

# When Literature Itself Was Bilingual: A Rule Of Vernacular Insertions

*Iván Horváth, Eötvös Loránd University (Budapest)*

This paper discusses the period during which Hungarian literature gradually shifted from a bilingual phase mode to a mostly monolingual phase. I am concerned with a rule which applies to Hungarian literature, the rule of vernacular insertions. A similar rule may also apply to other literatures. The first test of the rule is carried out in French literature.<sup>1</sup>

## 1. Secondary orality

Hungarian literature was initially characterised by its use of two languages and spread across two media: it was written in Latin and spoken in the vernacular, which is what Andor Tarnai (1983) called secondary orality. He distinguished two types of secondary orality – and thus, of bilingualism:

Translation: Church-affiliated intellectuals translated the Latin texts used in Christian rituals, mainly prayers, literally into the vernacular. These therefore became fixed texts in oral tradition, just like the Latin originals in written tradition. Only some of them had to be memorised by the believers, others by the priest.

Interpretation: Vernacular texts that were not prescribed by the liturgy, particularly the sermons, were produced *ex tempore* in the vernacular. This process was also based on Latin reference books (collections of exempla, sample and draft sermons), but the final phrasing was produced in the vernacular at the speed of speech, during the time it took to deliver the sermon.

## 2. The first texts written in vernacular

The literature in two languages and two media was not insignificant in volume. In most cases, the early codices, which contain sermon-editing tools and were used in Hungary, have vernacular notes written in the margins. It was one simple step for a vernacular note in the margin to transform into a guest text.

The examined guest texts<sup>2</sup> are always short texts that were written in the vernacular by a priest who copied or simply used the Latin codex. A guest text was often connected to the Latin text around it, and was written for its author's own benefit (the Old French *Jonas* is a Western European example). We also know of cases where the content of the vernacular text occupying the blank parts of a codex is not connected to the Latin text (for example, the Old High German *Muspilli*). We call both kinds of guest texts “vernacular insertions”. Exceptionally a vernacular text can be included in the Latin original with its own rubric (e.g. the Old Hungarian *Funeral Sermon*).<sup>3</sup> We call this kind of guest text an “integrated vernacular text”.<sup>4</sup>

Of course, Latin codices had a long-established readership. When did a readership for a vernacular literature develop?

---

<sup>1</sup> The rule of vernacular insertions was first discussed in a special lecture which I held on December 7, 2012 at the Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest (Horváth 2014). Many thanks to the editors of this volume; to Stephen G. Nichols (Johns Hopkins University) for sending me his manuscript; to Ágnes Bezeczkzy (Freie Universität Berlin) for her linguistic assistance; to Pascal Trousse and Michiel Verweij (Royal Library of Belgium) as well as to Farkas Gábor Kiss and Borbála Lovas (Eötvös Loránd University) for their bibliographical assistance. After three rejections (81274, 100426, 105573), my research is now supported by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund (109127).

<sup>2</sup> Patrick Andrist does not use the term to refer exclusively to vernacular texts (Andrist 2006: 337).

<sup>3</sup> See Madas (2009a: 222).

<sup>4</sup> Now I do not deal with this exceptional case.

### 3. The conditions for the development of a vernacular readership

The development of a readership for this vernacular literature depends heavily upon several conditions. I use analogies of two modern-day telecommunications networks to illustrate how these conditions need to be fulfilled, as well as demonstrate how the readership may potentially develop.

#### 3.1. Local area network

1. The authors of the vernacular texts included in Latin codices<sup>5</sup> destined them not for other readers, but for themselves, and at most for the few other people who used the same codex. Nobody else even knew of the vernacular note. My collective term for the copy of the text, its author, and the users who had access to the carrier of the text – the codex that contains it – is local area network.
2. There was no need to multiply (i.e. copy) an inserted text if it did not leave the local area network in which it was created, because it could be used not only by a single reader, but potentially by every reader in the local network, either at once or one after the other.
3. The vernacular text in the local area network generally did not occupy the entirety of the data carrier. The author could have called the attention of the readers in the local area network directly, personally to the fact that the lengthy Latin codex contained a short vernacular insertion.

#### 3.2. Inter-net

4. A so-called inter-net was created when a vernacular text moved from one local area network to at least one other local area network.
5. If someone wanted to use the text in another environment, that is, in another local area network, the text had to be transported there. A text could move from one local area network to another in two ways:
  - a. In the first case, the text was transported together with its carrier, meaning the book was donated, sold or lent out.
  - b. In the second case, the original text was recreated precisely, sign by sign, in a different carrier. This second carrier was subsequently transported to the other network. This is the process of copying.
6. A vernacular text could only flow through the inter-net if the vernacular part of the text made up the majority of the carrier's capacity. Otherwise, the reader would have expected to find a text written entirely in Latin. The only people who were aware of an inserted vernacular text were its author and, at most, the people to whom he/she showed it. As soon as the Latin codex containing an inserted vernacular text left its local area network to become part of another such network, this knowledge was lost. Local area networks with a demand for vernacular texts could not use such hidden inserted texts. They needed books written entirely in vernacular.
7. What we commonly call a vernacular readership is nothing other than this inter-net.

### 4. The absolute boundary of reading

The development of a Hungarian readership ended the exclusive reign of secondary orality in Hungarian literature. I call this moment the absolute boundary of reading. I tried to date this absolute boundary of reading in an earlier paper (Horváth 2010: 85–92), that is, I attempted to determine the moment at which the first book entirely in Hungarian was completed (cf. condition 6 under 3.2), since the authors of the vernacular insertions had included them in the codices for their own use, while the texts that filled the capacity of their codex carriers were made for a readership. I drew a graph of the increase in the number of codices entirely in Hungarian by the decade, and multiplied it by the average codex-loss constant. The resulting function reaches the value of 1 at some point as we move backwards in time: this point presumably marks the first decade of books written completely in Hungarian.

I used a graph of surviving letters (diplomas and missives) written in Hungarian to verify my results. I used the same method of calculation, presuming firstly that books and letters, made of paper and parchment, were similarly well-preserved; and secondly, that it started to make sense to send letters or issuing diplomas in Hungarian at just the time when the first Hungarian book readers appeared. Going backwards in time, the decade in which the function reaches the value of 1 is the decade in which we can presume that the first

---

<sup>5</sup> I do not discuss the development of the readership of Latin-language texts.

Hungarian letter was sent (without a response). The resulting preliminary estimate is the decade of 1411–1420 for both books and letters. This is the time period when a Hungarian readership appeared, and when the exclusive reign of secondary orality ended.

## 5. Textual studies argument

According to condition 2 under 3.1, vernacular texts could only be transmitted orally before the absolute boundary of reading had been reached, since written transmission was reserved for Latin texts. Moreover, if vernacular texts were not copied before the absolute boundary of reading, they had to have been jotted down from memory or translated or compiled or formulated by their authors – that is, they must have been authorial manuscripts of sorts.<sup>6</sup> This is what I call the rule of vernacular insertions. What could refute the validity of this rule?

If the period was not characterised by copying, then the errors made by copyists must have been similarly rare. If the textual errors that we find are characteristic of copyists rather than authors, we have refuted condition 2, because we have refuted a conclusion that was based upon that. We thus have to search for errors made by copyists in the Hungarian texts from the period preceding the absolute boundary of reading – the second decade of the 15th century, according to the current preliminary estimate. Taking into account their short length, these texts do indeed contain a great number of errors. Hungarian orthographical customs were also quite undeveloped at this time, which did not make it easier to interpret, much less to copy, a Hungarian text. This made it likely for a copyist to make a mistake. We can thus expect to find textual errors characteristic of copyists rather than authors.<sup>7</sup>

I examined every surviving text from period that starts with the first Old Hungarian text and ends with the absolute boundary of reading (1192–1420),<sup>8</sup> but I did not find a single textual error characteristic of copyists (Horváth 2014).

The vernacular texts inserted into Latin codices before the absolute boundary of reading were probably the manuscripts of authors (translators/compilers). This opens up new perspectives for research in the field of literary history, because it raises the status of the already often investigated *scriptors* of the codices to that of more important figures of the literary creation.

For instance, philologists consider the first Hungarian poem, the Old Hungarian *Lamentations of Mary* from the end of the 13th century, to be a late copy. If the text is in fact an autographic manuscript (Horváth 2014), we must give great importance to the systematic rhythmical punctuation, to the title (*Christus*) and to the genre (*poetico-planctus* [!]) given by the same hand in the table of contents of the codex (Vizkelety 2004: 140).

## 6. A question for other literatures

When a well-established carrier literature (in our case, the Latin codex literature of the Church) contains an infant form of vernacular literature, this – which still only exists in the form of inserted texts – does not have a readership as of yet. This makes it difficult to assume that vernacular texts are regularly copied. Perhaps this is not only true of Hungarian literature; doubts as to whether inserted vernacular texts were copied may be extended to other literatures.

Perhaps even in the case of the very first Old French poem, the *Buona pulcella fut Eulalia* (or *Séquence* or *Cantilène de Sainte Eulalie*). The same hand inscribed the Old French poem and the Old High German *Rithmus Teutonicus* (or *Ludwigslied*) side by side in the Valenciennes Bibliothèque Municipale codex no. 150 (at the end of the sermons of Gregory of Nazianzus translated from Greek to Latin), following two Latin poems written by two other hands and preceding a Latin poem written by a fourth scribe.

<sup>6</sup> From a strictly textual studies point of view any scribe who does not copy is an author.

<sup>7</sup> Authors also make mistakes due to their attention being directed forwards or backwards, and these are thus not specifically copyist's errors. However, only a copyist typically leaves out longer passages, and only a copyist makes mistakes that are due to a misunderstanding of the text.

<sup>8</sup> *Halotti beszéd és Könyörgés* [Funeral Sermon and Prayer], *Christus* (“*Ómagyar Mária-siralom*”) [Christus (“Lamentations of Mary”)], *Königsbergi Töredék és Szalagjai* [The Königsberg Fragment and Its Ribbons], *Gyulafehérvári Sorok* [The Gyulafehérvár Lines], *Marosvásárhelyi Sorok* [The Marosvásárhely Lines], *Rotenburgi János deák nyelvmestere* [The conversation book of Clerk John of Rotenburg], *Laskai Demeter imádsága* [Laskai Demeter's Prayer]. See Molnár and Simon (1976), Madas (2009b).

The *Buona pulcella fut Eulalia* is only an example. If it is not meaningless to question the issue of copying in the case of the first surviving Old French literary text, then we will have to pose the same question regarding all early inserted texts (which predate the absolute boundary of reading) in all vernaculars.

### 6.1. Is the *Buona pulcella fut Eulalia* a copy?

Theoretically, it cannot be a copy. It is highly unlikely that vernacular texts were transported via copying before the absolute boundary of reading had been reached, before the emergence of a vernacular readership.<sup>9</sup> Some passages are, naturally, difficult to interpret (*adunet, element* etc.), but there are no omissions or misunderstandings in the text to prove that it was copied.

According to the authors of the new critical edition, the fact that the person who inscribed the Old French lines in the codex did not use the space well is a sign of copying.<sup>10</sup> However, this argument implies just the opposite. If this person had not been working from memory, but had had a written text in front of him, he could have estimated the amount of space needed more precisely.

A Latin sequentia also praising the Iberian virgin, *Cantica virginis Eulaliae*, is immediately before the *Buona pulcella fut Eulalia* on f.141r of the codex. After more or less successful attempts by others (Berger and Brasseur 2004: 171), Maurizio Perugi described the identical, and rather complicated metrical patterns of the Latin and Old French poems (Perugi 2011: 29), and determined that the Old French follows the Latin.<sup>11</sup> The similarities in prosody (Bulst 1971: 209–210, 214–217), as well as the fact that the topic and some topoi are identical (Berger and Brasseur 2004: 171), suggest that the Latin sequentia was a source of inspiration for the Old French poem or both texts were produced in the same poetry workshop. This makes it extremely unlikely that the *Buona pulcella fut Eulalia* was a copy. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine that a copyist might accidentally copy a vernacular poem into a codex in which the previous Latin poem, unknown from any other sources, happens to be one of the literary models for the vernacular poem in question.

The relative rapidity with which the two vernacular texts were produced and copied is a weaker counter-argument against copying.

According to the philologists (Dion 1990b: 49–50), the poets composed the two poems soon after the events by which they were probably inspired (Saint Eulalia's grave was found in Barcelona in 879, and the battle made famous by the *Rithmus Teutonicus* took place in 881). The first hypothetically, the second certainly, these would be the *termini post quos* of the creation of the poems.

It is even more difficult to gain an overview of their common *terminus ante quem*, the date before which the two poems were noted down. This had to be after the death of Louis III (882), since the copyist mentions his death. The act of copying took place immediately or a few years after the poems were composed, or, at most, one or two decades later. The highly respected palaeographer Bernhard Bischoff dated the writing of the two vernacular poems to the last decades of the 9<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>12</sup> Therefore, the two texts could have been written and copied not very far apart in time. The relatively rapid transmission of vernacular texts in two vernacular languages at once would suggest an implausibly lively cultural life.

### 6.2. Is the *Rithmus Teutonicus* a copy?

It is uncertain whether the *Rithmus Teutonicus* is a copy. Old High German literature had just barely crossed the absolute boundary of reading, which is attested by the presence of the works of Otfrid von Weißenburg in the contemporary written tradition (his works were being copied, which means that a readership for Old High German texts was starting to develop, Flood 2005: 328–331), but it seems as though Old French literature had not crossed the boundary yet (because of the proximity of the Romance vernacular to Latin in general).

<sup>9</sup> “Ihr Dichter hat unseres Wissens keine Nachfolger gehabt. Obgleich die Möglichkeit erwiesen war, sogar die schwierige Form der archaischen Sequenz romanisch nachzubilden, ist noch Jahrhunderte lang der Gesang der Kirche lateinisch geblieben” (Bulst 1971: 217).

<sup>10</sup> “Cinq fois la fin du second [vers du distique] ne pouvant tenir dans l'espace disponible a été reportée à l'interligne supérieur. Cette constatation, le fait que le *Rithmus teutonicus* venant à la suite a dépassé les limites des feuillets restés blancs montrent que le copiste ne peut être l'auteur des deux poèmes” (Berger and Brasseur 2004: 64 and Perugi 2011: 33).

<sup>11</sup> “La versification de la séquence vernaculaire reproduit, à quelques exceptions près, celle de la séquence latine” (Perugi 2011: 28).

<sup>12</sup> “[I]m späten IX. Jahrhundert” (Bischoff 1981: 108).

Although there is no theoretical obstacle to the *Rithmus Teutonicus* being a copy, there are no omissions or misunderstandings in the text to prove it either.

According to the critical edition (Berger and Brasseur 2004: 64 and Perugi 2011: 33), the amount of space needed for the Old High German poem was also not estimated precisely, suggesting that the *Rithmus Teutonicus* is a copy rather than an authorial manuscript. To the contrary: the fact that the *scriptor* could not judge the amount of space needed for the *Rithmus Teutonicus* accurately enough, and had to provide an extra folio, is once again an argument that he was working from memory, and not copying from a visual source (another codex or piece of parchment or wax tablet). But I do not believe that the *scriptor* was struggling with a lack of space. (For more on this, see below.)

The philologists have good reason to consider the Old High German text a copy, since the poem celebrates the victory of Louis III over the Vikings in 881 in the present tense, emphasising that the speaker knows him personally – although the *scriptor* of the insertion calls the king, who died a year later, “of good memory”. It is naturally possible that the author himself wrote the poem down not when it was composed, but some time later.

André Boutemy's analysis increased the likelihood that the codex was not inscribed at the Saint Amand Abbey's *scriptorium*.<sup>13</sup> It was presumably part of a donation campaign after the Viking devastation in 883 (Dion 1990b: 49). This hypothesis is compatible with the position of Bernhard Bischoff, excluding all the scribes of Saint Amand's *scriptorium* (Bulst 1971: 208, Bischoff 1981: 109). He located the *Rithmus Teutonicus*'s notation in lower Lorraine, on the left bank of the Rhine. Could be this the same place where the poet composed it, *hier in Vrankon*?

The surprisingly strong similarity in both style and topic (Perugi 2011: 36) between the Old French and the Old High German poems suggests a kinship between the authors of the two works, or perhaps a common author. The two texts also have a similar metrical (32) and graphical structure (Berger and Brasseur 2004: 64, 183). There are linguists who are willing to entertain the possibility that the Old High German poem was composed by an educated bilingual (Welke 1989: 90). There is even an interpretation which projects the meaning of the two texts onto each other (Bauschke 2006: 220–222); resulting in the two nearly merging into a single text in the recipient by the end of the analysis (232). However, if the similarity of the poems and their adjacent position in the codex can be explained by their having a common author, our explanation would not need to rely on a copyist.

### 6.3 Are the three Latin poems copies?

It seems clear that the *Buona pulcella fut Eulalia* is a manuscript handwritten by its author, but the status of the *Rithmus Teutonicus* is uncertain. Taking a closer look at the Latin poems that form the immediate context of the two vernacular texts may help us establish the status of the Old High German poem.

Philologists have long acknowledged that the various inserted texts found at the end of the Valenciennes BM 150 codex form a group. They were published together in the critical edition, and analyzed as a group by Stephen G. Nichols, who proposed that the small collection might be organised around the mystery of Pentecost (Nichols 2010). Studies of their metric structure have also increasingly linked this set of poems. Bulst (1971: 207) includes the vernacular *Buona pulcella fut Eulalia* along with the *Cantica virginis Eulaliae* and the *Dominus caeli rex* in the category of the “archaic sequentia”, a revolutionary formal experiment which took place at the time within Latin ecclesiastic poetry. Later, Proto and Rainsford (2013: 67–68) interpret both vernacular poems with respect to the formal tradition of Latin ecclesiastic poetry.

If the poems in Latin had also been inscribed in the codex by their authors, then we would be dealing with an extremely early literary society, similar to the high school poetry workshops of the modern era – but in the context of a monastery.<sup>14</sup> That would make it very likely that the *Rithmus Teutonicus* is an autographic manuscript.

<sup>13</sup> “Il se pourrait que dans ces accroissements le *scriptorium* local n'ait joué qu'un rôle fort modeste” (Boutemy 1946–1947: 16).

<sup>14</sup> Boutemy (1946–1947: 15–16) notes that the 9th century layer of the library of the St Amand monastery, which preserved the Valenciennes BM 150 codex, happens to have a particularly large number of literary works of Antiquity, particularly works of literary theory. As in the case of our codex, these were generally not produced by the local *scriptorium*. If the replacement hypothesis is correct (which claims that, after the Vikings destroyed the library in 883, donations were used to restore it starting in 886 [Perugi 2011: 25]), the donors were probably largely other monasteries. Antique literature was primarily studied by Benedictine monks at the time, see Bischoff (1994: 134–160).

The collection grew gradually over time. The first entry was clearly the *Cantica virginis Eulaliae*, which follows the sermons on f.141r. The handwriting is not known from other sources, and the text is written so as to make the best possible use of the parchment: the metric patterns of the poem are marked only by capital letters and punctuation, not by line breaks. The text of *Dominus caeli rex* was written by another otherwise unknown and conspicuously frugal hand. Its frugality consists of: a rough style of handwriting, a similarly economic use of the space available by using only capital letters and punctuation to indicate the meter; the poem being written in the empty spaces under two different texts (f.140v, f.141r)<sup>15</sup>; as well as a repetition of the first two lines at the end of the poem marked only by the repetition of the words with which these lines begin. The main priority of the next *scriptor*, who inscribed the two vernacular poems, was easy readability. He did not skimp on the space, and indicated the metric units with great redundancy, using line breaks, capital letters, punctuation and extra spaces within individual lines. Perhaps the reason why the *Rithmus Teutonicus* continues on the top of f.143r is not that the *scriptor* did not make good use of the space available. Perhaps he knew from the beginning that he would not have to worry about the space, as he was already planning to add an extra folio for the final piece of the collection, the *Vis fidei* (f.143r–f.143v), inscribed in a similarly redundant fashion by yet another, fourth new *scriptor*. Upon examining the style of the handwriting, the reader may get the impression that the little collection of poems started out spontaneously, but it became more purposeful as the various *scriptors* added their contributions. The work of the poetry workshop became more focused.

Did the poets themselves inscribe the three poems in Latin?

The differences in handwriting are a strong argument in favor of this hypothesis. The three poems in Latin were each inscribed by a different hand, while the two poems in vernacular were written by a single *scriptor*. Why would it have been necessary to change the copyists so frequently to copy related, short material?

Another strong argument is that two of the three Latin poems, the *Cantica virginis Eulaliae* and the *Vis fidei* are only found in this codex, while the *Dominus caeli rex* occurs in only one other place. Hubert Silvestre found a copy of the latter poem in a codex in Brussels (KBR 5649-67)<sup>16</sup> from the Saints-Pierre-et-Exupère Abbey of Gembloux, which is not very far (120 km) away from the Saint-Amand-les-Eaux Abbey where the Valenciennes BM 150 codex was kept. Silvestre noted that the copy has little in the way of interesting textual variants.<sup>17</sup> This claim is supported by the critical apparatus. The only place where the text of the Brussels codex is better than the Valenciennes version is a simple mistake that could have been made by an author and then corrected by a copyist without any difficulty. Specifically, in line 10, the *scriptor* mechanically repeated the accusative *-m* of *igneam temperet vim* as an irregular and meaningless verbal suffix: „*igneam temperem uim*”.<sup>18</sup> However, unlike the Valenciennes codex, the Brussels text is full of the misunderstandings characteristic of copyists. Silvestre explains the *a* → *u* misunderstandings with the hypothesis that the copyist was using a text which contained uncial form Carolingian *a*-s, which are open at the top (Silvestre 1981: 171). The first two examples of such a misunderstanding in the Brussels codex do not correspond to an *a* of this type in the Valenciennes codex<sup>19</sup>, but the third does<sup>20</sup>. If we assume that the stemma consists of a single branch, then the *a*-s make a *Valenciennes* → ? → *Brussels* derivation somewhat more likely than *Valenciennes* → *Brussels*. The copyists' errors make it clear that the Brussels version cannot have been an autographic manuscript, but there are no such errors in the Valenciennes version, so we cannot rule it out. For the moment, nothing compels us to assume that the stemma consists of more than one branch.

We can suppose that the *Cantica virginis Eulaliae* was inscribed in the codex by its author. A perfect copyist<sup>21</sup> is always suspect.

The final piece in the little series, *Vis fidei*, differs from the others not because it contains misunderstandings typical of copyists (it does not), but because its form – the critical edition claims that it contains 15 and 13 syllable non-rhyming couplets – does not belong to the revolutionary experimentation of

<sup>15</sup> He started to write below the closing words of the collection of St Gregory's sermons, and continued below the text of the *Cantica virginis Eulaliae*.

<sup>16</sup> Many thanks to the Bibliothèque Municipale of Valenciennes, the Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique of Brussels, and Gallica.fr for the high-resolution photos.

<sup>17</sup> “Les leçons offertes sont assez décevantes” (Silvestre 1981: 171).

<sup>18</sup> Berger and Brasseur (2004: 191).

<sup>19</sup> Line 7: *conueniant*, 8: *conficiant*.

<sup>20</sup> Line 8: *mergant*.

<sup>21</sup> “Le copiste n'a commis qu'une seule erreur de transcription en oubliant un tilde sur le *u* de *mundet* 25” (Berger and Brasseur 2004: 168).

the early sequentiae.<sup>22</sup> The poem is in no way connected to the sequentia either in terms of rhyme or syllable count. However, its meter – which is misidentified in the critical edition, but identified correctly by Perugi (2011: 38) – is not experimental at all, but just as interesting as the early sequentiae. It is a regular elegiac distich of the Carolingian Renaissance. The *scriptor* calls attention to every caesura in the pentameters by leaving an empty space. In one of the hexameters (line 15) the poet imitates Virgil (*Aeneid*, V, 195). The Ovidian parallel (*Heroides*, XIII, 136) noted by Strecker (1951: 182) is even more interesting. But the most interesting thing is the topic: whether the love that the speaker feels for his monastic brother is acceptable according to the teachings of Christ, and whether it is improperly strong. This topic is perfectly compatible with the idea of a Benedictine poetry workshop, if this is a revival of the Antique topos of literary or philosophical friendship, which will be widespread in 15th century Florentine humanism. This is the beginning of a beautiful friendship.

Thus, having examined the narrower context of *Buona pulcella fut Eulalia*, we find three Latin texts produced by a poetry workshop which engaged in radical experimentation, and which may well be autographic manuscripts. This context does not rule out the hypothesis which we formulated as a claim regarding the Old French poem and as a question regarding the Old High German poem: their status as autographic manuscripts. Bernhard Bischoff assumed that the copyist of the *Buona pulcella fut Eulalia* and the *Rithmus Teutonicus* was a collector and an admirer of poetry in both vernaculars,<sup>23</sup> but perhaps he was more than that. It is possible that this person was a bilingual poet rather than merely a bilingual copyist.

## 7. Conclusion

A medieval codex in the vernacular is by default a copy and we are thus highly unlikely to find autographic manuscripts in it. However, inserted vernacular texts from the era of purely Latin codices are by default autographic manuscripts, since, at a time when the vernacular was starting to be written down but had yet to develop a readership, texts in the vernacular were not yet being transported in writing, i.e. they were not yet being copied.

It appears that this rule applies not only to the beginnings of Hungarian literature, but to French literature as well. It would be worthwhile to examine other medieval literatures from this perspective.

## References

- Andrist, Patrick (2006), La descrizione scientifica dei manoscritti complessi: tra teoria e pratica. *Segno e testo* 4: 299–356.
- Bauschke, Ricarda (2006), Die gemeinsame Überlieferung von ‘Ludwigslied’ und ‘Eulalia-Sequenz’. In: Eckart Conrad Lutz, Wolfgang Haubrichs, and Klaus Ridder (eds.), *Text und Text in lateinischer und volkssprachiger Überlieferung des Mittelalters. Freiburger Kolloquium 2004*, 209–232. (Wolfram-Studien XIX.) Berlin: Erich Schmidt.
- Berger, Roger and Anette Brasseur (eds.) (2004), *Les séquences de Sainte Eulalie. Buona pulcella fut Eulalia. Édition, traduction, commentaire, étude linguistique. Cantica uirginis Eulaliae. Édition, traduction et commentaire avec les autres poèmes du manuscrit 150 de Valenciennes. Rithmus Teutonicus, Dominus caeli rex, Uis fidei*. Genève: Droz.
- Bischoff, Bernhard (1981), *Mittelalterliche Studien: Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte* III. Stuttgart: Hiersemann.
- Bischoff, Bernhard, (1994), *Manuscripts and libraries in the age of Charlemagne*. Transl. and ed. by Michael Gorman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boutemy, André (1946–1947), Le ‘Scriptorium’ et la Bibliothèque de Saint-Amand d’après les mss. et les anciens catalogues. *Scriptorium*, 1: 6–16.
- Bulst, Walther (1971), “Buona pulcella fut Eulalia”. In: Johanne Autenrieth and Brunhölzl, Franz (eds.), *Festschrift Bernhard Bischoff zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*. Stuttgart: Hiersemann.
- Dion, Marie-Pierre (ed.) (1990a), *La Cantilène de sainte Eulalie. Actes du Colloque de Valenciennes, 21 mars 1989*. Lille: ACCES.

<sup>22</sup> “Il comporte quinze distiques qui [...] ne sont ni rimés ni assonancés. [...] Ceux-ci reposent sur une alternance, généralement respectée, de 15 et 13 syllabes. Chaque vers occupe une ligne et, le plus court, toujours placé en retrait, présente un blanc plus ou moins large qui semble correspondre à une coupe” (Berger and Brasseur 2004: 195, see also Proto and Rainsford 2013: 68).

<sup>23</sup> “Sammler und Freund der Dichtung beider Volkssprachen” (Bischoff 1981: 108).

- Dion, Marie-Pierre (1990b), Le Scriptorium et la bibliothèque de l'abbaye de Saint-Amand au IX<sup>e</sup> siècle. In: Marie-Pierre Dion (ed.), *La Cantilène de sainte Eulalie. Actes du Colloque de Valenciennes, 21 mars 1989*, 35–52. Lille: ACCES.
- Flood, John L. (2005), Literary theory and practice in early-medieval Germany. In: Alastair Minnis and Ian Johnson (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism II: The Middle Ages*, 324–332. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horváth, Iván (2010), Magyar versek: mi vészett el? [Hungarian poems: What has been lost?]. In: István Csörsz Rumen (ed.), *Ghesaurus: Tanulmányok Szentmártoni Szabó Géza hatvanadik születésnapjára*, 83–98. Budapest: rec.iti.
- Horváth, Iván (forthcoming 2014), Ómagyar szövegelemlékek mint textológiai tárgyak [Old Hungarian texts as the object of textual studies]. In: Rudolf Szentgyörgyi, Csilla Kósa, and N. Fodor János (eds.), *Árpád-kori szövegelemlékeink. Évfordulós tanulmányok*. Budapest: ELTE Magyar Nyelvtörténeti, Szociolingvisztikai, Dialektológiai Tanszék.
- Madas, Edit (2009a), *Halotti Beszéd és Könyörgés* [Funeral Sermon and Prayer]. In: Edit Madas (ed.), *“Látjátok feleim...” Magyar nyelvemlékek*, 222–223. Budapest: Országos Széchényi Könyvtár.
- Madas, Edit (ed.) (2009b), *“Látjátok feleim...” Magyar nyelvemlékek* [“Behold, brethren...” Old Hungarian texts], Budapest: Országos Széchényi Könyvtár.
- Molnár, József and Györgyi Simon (eds.) (1976), *Magyar nyelvemlékek* [Old Hungarian texts]. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó.
- Nichols, Stephen G. (2010) (ms.), *Tortured Tongues: A lost manuscript's invention of vernacular literature*.
- Perugi, Maurizio (2011), La Séquence de sainte Eulalie et le poème Virgo parens. Remarques sur les textes composant les additions du ms. Valenciennes, Bibl. mun. 150. *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale, Xe–XIIe siècles* 54: 21–48.
- Proto, Teresa and T. M. Rainsford (2013), Dalla tradizione mediolatina a quella volgare: Imitazione metrica nella Sequenza di Santa Eulalia e nel Canto di Ludivico. *Quaderni di Palazzo Serra* 22: 54–73.
- Silvestre, Hubert (1981), Un second témoin manuscrit de la séquence 'Dominus caeli rex'. *Revue bénédictine* 91, 169–171.
- Strecker, Karl (ed.) (1951), *Poetae Latini Medii Aevi*. VI, fasc. I. (Monumenta Germaniae Historica.) Weimar: Hermann Böhlhaus Nachfolger.
- Tarnai, Andor (1984), *“A magyar nyelvet írni kezdik”*. Irodalmi gondolkodás a középkori Magyarországon [“Starting to write in Hungarian”. Literary thinking in medieval Hungary]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Vizkelety, András (2004), *Az európai prédikációirodalom recepciója a Leuveni Kódexben – Die Rezeption der europäischen Sermonesliteratur im “Löwener Kodex”*. (Fragmenta et codices in bibliothecis Hungariae IV.) Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Welke, Dieter (1990), *Forme linguistique et origines du 'Rithmus Teutonicus' (Ludwigslied): remarques sur une énigme*. In: Marie-Pierre Dion (ed.), *La Cantilène de sainte Eulalie. Actes du Colloque de Valenciennes, 21 mars 1989*, 89–95. Lille: ACCES.