaller number of Latin *in situ* fragments were returned to Iceland together with their host codex.

To my knowledge, only five Icelandic codices containing Latin *in situ* fragments in their bookbindings remain in the library (see Tab. 2).⁴

In his catalogue, Kålund identifies all five Latin *in situ* fragments in Icelandic manuscripts in the Royal Danish Library only tentatively as belonging to Latin liturgical books. The *in situ* fragment in Thott 2010 8vo, for example, is described as “beskrevet pergament fra et latinsk ritualhåndskrift” (‘parchment with writing from a Latin liturgical manuscript’) (Kålund, 1900, p. 361 [no. 1154]). Still, all five Latin *in situ* fragments preserve enough text

⁴ In addition to these Latin *in situ* fragments, the Thott 2099 4to contains an Icelandic *in situ* fragment transmitting *Stjórn* (Kålund, 1900, pp. 352–353 [no. 1126]).

Tab. 2. Latin *in situ* fragments in Icelandic manuscripts in the Royal Danish Library.

Shelfmark	Description	Dismantled codex	Catalogue
Thott 210 8vo (cover)	1 folio, part of a patchwork cover for a limp binding	<i>missale</i> , Iceland	Kålund, 1900, p. 361 [no. 1154]
Thott 243 8vo (cover)	1 folio, used as cover for a limp binding	<i>antiphonarium</i> , Iceland	Kålund, 1900, p. 361 [no. 1155]
Thott 478 8vo (cover)	1 folio, used as cover for a limp binding	<i>graduale</i> , Iceland	Kålund, 1900, p. 362 [no. 1159]
Thott 484 8vo (cover)	1 bifolio, used as cover for a limp binding	<i>evangelarium</i> , Iceland	Kålund, 1900, p. 364 [no. 1164]
Thott 513 8vo (cover)	1 folio, used as cover for a limp binding	<i>antiphonarium</i> , Iceland	Kålund, 1900, p. 368 [no. 1175]

to identify the specific type of liturgical book and the part of the liturgy they contain. All five fragment were probably written in Iceland.

Thott 210 8vo

The cover fragment belongs to a dismantled *missale* and contains part of the liturgy for the Nativity of Christ [25 December]. Based on the dark parchment, the script and the polychrome major initial, it seems to have been written in Iceland. Specific features that point to Iceland are the use of the open ‘e’ as well as the shape of the Tironian note for ‘et’.

Thott 243 8vo

The cover fragment belongs to a dismantled *antiphonarium* and contains the liturgy for the feast of Peter and Paul [29 June]. Based on the ink, parchment and initials, the manuscript was written in Iceland. In addition, it contains double notes as well as the small capital ‘H’, features particular to Iceland.

Thott 478 8vo

The cover fragment contains part of the liturgy for the Purification of Mary (Candlemas) [2 February], St. Blaise [3 February] and Agatha [5 February]. The dismantled codex was a *missale* written in Iceland. Evidence for an Icelandic origin include the ink and parchment, the script as well as the particular style of the major and minor initials. The binding contains traces of paper used as inner cover or pastedowns which has been removed.

Thott 484 8vo

The cover fragment is worn and for the most part illegible on the outside. In contrast, the text on the inside is mostly readable and contains parts of the Gospels of Mark and Luke. The dismantled codex may thus have been an *evangeliarium*. Based on the parchment, ink and script, especially the use of small capital ‘h’, it was written in Iceland.

Thott 513 8vo

The cover fragment can be identified as an *antiphonarium* containing the liturgy for the fourth Sunday of Advent as well as the vigil of the Nativity of Christ [25 December]. The ink and parchment of the fragment suggest that the dismantled codex was written in Iceland.

3.3 The Árni Magnússon Institute for Icelandic Studies, Reykjavík

The majority of the manuscripts held today by the Árni Magnússon Institute for Icelandic Studies has been transferred either from the Arnarnæxan Collection or the Royal Danish Library in Copenhagen during the 1970s and 1980s (Greenfield, 2007, pp. 37–38). As both the Arnarnæxan Collection and the Icelandic manuscripts in the Royal Danish Library were catalogued by Kålund (1888–1892, 1900) long before the return of the Icelandic manuscripts to Iceland, these catalogues include descriptions of the manuscripts which are today in the Árni Magnússon Institute for Icelandic Studies in Reykjavík, including information about the Latin *in situ* fragments in their bookbindings.

In total, the Árni Magnússon Institute for Icelandic Studies today holds five manuscripts with Latin *in situ* fragments (see Tab. 3).

AM 463 to

The Latin *in situ* fragment is used as a cover for hardboards made of cardboard. The fragment was formerly hidden by an additional paper cover and only discovered when the paper cover was removed during repair in 1994, and it was therefore overlooked by Kålund when he catalogued the Arnarnæxan Collection (Springborg, 1995, p. 46).

The fragment belongs to a Latin Psalter and contains Ps 88,32–43 (outside of front cover) as well as Ps 88,53–89,9 (outside of back cover). As the two folios contain consecutive text passages, they seem to belong to a bifolio which was situated in the middle of a quire. The script is a *Textualis formata*.

Tab. 3. Latin *in situ* fragments in the Árni Magnússon Institute for Icelandic Studies.

Manuscript shelfmark	Description	Dismantled codex	Related fragments	Catalogue
AM 463 4to (cover)	1 bifolio used as cover for a hardboard binding	<i>psalterium</i> , England 1200–1300	AM accessoria 7 Hs 111 Lbs fragm 96 Pjms 366	Springborg, 1995, p. 46
AM 471 4to (end leaves 1–2)	2 fragments belonging to the same dismantled folio used as end leaves in the front and back of the codex	<i>graduale</i> , Netherlands 1400–1500	AM accessoria 48 a AM accessoria 48 d [= AM accessoria 7 Hs 130]	Kålund, 1888–1892, I, p. 655 [no. 1243]
AM 38 8vo (end leaves 1–2)	2 fragments used as end leaves in the front and back of the codex	<i>sequentiarium</i> , Iceland		Kålund, 1888–1892, II, p. 351 [no. 2235]
GKS 3270 4to (end leaf 1)	1 trimmed folio used as end leaf in the front of the codex	<i>breviarium</i> , Iceland?		Kålund, 1900, p. 72 [no. 126]
GKS 3270 4to (end leaf 2)	1 trimmed bifolio used as end leaf in the back of the codex	<i>antiphonarium</i>		Kålund, 1900, p. 72 [no. 126]
NKS 11 fol. (end leaf)	1 trimmed folio used as end leaf in the back of the codex	<i>homiliarium</i> (Paulus Diaconus), England 1200–1300	AM accessoria 7 Hs 94	Kålund, 1900, p. 86 [no. 158]

The verses are introduced by flourished initials in red and blue. Comparing this fragment to other Psalter fragments in collections in Reykjavík and Copenhagen, I was able to identify three further fragments which belong to the same dismantled codex: AM accessoria 7 Hs 111, Lbs fragm 96 and Pjms 366. AM accessoria 7 Hs 111 consists of 32 folios which were detached from bookbindings in the Arnarnagðan collection. Andersen identified AM accessoria 7 Hs 111 as a Psalter written in England in the thirteenth century (Andersen, 2008, pp. 102–103).

GKS 3270 4to

Kålund (Kålund, 1900, p. 72 [no. 126]) describes the two end leaves in the front and the end of the codex as “beskrevet og med notetegn forsynet pergament fra latinske ritualhåndskrifter.” (‘parchment with writing and musical notes from Latin liturgical manuscripts’). The first fragment is of a trimmed folio of a *breviarium*. It contains the liturgy for the Sabbath. The second fragment is an incomplete bifolio of part of an *antiphonarium*. It

contains part of the responsories for the period after Pentecost, the so-called summer histories: 1r–1v contains part of the chants for the *historia De libro Sapientiae* whereas 2r–2v contains part of the chants for the *historia De libro Iob*. In addition, the binding contains paper maculature from an Icelandic translation of the psalms (Ps 69,16–20 & Ps 69, 32–36).

NKS 11 fol.

Kålund (Kålund, 1900, p. 86 [no. 158]) identified the flyleaf as a “beskr. Perg.-bl. fra et latinsk ritual”. Based on my own investigation, the fragment contains part of Fulgentius Ruspensis’ sermon *De sancto Stephano protomartyre et de conversione sancti Pauli* (Sermones, ch. 3, 4–6). Moreover, I have identified the fragment as belonging to the same dismantled manuscript AM accessoria 7 Hs 94, three detached fragments which belong to the *homiliarium* compiled by Paulus Diaconus. (McDougall, 2003; Andersen, 2008, pp. 85–86).

AM 38 8vo

Kålund (Kålund, 1888–1892, II, p. 351 [no. 2235]) describes the two end leaves as “beskrevet og med nodetegn forsynet perg. fra et latinsk ritual-hskr.” (‘parchment with writing and musical notes from Latin liturgical manuscripts’). Based on my own investigation, they stem from the same folio of a dismantled liturgical book, likely a *sequentarium*. They contain the final part of the sequence *Resonet sacrata jam turba diva symphonia* (AH 53:74) for Pentecost Monday as well as the complete sequence *Eia Musa die quaeso praeclara chorea* (AH 53:75) for Pentecost Tuesday, both with considerable lacunas. The dark parchment, the script, the use of small capital ‘H’ and the style of pencil-drawn major initials suggest that manuscript was written in Iceland.

3.4 The National Library of Iceland, Reykjavík

In his catalogue of the parchment fragments in the National Library of Iceland, Jakob Benediktson (1959, pp. 23–24) provided a list of 19 uncatalogued fragment items, including both detached fragments and *in situ* fragments. Among these fragments are both manuscript and printed fragments, made of paper or parchment and written in Latin or the vernacular.

The majority of the *in situ* fragments in this list are today detached from their host volumes and stored under the shelfmarks Lbs fragment 83–109. However, two manuscripts still contain a Latin *in situ* fragment today (see Tab. 4).

Tab. 4. Latin *in situ* fragments in Icelandic manuscripts in the National Library of Iceland.

Shelfmark	Description	Dismantled codex	Catalogue
ÍB 230 8vo (cover)	1 trimmed leaf used as front cover for a limp binding; the back cover has been lost	<i>martyrologium</i>	Páll Eggert Ólason, 1918–1935, III; p. 55; Jakob Benediktsson, 1959, p. 24
ÍB 346 8vo (cover)	1 trimmed bifolium used as a cover for a limp binding	<i>missale</i> , 1200–1300	Páll Eggert Ólason, 1918–1935, III, p. 80; Jakob Benediktsson, 1959, p. 24

In addition to the parchment fragment, ÍB 346 8vo contains a second *in situ* fragment, not mentioned by Páll Eggert Ólason (1918–1935, III, p. 80) and Jakob Benediktsson (1959, p. 24): a trimmed paper leaf belonging to a printed Latin *missale* which is used as end leaves in the front and back of the codex.⁵ This fragment falls outside the scope of this survey which does not cover paper or print fragments.

3.5 The National Library of Sweden, Stockholm

The National Library of Sweden holds ca. 300 West Norse manuscripts, including manuscripts written in Iceland or Norway or copies of such manuscripts written in Sweden. Several of these manuscripts contain Latin *in situ* fragments in their bookbindings. Some of these manuscripts are not connected to Iceland, e.g. Holm papp 72 fol. (cover; Pseudo-Chrysostomus: *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*) and Holm papp 71 4to (cover; *missale*, 1300–1400), both written in Sweden.

Still, there remain ten Icelandic codices that contain 27 Latin *in situ* fragments (see Tab. 5).

In addition to the *in situ* fragments discussed above, there is another type of fragment present among the Icelandic codices in the National Library of Sweden: In several cases, parchment fragments were first detached but then appended to the same codex behind the book (see Tab. 6).⁶ Although these

⁵ Fragments of printed books in the Latin manuscript material connected to Iceland include the detached fragments Lbs fragment 93 (parchment, *missale*, undated) (Jakob Benediktsson, 1959, p. 24) and AM accessoria 48 I II (paper, *graduale*, undated) (Kålund, 1900, pp. 69–70 [no. 118]).

⁶ Two further such reinserted fragment can be found in Holm papp 16 I fol. (*antiphonarium*, ca. 1500), written by Olof Verelius in the second half of the seventeenth century (Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 22r), and Holm papp 52 4to (*antiphonarium*, 1300–1400), written by Jakob

Tab. 5. Latin *in situ* fragments in Icelandic manuscripts in the National Library of Sweden.

Manuscript shelfmark	Description	Dismantled codex	Related fragments	Catalogue
Holm perg 13 4to (end leaves 1–2)	2 trimmed folios belonging to the same bifolio	<i>breviarium</i> , 1400–1500		Gödel, 1897, p. 53 [25]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 16r; Gjerløw, 1980, p. 91
Holm perg 18 4to (cover 1)	1 bifolio, part of a patchwork cover for a limp binding	Hieronymus: <i>Vita Sancti Hilarionis</i> (ch. 14–20), non-Icelandic 1100–1500		Gödel, 1897, p. 60 [no. 30]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 17r
Holm perg 18 4to (cover 2)	1 bifolio, part of a patchwork cover for a limp binding	<i>psalterium</i> , Iceland? 1350–1400		Gödel, 1897, p. 60 [no. 30]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 17r; Gjerløw, 1980, pp. 115–116
Holm perg 25 4to (end leaves 1–2)	2 trimmed folios from same bifolio, used as pastedowns	Petrus Lombardus: <i>Sententiae in IV libris distinctae</i> , 1200–1300		Gödel, 1897, pp. 71–73 [no. 35]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 18r
Holm perg 5 8vo (cover 1–3)	3 bifolios, patchwork cover	<i>ordinale</i> , Iceland 1200–1300		Gödel, 1897, pp. 109–110 [no. 51]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 20r; Gjerløw, 1968, pp. 69–70; Gjerløw, 1980, p. 5
Holm perg 8 8vo (end leaves 1–2)	2 loosened pastedowns, in the front and back of the codex	<i>missale</i> , England 950–1000		Gödel, 1897, p. 113 [no. 54]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 21r; Gjerløw, 1980, pp. 9–17
Holm papp 10 4to (cover 1)	1 trimmed folio, part of a patchwork cover for a limp binding (lid)	<i>homiliarium</i> ? (Guilielmus Peraldus), Iceland 1300–1400		Gödel, 1897, pp. 272–273 [no. 188]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 24r; Gjerløw, 1980, p. 6
Holm papp 10 4to (cover 2)	1 trimmed folio, part of a patchwork cover for a limp binding	<i>graduale</i> , 1400–1500		Gödel, 1897, pp. 272–273 [no. 188]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 24r; Gjerløw, 1980, p. 6
Holm papp 17 4to (cover 1)	1 trimmed bifolio, part of a patchwork cover for a limp binding (lid)	<i>psalterium</i> , England? 1150–1200		Gödel, 1897, p. 282 [no. 195]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 25r; Gjerløw, 1980, p. 6
Holm papp 17 4to (cover 2–3)	2 folios, part of a patchwork cover for a limp binding (outer + inner cover), the second fragment has been detached and reinserted behind the book block	<i>psalterium</i> , Iceland 1400–1500	Holm papp 18 4to (cover 1) Holm papp 19 4to (cover 2–3)	Gödel, 1897, p. 282 [no. 195]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 25r; Gjerløw, 1980, p. 6

Manuscript shelfmark	Description	Dismantled codex	Related fragments	Catalogue
Holm papp 18 4to (cover 1)	1 folio, part of a patchwork cover for a limp binding	<i>psalterium</i> , Iceland 1400–1500	Holm papp 17 4to (cover 2–3) Holm papp 19 4to (cover 2–3)	Gödel, 1897, p. 287 [no. 196]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 26r; Gjerløw, 1980, pp. 6–7
Holm papp 18 4to (cover 2–5)	4 strips, part of a patchwork cover for a limp binding	<i>sequentiarium</i> , Iceland? 1200–1300		Gödel, 1897, p. 287 [no. 196]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 26r; Gjerløw, 1980, pp. 6–7
Holm papp 19 4to (cover 1)	1 bifolio, part of a patchwork cover for a limp binding (outer cover)	<i>graduale</i> , Iceland 1400–1450		Gödel, 1897, p. 288 [no. 197]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 27r
Holm papp 19 4to (cover 2–3)	1 trimmed bifolio + 1 trimmed folio, part of a patchwork cover for a limp binding (inner cover + lid)	<i>psalterium</i> , Iceland 1400–1500	Holm papp 17 4to (cover 2–3) Holm papp 18 4to (cover 1)	Gödel, 1897, p. 288 [no. 197]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 27r
Holm papp 27 4to (cover 1)	1 trimmed folio, part of a patchwork cover for a limp binding	<i>missale</i> , Iceland 1300–1400		Gödel, 1897, p. 297 [no. 205]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 29r; Gjerløw, 1980, p. 66
Holm papp 27 4to (cover 2–3)	2 trimmed folios, part of a patchwork cover for a limp binding	<i>breviarium</i> , Iceland (Jón Þorláksson) ca. 1470		Gödel, 1897, p. 297 [no. 205]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 29r; Gjerløw, 1980, p. 56

fragments do not remain in their original position in the host codex, they are in a way still ‘*in situ*’. This type of fragment is here referred to as a *reinserted fragment*. This type of fragment does not occur among the Icelandic codices held by any other Nordic manuscript collection; it is specific to the National Library of Sweden.

Furthermore, the National Library of Sweden holds a unique manuscript consisting of two parts which are entirely written on the empty margins of a large liturgical book, meaning the whole book block of the manuscript consists of fragments (see Tab. 10; Section 4.3). These fragments constitute a different type of fragment which is essentially closer to palimpsests than

Isthmén Reenhielm in the second half of the seventeenth century (Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 31r). Neither the host manuscripts nor the Latin fragments have an Icelandic provenance

Tab. 6. Detached and reinserted fragments in Icelandic manuscripts in the National Library of Sweden.

Manuscript shelfmark	Description	Dismantled codex	Related fragments	Catalogue
Holm papp 26 4to	1 trimmed folio, formerly used as a cover for a limp binding	<i>missale</i> , Iceland 1400–1500		Gödel, 1897, p. 296 [no. 204]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 28r
Holm papp 34 4to (fragment 1)	1 trimmed folio, formerly part of a patchwork cover for a limp binding	<i>missale</i> , Ireland? 1200–1300	Lbs fragm 22	Gödel, 1897, pp. 306–308 [no. 212]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 30r; Gjerløw, 1980, p. 18–19
Holm papp 34 4to (fragment 2)	1 trimmed folio, formerly part of a patchwork cover for a limp binding	<i>missale</i> , Iceland? ca. 1400		Gödel, 1897, pp. 306–308 [no. 212]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 30r
Holm papp 2 8vo (fragment 1)	1 trimmed folio, formerly used as a cover for a limp binding	<i>graduale</i> , 1300–1400		Gödel, 1897, p. 357 [no. 259]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 33r
Holm papp 2 8vo (fragment 2)	1 strip, formerly part of the binding	Unidentified liturgical book, Iceland ca. 1350		Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 33r
Holm papp 8 8vo	1 bifolio, formerly used as a cover for a limp binding	<i>psalterium</i> , Iceland ca. 1300		Gödel, 1897, p. 357 [no. 259]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 34r
Holm papp 15 8vo	1 bifolio, formerly used as a cover for a limp binding	<i>antiphonarium</i> , Iceland ca. 1300		Gödel, 1897, p. 376 [no. 272]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 35r

fragments which are *in situ* in bookbindings. They are therefore not included in this survey.

Due to the meticulous cataloguing of Latin *in situ* fragments connected to Iceland in the National Library of Sweden by Kolsrud (Holm U 170) and Gjerløw (1980), only a few texts preserved in these fragments have so far remained unidentified. During my survey, I was able to identify these Latin *in situ* fragments.

Holm perg 25 4to

The codex is bound in two parchment leaves belonging a dismantled manuscript. Kolsrud (Holm U 170, f. 12br, 18r) identified the text contained in the fragment tentatively as “Tractatus de creatione(?)” or “et hdskr. fra 1200talet, av theologisk indhold, formodentlig en dogmatisk avhandling om skabelsen”. Based on my own investigation, the fragments contain part of

Petrus Lombardus' *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae* (liber II, 12, 2 (25)–13, 2 (65)). This work was widespread in Europe from the twelfth century on and its study was a fundamental requirement for the degree of theology. The Latin *in situ* fragment presents the first witness of the work in the Icelandic manuscript material.

Holm papp 10 4to

The codex is bound in a such a patchwork cover consisting of two fragments (Gödel, 1897, pp. 272–273 [no. 188]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 24r). While the first fragment belongs to a *graduale* written in the fifteenth century, probably in Iceland (Gjerløw, 1981, p. 6), the identification of the second fragment, used as a lid for the codex, is more complicated. Kolsrud (Holm U 170, f. 12ar, 24r) identified this manuscript as “Tractatus theologicus”. Likewise, Gjerløw (1979, p. 6) described it as a “manuscript of theological contents, now very difficult to read” and dated it to the fourteenth century. Based on my own investigation, the legible text in the left column corresponds to Guillelmus Peraldus' (William Perault; ca. 1190–1271) *Summa de virtutibus et vitiis*. The legible text in the right column, however, corresponds to the text of one of Peraldus' sermons on the epistles (sermo 44: *Hoc sentite in vobis quod in Iesu Christo* [Phil 2:5]).⁷ Both Peraldus' *Summa* and his sermon cycles were very popular in medieval Europe and survive in many late medieval manuscripts. Siegfried Wenzel (2017, pp. 63–64) provides several examples of manuscripts which insert extracts of the *Summa de virtutibus et vitiis* into the text of Peraldus' sermons. The lid fragment in Holm papp 10 4to probably belongs to such a manuscript.

Holm papp 2 8vo

This codex contains two *in situ* fragments which were removed from the original bookbinding and appended behind the book block. One of these two fragments, belonging to a liturgical book, is difficult to identify due to its small size and limited content (Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 33r). However, certain palaeographic features such as the use of open ‘e’ suggest that it was written in Iceland. Furthermore, ff. 1r4–5 read “Aue nobilissima uirgo maria ancilla sancte trinitatis”. This is a variation of *Ave maria ancilla trinitatis*, a common prayer often attributed to St. Bernhard of Clairvaux. The fragment

⁷ The *Summa de virtutibus et vitiis* was first printed by Heinrich Quentell in Cologne in 1497. Peraldus' sermons were first printed by André Pralard in Paris in 1674, wrongly attributed to Guillelmus Alvernus (William of Auvergne; ca. 1180–1249). As of yet, there exist no critical editions of Guillelmus Peraldus' works.

Tab. 7. Latin *in situ* fragments in Icelandic manuscripts in Uppsala University Library.

Manuscript shelfmark	Description	Dismantled codex	Catalogue
R 717 (end leaves 1–2)	2 fragments of the same leaf, formerly used as a cover for a limp binding, now used as flyleaves in the front and back of the codex	<i>graduale</i> or <i>sequentiarium</i> , Iceland	Gödel, 1892, pp. 68–69

corresponds to a version of the prayer particular to *Breviarium Nidrosiense* (ff. 305r4–8), printed in Copenhagen in 1519 as a standardised *breviarium* for the Archdiocese of Niðaróss which Iceland was part of.

3.6 Uppsala University Library

Although Uppsala University Library holds more than 50 West Norse manuscripts, mostly paper manuscripts written in early modern times, only two manuscripts contain *in situ* fragments. The first, DG 8 (2 pastedowns, glossed canon law), received its current binding in sixteenth-century Norway (Gödel, 1892, p. 4; Holtsmark, 1956, p. 4), and the Latin *in situ* fragments in its bookbinding are not connected in Iceland. Only the two *in situ* fragments in the second codex are connected to Iceland (Tab. 7).

R 717

Gödel (1892, pp. 68–69) identified the Latin *in situ* fragment only tentatively as a “pergamentblad efter en messbok från omkring 1300” (‘parchment leaf from a liturgical book from ca. 1300’). At this time, the codex was still bound in a limp binding with a parchment fragment used as cover. When the manuscript received a new hardboard binding, however, the cover fragment was evidently divided into two and used as flyleaves in the front and the back of the codex respectively. The part of the fragment which originally covered the spine of R 717 was not preserved.

Based on my own investigation the now divided fragments belong to a dismantled *graduale* or *sequentiarium* and contain the sequence *Alme concepent* (AH 10:211) for the translation of St. Cuthbert of Lindisfarne. This sequence, uncommon outside the diocese of Durham, is documented in Iceland in the form of another liturgical fragment, AM accessoria 7 Hs 14,

Tab. 8. Latin *in situ* fragments connected to Iceland by collection.

Collection	Host volumes		<i>in situ</i> fragments		Dismantled books	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Arnarnagnæan Collection	3	9,7 %	6	10,5 %	5	12,5 %
Royal Danish Library	5	16,1 %	5	8,8 %	5	12,5 %
Árni Magnússon Institute	5	16,1 %	8	14,0 %	5	12,5 %
National Library of Iceland	2	6,5 %	2	3,5 %	2	5,0 %
National Library of Sweden	15	48,4 %	34	59,7 %	21	52,5 %
Uppsala University Library	1	3,2 %	2	3,5 %	2	5,0 %
Total	31	100 %	57	100 %	40	100 %

which belongs to a *graduale* written in Iceland in the fourteenth century (Andersen, 2008, p. 28). These two newly identified fragments provide further evidence for the cult of St. Cuthbert in medieval Iceland.

4. Discussion

4.1 Distribution by collection

Few Latin fragments remain *in situ* in the bookbindings of Icelandic manuscripts held by collections in Denmark, Iceland and Sweden. In my survey of the Latin *in situ* in fragments connected to Iceland, I found the following number of fragments in the investigated manuscript collections in Denmark, Iceland and Sweden (see Tab. 8).

The Latin parchment fragments connected to Iceland which remain *in situ* in the different collections demonstrate different approaches to the preservation of manuscripts and bookbindings by the librarians and conservators of these collections.

Although Kålund's catalogues show that the Arnarnagnæan Collection held the by far largest number of Icelandic codices containing Latin *in situ* fragments at the end of the nineteenth century, these fragments were systematically detached in the early twentieth century (Andersen, 2008, p. xii). While there remain ca. 60 manuscripts containing *in situ* fragments in the collection (Guðvarður Már Gunnlaugsson, 2017, p. 171), only three of these manuscripts have an Icelandic provenance (see Tab. 1). In contrast, the Latin *in situ* fragments preserved in Icelandic manuscripts in the National Library of Sweden were never systematically detached from their host volumes. As a

Tab. 9. Latin *in situ* fragments connected to Iceland by fragment type.

Fragment type	<i>in situ</i> fragments		Dismantled books	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Covers	30	52,6 %	20	50,0 %
End leaves	19	33,3 %	12	30,0 %
Reinforcements	1	1,8 %	1	2,5 %
Reinserted fragments	7	12,3 %	7	17,5 %
Total	57	100 %	40	100 %

result, the library holds today more than half of the remaining Latin *in situ* fragments connected to Iceland (see Tab. 5 and Tab. 6). The four remaining collections all hold smaller number of Latin *in situ* fragments connected to Iceland.

4.2 Distribution by fragment types

The Latin *in situ* fragments connected to Iceland demonstrate different ways in which parchment of obsolete manuscripts was recycled as material for bookbindings in early modern Iceland. In the survey, I ordered the *in situ* fragments into four distinctive groups: covers, end leaves, reinforcements, and reinserted fragments (see Tab. 9).

Among the different types of *in situ* fragments, fragments used of covers for limp bindings demonstrate the lowest degree of modification by later scholars and librarians and are therefore most indicative for early modern bookbinding practices. In the survey, I identified 30 parchment fragments used as covers or part of covers, 28 of which are part of limp bindings.

The National Library of Sweden holds several Icelandic manuscripts bound in limp bindings made of recycled parchment taken from dismantled Latin manuscripts. Limp binding constitutes the most simple form of bookbinding and seems to have been common in medieval and early modern Iceland (Soffía Guðný Guðmundsdóttir, Laufey Guðnadóttir and Hansen, 2015). Most of the limp bindings of Icelandic manuscripts in the National Library of Sweden consists of several leaves of dismantled liturgical books which were sewn together to form a patchwork-cover. Several of these bindings have a lid which could be folded around the book or a thread of leather which could be used to tie the book up to protect the book block from damage. The bindings were evidently made in Iceland and are often of lower quality (Gjerløw, 1981, pp. 6–7).

Holm papp 17 4to (Gödel, 1897, pp. 282–287 [no. 195]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 25r), Holm papp 18 4to (Gödel, 1897, pp. 287–288 [no. 196]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 26r) and Holm papp 19 4to (Gödel, 1897, pp. 288–290 [no. 197]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 27r) are bound in similar patchwork covers made of parchment from different liturgical books. As all three bindings include parchment from the same Psalter written in Iceland in the fifteenth century (Gjerløw, 1980, pp. 6–7; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, ff. 26r–27r), they were probably made by the same bookbinder. The binding of Holm papp 17 4to originally consisted of three fragments in addition to a piece of new parchment: Two folios of the Icelandic fifteenth-century Psalter were used as outer and inner cover respectively. However, the inner cover was later detached and inserted in the back of the codex in a way similar to the reinserted fragments discussed below (see Tab. 5). The third fragment, used as a lid for the codex, belongs to a Psalter written in England in the second half of the twelfth century (Gjerløw, 1981). The cover of Holm papp 18 4to consists of one folio of the Icelandic fifteenth-century Psalter in addition to a piece of new parchment as well as four strips cut from a *sequentarium* written in Iceland in the thirteenth century (Gjerløw, 1981, pp. 6–7). Finally, Holm papp 19 4to consists of two fragments from the Icelandic fifteenth-century Psalter: The first is used as inner cover, the second is used as a lid for the binding. A third fragment, belonging to a dismantled *graduale* written in Iceland, is used as outer cover.

Moreover, the five Icelandic codices containing Latin in situ fragments in the Royal Danish Library five are bound in very similar limp bindings with a cover made of recycled parchment from dismantled manuscripts wrapped around paper maculature. While four of these bindings consists of a single leaf of recycled parchment, Thot 210 is bound in a patchwork cover made of a leaf of recycled parchment and a piece of new parchment which were sewn together. The paper maculature consists for the most part of letters written in Icelandic. As all five limp bindings are very similar to each other in the way in which they combine recycled parchment leaves and paper maculature, they may have been bound by the same person, probably in the eighteenth-century Iceland. The respective *terminus post quem* for each bookbinding is the production of the host codex; the *terminus ante quem* is the incorporation of the host codex into the private book collection of Danish statesman and book collector Otto Thott (1703–1785).

In addition to the limp bindings in the National Library of Sweden and the Royal Danish Library, the two *in situ* fragments in the National Library of Iceland are used as covers for similar Icelandic limp bindings. Furthermore,

the *in situ* fragments in bookbinding of R717 in Uppsala University Library seem to have formed part of such a limp binding before the manuscript was rebound and the fragment was cut in two and repurposed as end leaves.

In the survey, I identified 19 fragments used as end leaves, including both pastedowns and flyleaves. Most of the end leaves in my survey are pastedowns which were loosened from the hardboards by librarians or scholars who wanted to access the text on the hidden side of the leaf. Still, these end leaves form an original part of an early modern Icelandic bookbinding. Despite being modified, these thus represent a valuable source for early modern Icelandic bookbinding practices. For example, Holm perg 13 4to is bound in limp binding which combines a cover made of sealskin with two leaves of a dismantled fifteenth-century *breviarium* used as flyleaves in the front and back of the codex respectively (Gödel, 1897, pp. 53–54 [no. 25]; Gjerløw, 1980, p. 91; Springborg, 2000, p. 134; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 16r). A smaller number of bookbindings containing end leaves made of recycled parchment are younger, for example R717 in Uppsala University Library which received its current bookbinding in the twentieth century and whose end leaves were used as a cover for the same codex in an earlier bookbinding which is described by Gödel (1892, pp. 68–69).

In contrast, I found only one single example of a Latin *in situ* fragment used as a cover for a hardboard binding: AM 463 4to in the Arnarnagæan Collection (see Section 3.3). This bookbinding was probably made during Árni Magnússon's time and does thus not constitute evidence for early modern Icelandic bookbinding practices.

In my survey, I identified only one single case of a parchment fragment used as some sort of spine reinforcement which is part of the early modern bookbinding of AM 623 4to. However, this type of binding fragment is the most probable to remain undiscovered as it is often hidden by the cover and book block. As reinforcements are less likely to be discovered, they were also less likely to be detached by librarians and scholars interested in the fragments in the nineteenth and twentieth century. It is therefore possible that there exist more undiscovered fragments of this type in the preserved early modern bookbindings of Icelandic manuscripts.

In my survey, I identified a fourth group of *in situ* fragments particular to the National Library of Sweden which I have termed 'reinserted fragments'. This group included fragments which were at one point detached from their original context when the original bookbinding of the host codex was dismantled and later reinserted in the back of the same codex behind the book block and bound together with the manuscript in a new bookbinding. In

my survey, I found 7 such fragments belonging to 7 dismantled manuscripts which are today preserved in the bookbindings of 5 manuscripts. For the study of early modern bookbinding practices, this type of *in situ* fragment has no direct value.

The comparison of the preserved *in situ* fragments in these collections with the descriptions of the former *in situ* fragments in the printed catalogues reveal different approaches to the preservation of *in situ* fragments. In the Arnamagnæan Collection in Copenhagen which held the by far largest number of Latin fragments which were *in situ* in Icelandic manuscripts in the nineteenth century, these fragments were systematically detached in the early twentieth century by Ehlert and Kålund. In contrast, *in situ* fragments were more sporadically detached from Icelandic bookbindings in other collections. For this reason, the largest number of Latin fragments connected to Iceland is today preserved *in situ* in the National Library of Sweden.

Even in those cases in which fragments remain *in situ* in the bookbinding of an Icelandic codex, the original bookbinding was often modified by the librarians and conservators of the holding institutions, e.g. to stabilise the original bookbinding or to give the codex a new bookbinding. As a result, the physical description of an *in situ* fragment in Kålund's and Gödel's nineteenth-century catalogues in several cases does not correspond to the current state of the *in situ* fragments in the bookbinding. In my survey, I identified several examples in which pastedowns were loosened from the hardboards they were originally pasted on as well as several cases in which *in situ* fragments were repurposed and reinserted in a different position in their host volume during a rebinding. Moreover, I identified one case, AM 623 4to in the Arnamagnæan Collection, in which the discrepancy between Kålund's description of the *in situ* fragments and the current state of the manuscript cannot be adequately explained by a later modification of the bookbinding. The most probable explanation is therefore an error on the part of Kålund. As the four *in situ* fragments in the bookbinding of the codex have never been studied since the nineteenth century, the error in Kålund's catalogue has remained uncorrected to this day.

4.3 Excursus: Recycling of margins in Holm perg 5 8vo

In addition to using parchment leaves from dismantled books as material for bookbindings, such parchment may be reused as writing material for a new book, for example in a palimpsest. Palimpsestation consists of a two-step process: first the original content of a manuscript, the so-called undertext

Tab. 10. Recycled margins in Holm perg 5 8vo.

Manuscript shelfmark	Description	Dismantled codex	Related fragments	Catalogue
Holm perg 5 8vo (I)	54 strips of parchment, sewn together to create 27 patchwork folios	Empty margins of an <i>antiphonarium</i> or <i>graduale</i>	Holm perg 5 8vo (II)	Gödel, 1897, pp. 109–110 [no. 51]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 18r; Gjerløw, 1968, pp. 69–70; Gjerløw, 1980, p. 3
Holm perg 5 8vo (II)	33 strips of parchment used as folios	Empty margins of an <i>antiphonarium</i> or <i>graduale</i>	Holm perg 5 8vo (I)	Gödel, 1897, pp. 109–110 [no. 51]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 18r; Gjerløw, 1968, pp. 69–70; Gjerløw, 1980, p. 3

or *scriptio inferior*, is erased, effectively recreating the empty state of the parchment. In the second step, new content, the so-called overtext or *scriptio superior*, is inserted in the new empty parchment. The result of this process is a complex, multi-layered manuscript, the actual palimpsest, also called *codex rescriptus* (Hødnebo, 1968; Jakob Benediktsson, 1968, p. 82; Lowe, 1972, p. 480; Roberts and Etherington, 1982, p. 186; Declercq, 2007, p. 7; Ryley, 2017, p. 7).

In medieval and early modern Iceland, palimpsestation was a very common phenomenon. Especially after the introduction of the Reformation in Iceland, large numbers of obsolete liturgical books were palimpsested and their parchment used to create new manuscript, charters and even parchment prints (Lorenz, forthcoming). Among the manuscripts discussed in this article, AM 618 4to and Holm perg 13 4to are palimpsests written on recycled parchment from an older liturgical book.

Holm perg 5 8vo represents a very different way of recycling of parchment as writing material (Tab. 10). Although Gjerløw (1968, pp. 69–70) refers to the codex as a ‘palimpsest’, this codex does not fulfil the accepted standard definition of the term. The manuscript is rather a composite codex consisting of two distinctive parts written by the same scribe, Gottskálk Jónsson í Glaumbæ (ca. 1524–1590) (Gödel, 1897, pp. 109–111 [no. 51]; Gjerløw, 1968, pp. 69–70, 1980, p. 3; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 20r). Both parts consist of leaves which are made of the empty margins of a large liturgical book which were cut out and sewn together to create a new manuscript.

Part I consists of 27 patchwork folios. Each of these patchwork folios is made up of two strips of parchment which were cut out from the empty

outer margins of a liturgical manuscript and then sewn together to form a larger piece of parchment. The fragments preserve the original ruling as well as remains of musical notation, both clefs and notes in German Gothic notation, and flourished initials in red or blue.

Part II consists of 33 folios. Each of these is made up of one single large strip of parchment cut from the empty top and bottom margins of a liturgical manuscript in folio format. The fragments preserve the original ruling as well as remains of German Gothic notation, parts of flourished major initials in red and blue and part of the bottom line of the original text.

While both Gödel and Kolsrud imply that these strips of parchment stem from two different manuscripts (Gödel, 1897, pp. 109–111 [no. 51]; Kolsrud, Holm U 170, f. 20r), Gjerløw assumes that they derive from the same dismantled codex (Gjerløw, 1980, p. 3). Based on the similar flourished initials and Gothic notation in both parts, it is likely that the parchment was indeed taken from the same manuscript, a large liturgical book with musical notation, probably a *graduale* or *antiphonarium*.

Many liturgical manuscripts contain large margins in the top, bottom and outer edges to provide a space where a user can customise the codex by adding marginalia such as a commentary, glosses, memory aids, illustrations or decorations. Cutting out these margins does not necessarily damage the main text. The use of empty margins as writing material for another manuscript would thus seem to be an obvious way to recycle obsolete parchment manuscripts. As far as I am aware, however, Holm perg 5 8vo constitutes an isolated case of parchment recycling which has no equivalent in the Icelandic or other European manuscript materials. Rather than representing a widespread early modern recycling practice, this patchwork manuscript may be interpreted an experimental attempt by Gottskálk Jónsson to make use of parchment from an obsolete liturgical book to create a new manuscript.

4.4 New findings

As only very few Latin fragments connected to Icelandic survive today, any single fragment holds a high value as source for medieval Icelandic book history, liturgical practices and intellectual culture. Any new Latin fragment connected to Iceland which is discovered or identified significantly widens our knowledge about what types of books were used.

In my survey, I identified the specific book type or textual content of several fragments which were previously only known to belong to an unspecified liturgical or Latin manuscript, including botch patristic writings

and medieval liturgical, theological and homiletic texts which widen our knowledge about which texts were present.

The sequence *Alma concrepent* for the translation of St Cuthbert of Lindisfarne, which is very uncommon outside the diocese of Durham, was previously only documented in Iceland in the form of AM accessoria 7 Hs 14, a fragment of a fourteenth-century Icelandic *graduale*. The two new fragments of the sequence, preserved as end leaves in the bookbinding of R 717, provide further evidence for the cult of St. Cuthbert in medieval Iceland (see Section 3.6).

The prayer *Ave maria ancilla trinitatis* is preserved in a large number of medieval European manuscripts where it is often attributed to St. Bernhard of Clairvaux. The version of this pseudo-Bernardine prayer preserved in Holm papp 2 8vo as a reinserted fragment corresponds to the particular version printed in the *Breviarium Nidrosiense* (ff. 305r4–8), the standardised *breviarium* for the Archdiocese of Niðaróss printed in 1519 (see Section 3.5). The fragment suggests that the prayer may have been known in Iceland in this specific form already before the completion of *Breviarium Nidrosiense*.

In other cases, the newly-identified fragments constitute the first known witness of a Latin work in the Icelandic fragment material. The cover of Holm perg 25 4to, for example, preserves part of the *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae* written by the scholastic theologian Petrus Lombardus (†1160) in the last decade of his life (see Section 3.5). The study of this work was a fundamental requirement for the degree of *baccalarius sententiarum*, the Bachelor's degree in theology, from the end of the twelfth century onwards. The discovery of a witness of the work in the Icelandic fragment material demonstrates that medieval Icelanders were familiar with contemporary European theological literature.

In the survey, I furthermore identified two examples of homiletic fragments. The first fragment is preserved as an end leaf in the back of NKS 11 fol. The leaf preserves part of Fulgentius Ruspensis' sermon *De sancto Stephano protomartyre et de conversione sancti Pauli* and belongs to an dismantled exemplar of Paulus Diaconus' sermon collection. Three further fragments of the same manuscript were detached from bookbindings in the Arnarnagðan Collection and are today stored under the shelfmark AM accessoria 7 Hs 94 (see Section 3.3). The identification of a fourth fragment outside the Arnarnagðan Collection strongly suggests that the manuscript was not first dismantled and reused as material for bookbindings by Árni Magnússon but already earlier.

The second homiletic fragment consists in a largely illegible parchment

leaf used as a lid for Holm papp 10 4to. The leaf preserves part of a sermon Guillelmus Peraldus' cycle of sermons on the Epistles (*sermo 44: Hoc sentite in vobis quod in Iesu Christo* [Phil 2:5]). As common in many medieval European exemplars of the Peraldus' sermons, the fragment includes textual interpolations from Peraldus' *Summa de virtutibus et vitiis*. The fragment, which was written in Iceland, is the first known witness of Peraldus' sermons in the Icelandic manuscript material, adding to our knowledge about which Latin homilies and sermons were known in medieval Iceland. (see Section 3.5).

Taken together, these different liturgical, theological and homiletic fragments, some of which constitute the first known manuscript witness of a work in the Icelandic fragment material, paint a picture of medieval Iceland as a society which closely followed contemporary European intellectual culture.

5. Conclusion

The Latin manuscript material connected to Iceland, most of which is preserved only as fragments, remains incompletely catalogued to this day. With this article, I hope to contribute to the ongoing research by providing additions and corrections to the existing catalogues as well as an overview about which Latin fragments remain *in situ* in bookbindings of manuscripts connected to Iceland today.

Using recycled parchment as binding material for another book, e.g. as covers, pastedowns, flyleaves or reinforcements, was the most productive way of parchment recycling in Iceland. The catalogues of Kålund (1888–1892, 1900) and Gödel (1892, 1897) mention hundreds of codices containing *in situ* fragments in their bookbindings. However, very few of these fragments remain *in situ* in manuscript collections in Denmark, Iceland and Sweden today while the overwhelming majority of the former *in situ* fragments were detached in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and are preserved as separate items. In my survey, I identified 31 manuscripts containing 57 *in situ* fragments belonging to 40 dismantled Latin manuscripts connected to Iceland in the Arnarnagðæran Collection and the Royal Danish Library in Copenhagen, the Árni Magnússon Institute for Icelandic Studies and the National Library of Iceland in Reykjavík, the National Library of Sweden in Stockholm and Uppsala University Library (see Section 3).

Due to different approaches to the preservation of historical bookbindings

and *in situ* fragments, the remaining *in situ* fragments are today unequally distributed between the different collections. In the Arnamagnæan Collection in Copenhagen which held the by far largest number of Latin *in situ* fragments in the nineteenth century, these fragments were systematically detached in the early twentieth century by Ehlert and Kålund. In contrast, the largest number of Latin fragments connected to Iceland is today preserved *in situ* in the National Library of Sweden where such fragments were more sporadically detached from bookbindings (see Section 4.1).

In my survey, I identified several so far unidentified texts, including both liturgical, homiletic and theological works. In some cases, the newly identified fragments represent the first known witness of a text in the Icelandic fragment material, for example Fulgentius Ruspensis' sermon *De sancto Stephano protomartyre et de conversione sancti Pauli* (NKS 11 fol., end leaf), Petrus Lombardus' *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae* (Holm perg 25 4to, cover) and Guillelmus Peraldus' Sermons on the Epistles with interpolations of his *Summa de virtutibus et vitiis* (Holm papp 10 4to, lid) (see Sections 3.3 and 3.5). As only very few Latin fragments survive in the Icelandic manuscript material, any additional text which can be identified in this material holds a high value as source for medieval Icelandic liturgical practices and intellectual culture. Although they have often been overlooked in favour of the more extensive and more easily accessible collections of detached fragments, the closer look at the Latin fragments which remain *in situ* in the collections of Icelandic manuscripts has resulted in the discovery of new sources for medieval Icelandic liturgical practices and intellectual culture.

Acknowledgements

The archival work for this article was funded by the *Kaia og Tofinn Tobiassens Fond*, *Sparebanken Midt-Norges gavefond til Norges teknisk-naturvitenskapelige universitet*, *DKNVS Det Kongelige Norske Videnskabers Selskab – IK Lykkes fond* and the national PhD school *ATTR Authoritative Texts and Their Receptions*. I want to thank Natasha Fazlić (Arnamagnæan Collection), Vasarè Rastonis (Árni Magnússon Institute for Icelandic Studies), Patrik Granholm and Christina Svensson (National Library of Sweden) as well as Kia Hedell (Uppsala University Library) for their assistance and for lending me their 'conservator's eye'.

In addition to the editors and anonymous peer reviewers, I want to thank

Ivar Berg (NTNU) and Beeke Stegmann (Árni Magnússon Institute for Icelandic Studies) for reading this manuscript and offering valuable advice for its improvement. All mistakes and shortcomings are, of course, my own.

Bibliography

Manuscripts

Den Arnamagnæanske Samling, Copenhagen (DAS)

AM 12 4to

AM 25 4to

AM 62 4to

AM 618 4to

AM 623 4to

AM 678 4to

AM accessoria 7 Hs 14

AM accessoria 7 Hs 94

AM accessoria 7 Hs 111

AM accessoria 7 Hs 130

Den Kongelige Bibliotek, Copenhagen (DKB)

Thott 2099 4to

Thott 210 8vo

Thott 243 8vo

Thott 478 8vo

Thott 484 8vo

Thott 513 8vo

Kungliga Biblioteket, Stockholm (SKB)

Holm perg 13 4to

Holm perg 18 4to

Holm perg 25 4to

Holm perg 5 8vo

Holm perg 8 8vo

Holm papp 16 I fol.

Holm papp 72 fol.

Holm papp 10 4to

Holm papp 17 4to

Holm papp 18 4to

Holm papp 19 4to

Holm papp 26 4to
Holm papp 27 4to
Holm papp 34 4to
Holm papp 52 4to
Holm papp 71 4to
Holm papp 2 8vo
Holm papp 8 8vo
Holm papp 13 8vo
Holm U 170

Landsbókasafn Íslands – Háskólabókasafn, Reykjavík (Lbs)

ÍB 230 8vo
ÍB 346 8vo
Lbs fragm 22
Lbs fragm 93
Lbs fragm 96

Riksarkivet, Stockholm (SRA)

SRA Fr 878
SRA Fr 879
SRA Fr 943
SRA Fr 944
SRA Fr 5238
SRA Fr 28002

Stofnun Árna Magnússonar í íslenskum fræðum, Reykjavík (SÁM)

AM 249 I fol.
AM 471 4to
AM 489 4to
AM 510 4to
AM 640 4to
AM 38 8vo
AM accessoria 48 a
AM accessoria 48 d [= AM accessoria 7 Hs 130]
AM accessoria 48 I II
GKS 1812 4to
GKS 3270 4to
NKS 11 fol.
SÁM 60
Þjms 174
Þjms 366

Uppsala universitetsbibliotek, Uppsala (UUB)

DG 8

R 717

Literature

- Andersen, M. G., 2008: *Katalog over AM Accessoria 7: de latinske fragmenter*. (Bibliotheca Arnamagnæana 46.) København: Reitzel.
- Attinger, G., 2017: Iceland and Norway: separate scribal cultures versus cultural exchange. In: *Nordic Latin manuscript fragments. The destruction and reconstruction of medieval books*. Pp. 221–238.
- Attinger, G. and Å. Ommundsen, 2013: Icelandic Liturgical Books and how to Recognise them. In: *Scriptorium*, 67. Pp. 293–317.
- Declercq, G., 2007: Introduction: Codices Rescripti in the Early Medieval West. In: G. Declercq (ed.), *Early Medieval Palimpsests*. Pp. 7–22. Turnhout.
- Gjerløw, L., 1968: *Libri liturgici provinciae Nidrosiensis medii aevi 2: Ordo Nidrosiensis ecclesiae: (orðubók)*. Osloiae: Universitetsforlaget.
- Gjerløw, L., 1979: *Libri liturgici provinciae Nidrosiensis medii aevi 3: Antiphonarium Nidrosiensis ecclesiae*. Osloiae: Norsk historisk kjeldeskrift-institutt, Den Retts-historiske kommisjon.
- Gjerløw, L., 1981: *Liturgica Islandica*. (Bibliotheca Arnamagnæana 35–36.) Copenhagen: Reitzel.
- Greenfield, J., 2007: The Icelandic manuscripts. In: Greenfield, J., *The Return of Cultural Treasures*. 3rd edn. Pp. 13–40. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Guðbjörg Kristjánsdóttir, 1983: Íslenskt saltarablað í Svíþjóð. In: *Skírnir*, 157. Pp. 64–73.
- Guðvarður Már Gunnlaugsson, 2017: Latin fragments related to Iceland. In: *Nordic Latin manuscript fragments. The destruction and reconstruction of medieval books*. Pp. 163–183.
- Gödel, V., 1892: *Katalog öfver Upsala universitets biblioteks fornisländska och fornnorska handskrifter*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Gödel, V., 1897: *Katalog öfver Kongl. Bibliotekets fornisländska och fornnorska handskrifter*. Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt.
- Hødnebo, F., 1968: Palimpsest; allmenn og Norge. In: F. Hødnebo (ed.), *Kultur-historisk leksikon for nordisk middelalder fra vikingtid til reformasjonstid*. Pp. 82–84. København: Rosenkilde og Bagger.
- Holtmark, A., 1956: Innledning. In: Seip, D. A. (ed.), *Legendarisk Olavssaga. Etter Uppsala Universitetsbiblioteks Delagardieska Samlingen nr. 8 II*. Oslo: Selskapet til utgivelse av gamle norske håndskrifter.
- Jakob Benediktsson, 1959: Skrá um skinnblöð í Landsbókasafni Íslands. In: Lárus H. Blöndal and Páll Eggert Ólason (eds), *Skrá um handritasöfn Landsbókasafnsins. Aukabindi 2*. Pp. 1–41. Reykjavík: Félagsprentsmiðjan.
- Jakob Benediktsson, 1968: Palimpsest; Island. In: F. Hødnebo (ed.), *Kulturbistorisk*

- leksikon for nordisk middelalder fra vikingtid til reformasjonstid*. P. 84. København: Rosenkilde og Bagger.
- Kålund, K., 1888–1892: *Katalog over den arnamagnæanske Håndskriftsamling* 1–2. København: Gyldendalske Boghandel.
- Kålund, K., 1900: *Katalog over de oldnorsk-islandske håndskrifter i Det store kongelige bibliotek og i Universitetsbiblioteket (udenfor den Arnamagnæanske samling) samt den Arnamagnæanske samlings tilvækst 1894–99*. København: Gyldendalske Boghandel.
- Lorenz, T., (forthcoming): Recycling and Recontextualisation in Icelandic Palimpsests. In: *Gripla*, 35 (2024).
- Lowe, E.A., 1972: Codices rescripti: a list of the oldest Latin Palimpsests with stray observations on their origin. In: L. Bieler (ed.), *Lowe, Elias Avery: Palaeographical Papers, 1907–1965*. Pp. 480–519.
- McDougall, I., 2003: Acc. 7 c, Hs. 94. Fragments of an English homiliary in the Arnamagnæan collection. In: *Opuscula* 11 (Bibliotheca Arnamagnæana 42). Pp. 268–288.
- Páll Eggert Ólason, 1918–1935: *Skrá um handritasöfn Landsbókasafnsins* 1–3. Reykjavík: Prentsmiðjan Gutenberg.
- Roberts, M. T. and D. Etherington, 1982: *Bookbinding and the conservation of books: a dictionary of descriptive terminology*. Washington: Library of Congress.
- Ryley, H., 2017: Constructive parchment destruction in medieval manuscripts. In: *Book 2.0*, 7(1). Pp. 9–19.
- Ryley, H., 2022: *Re-using Manuscripts in Late Medieval England: Repairing, Recycling, Sharing*. (York Manuscripts and Early Print Studies 4.) York: Medieval Press.
- Soffía Guðný Guðmundsdóttir, Laufey Guðnadóttir and A. M. Hansen, 2015: Book production in the Middle Ages. In: M. J. Driscoll and Svanhildur Óskarsdóttir (eds), *66 Manuscripts from the Arnamagnæan Collection*. Pp. 211–228. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.
- Springborg, P., 1970: Fra Snæfjallaströnd (tilføjelse til Afmælisrit Jóns Helgasonar 30. júní 1969). In: *Opuscula* 4 (Bibliotheca Arnamagnæana 39). Pp. 366–368.
- Springborg, P., 1995: The work of conservation at the Arnamagnæan Institute. In: *Care and conservation of manuscripts* 1. Pp. 41–52.
- Springborg, P., 2000: Types of bindings in the Arnamagnæan collection. In: *Care and conservation of manuscripts* 5. Pp. 129–147.
- Stefán Karlsson, 1970: Ritun Reykjavígarðarbókar, Excursus: Bókagerð bænda. In: *Opuscula* 4 (Bibliotheca Arnamagnæana 30). Pp. 120–140.
- Wenzel, S., 2017: *The Sermons of William Peraldus. An appraisal*. Turnhout: Brepols.

Electronic resources

- Handrit.is*. <<https://handrit.is>>
- Manuscripta.se*. <<https://manuscripta.se>>
- Riksarkivets databas över medeltida pergamentomslag* (MPO). <<https://sok.riksarkivet.se/mpo>>

Summary

In this article, I provide a survey of the fragments of dismantled Latin books that are *in situ* in bookbindings in the major collections of Icelandic manuscripts in Denmark, Iceland and Sweden as a supplement to the existing printed catalogues of the collections, including additional information, updates and corrections.

In the survey, I found six Latin *in situ* fragments in the Arnarnagænan Collection in Copenhagen, five in the Royal Danish Library in Copenhagen, eight in the Árni Magnússon Institute for Icelandic Studies in Reykjavík, two in the National Library of Iceland in Reykjavík, 34 in the National Library of Sweden in Stockholm and two in Uppsala University Library. These numbers demonstrate different approaches to the preservation of fragments in the respective collections. While the Arnarnagænan collection once held the largest number of *in situ* fragments preserved in Icelandic manuscripts, these fragments were systematically detached from their host volumes in the twentieth century. In contrast, the *in situ* fragments preserved in Icelandic manuscripts in the National Library of Sweden were never systematically detached. As a result, the library holds today more than half of the remaining Latin *in situ* fragments connected to Iceland.

In the survey, I furthermore identify the content of several so far unidentified Latin liturgical, theological and homiletic fragments, including the sequence *Alme concrepent* for the translation of St. Cuthbert of Lindisfarne (R 717, end leaves), the pseudo-Bernardine prayer *Ave maria ancilla trinitatis* (Holm papp 2 8vo, reinserted fragment), Petrus Lombardus' *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae* (Holm perg 25 4to, cover), Fulgentius Ruspensis' sermon *De sancto Stephano* (NKS 11 fol., end leaf) and Guillelmus Peraldus' Sermons on the Epistles with interpolations of his *Summa de virtutibus et vitiis* (Holm papp 10 4to, lid). Moreover, I discovered a previously unknown fragment of a Latin musical liturgical book preserved as an inlay in the binding of AM 623 4to.

Keywords: Binding waste, book bindings, maculature, *in situ* fragments, liturgical books, parchment recycling

Tom Lorenz

NTNU – Norwegian University of Science and Technology

Department of Language and Literature

ORCID iD 0000-0002-5642-6380

