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Abstract: This article presents an overview of the current state of knowledge concerning detached and in situ fragments in the collection of the University and Provincial Library of Tyrol (ULB Tyrol). The detached fragments were removed in several different phases from manuscripts and printed volumes, and, at the turn of the twentieth century, were assembled in a separate collection, which now numbers 233 shelfmarks, some of which contain as many as 26 individual pieces. A current Austrian National Bank project is underway to publish images and descriptions on Fragmentarium. Among in situ fragments, only those in manuscript codices have been described, namely in the ten-volume ULB Tyrol manuscript catalogue, but they represent only part of the holdings of fragments. Nevertheless, these 390 fragments contained in some 302 manuscripts provide an overview of the range of material in the collection, and the promise held by the larger collection.
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1. Introduction

The great majority of fragments known today were not created by cutting individual leaves out of manuscripts, whether for their retail value in the art trade or perhaps because of the poor condition...
of a page. Rather, they are the product of the destruction and reuse of entire codices, ones that were no longer needed or considered unimportant. These could be materials deteriorated by long and heavy use, for example in the case of liturgical works such as missals and breviaries. In these cases, the Council of Trent played a major role through the general introduction of the Roman Missal and Breviary in place of the previously habitual use of specific diocesan texts, such as the *Missale Brixinense* and the *Breviarium Brixinense* in Tyrol. Unfinished copies, exemplified by a missal fragment in Cod. 661, and draft or practice writings not intended for future use, like the psalms in Cod. 662, were also prime candidates for reuse. Schoolbooks were likewise continuously being replaced, resulting in frequent transmission as fragments for works like Aelius Donatus’s *Ars maior* and *Ars minor*, the foremost school grammars of the Middle Ages.

Charters, especially copies with probative value only for a limited duration, such as commercial agreements, were likewise used as waste in the bindings of new manuscripts or incunabula, be it as pastedowns on the inside covers, as flyleaves protecting the first page of text, or as binding strips sewn in for strengthening. Many interesting texts of charters have been preserved only as fragments. In Tyrol, this concerns mainly charters of the monasteries of Stams, Schnals, and Wilten, from both the high and the late Middle Ages.

Another decisive factor in selecting manuscripts for reuse was the legibility of the writing, rooted in the current owners’ inability to read older scripts, often combined with a lack of language comprehension. Censorship was also an essential influence, especially in the period of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation, in situations such as the suppression of monastic institutions in Protestant areas. Similar attitudes extended into the Modern period, particularly during the Enlightenment. Later, the dissolution of monasteries also played a key part, though by this time it was mainly

emphasis on detached manuscript fragments, will appear in German at the end of 2020 in a collective volume (ed. Claudia Schretter-Picker and Anna Pinter) on the manuscript holdings of the ULB Tyrol, analyzing and presenting the results of decades of manuscript cataloguing work from a thematic perspective.

no longer manuscripts but printed books, such as prayer books and other devotional and edifying works, that were removed, sold off, or forbidden, and therefore reused for their materials.

Technological change, particularly the introduction of printing, caused a particularly intense wave of reuse, as printing often led to the end of manuscript transmission, not only because new works were distributed only in print, but also because older works were replaced by printed copies and the manuscript versions were seen as unimportant and thus disposed of. A good example is provided by the abbey of Stams, where around the year 1600 Father Wolfgang Lebersorg (1570/71–1646) began a new library catalogue, into which he entered only those manuscripts of works of which the abbey did not possess printed copies. Printed texts were frequently seen as more reliable and even as more authentic.

2 Fragments at the ULB Tyrol

The University and Provincial Library of Tyrol (ULB Tyrol) holds manuscript fragments both in detached condition and in situ. The fragments removed from manuscripts and printed volumes were put into a separate collection at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century and assigned shelfmarks


2 A concise compilation of data on the in situ fragments (and on later, self-contained texts written on binding materials) contained in the ten volumes of the catalogue is available as a PDF document on the department’s homepage: https://www.uibk.ac.at/ulb/sondersammlungen/2.1.1.2-fragmente.html.


Figure 1: ULB Tirol, Frg. 18_1–2 [F-4w1b], Formulas for the Sunday blessing of monastic rooms, eleventh century, © Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Tirol
from 1 to 90. In addition, a large number of other detached fragments were kept in folders. In the 1980s, Sieglinde Sepp reviewed these fragments, arranged them by subject categories, and gave them shelfmarks (A1–E40). Outside of an internal typewritten inventory, the detached fragments are largely uncatalogued. They are currently being processed by an Austrian National Bank project (timeframe: October 2018 to November 2020), which aims to publish images and descriptions of them on Fragmentarium.


In what follows, the Fragmentarium ID is included for these objects, although as of the publication of this article (December 2019), they have not yet been published; when they are published, it is planned that the links will be added.
The ULB Tyrol has fragments in situ in both manuscript codices and early printed books. The catalogue of manuscripts documents only those fragments held in situ in manuscripts at the ULB Tyrol. In comparison to a specific description form for fragments, such as that offered by Fragmentarium, this information is often rather limited. The detail of the description varies according to the person responsible for dealing with the manuscript and the method of description used at the time each catalogue volume was produced (1987–2017). Sometimes descriptions are only a few lines, but sometimes they are complete, with current and original dimensions, dating, script type, incipit and desinit or identification of the contents. These discussions form the basis for the quantitative discussion below.\(^6\) There is no documentation of the manuscript fragments in situ in printed books, with rich deposits to be expected especially in the incunables.\(^7\)


\(^7\) The only exceptions are the musical manuscript fragments formerly contained in incunables from the library of the Augustinian canonry of Neustift near http://fragmentology.ms/issues/2-2019/fragments-in-ulb-tyrol
2.1 Quantitative Information

Overall, some 390 in situ fragments contained in 302 manuscripts are documented at present in the manuscript collections of the ULB Tyrol. The major provenances of these manuscripts are the Cistercian abbey of Stams (147), the Mount of Angels (Allerengelberg) Charterhouse in the Schnals Valley (91), the Premonstratensian abbey of Wilten in Innsbruck (13), the Jesuit College at Hall (10), and the Augustinian canonry of Neustift near Brixen (8), with 33 manuscripts coming from other prior owners. Other cases concern self-contained texts written on binding materials, usually on pastedowns or flyleaves, that do not form part of the main manuscript, but are entered there after the binding was made, such as notes, mnemonic verses, calculations, etc. These are not fragments in the strict sense. They are of course described in the catalogue, but not referred to as ‘fragments’. The major part of the in situ fragments come from liturgical books, charts, or schoolbooks.

Most of these fragments are handwritten text, while only nine manuscripts contain fragments of sixteenth- to eighteenth-century printed material (Cod. 234, 330, 362, 422, 632, 716, 719, 840, 1040). Some of these are not identifiable, because they are too small or because they are pasted over (Cod. 362, 716, and 840). Cod. 330 contains an eighteenth-century text in Italian, Cod. 422 a fragment of the 1581 Frankfurt edition of Marx Rumpolt’s cookbook. Cod. 719 is bound in waste pasted together from leaves taken from Leonhart Fuchs’s *Num morbifica aliqua de Galeni sententia sit causa continens*

---

Brixen, which are included in a project by Dr. Giulia Gabrielli and her team at the Free University of Bolzano. They will be published with the Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, presumably in 2020.

8 About these “occasional microtexts” (*microtesti avventizi*), which differ from fragments primarily in that something new is inserted into something old, and not vice versa, as is usually the case with fragments, see A. Petrucci, “Spazi di scrittura e scritte avventizie nel libro altomedievale”, in *Ideologie e pratiche del reimpiego nell’alto medievo, Settimana di studio del Centro italiano di Studi sull’Alto Medioevo XLVI, 16–21 aprile 1998, tomo secondo*, ed. Centro italiano di Studi sull’Alto Medioevo, Spoleto 1999, 981–1010. Petrucci examined the microtexts in codices of the sixth–ninth centuries, i.e. which kind of microtexts occur in which codices (contents). The phenomenon for the period after the ninth century therefore remains largely unexplored.

disceptatio, printed at Basle in 1557. Cod. 234 and Cod. 1040 contains fragments of printed missals, Cod. 632 printed psalms.

25 of these fragments (all parchment) have since been detached and added to the fragment collection, with only traces of their presence visible in the codices (see List 1). Another 15 fragments are visible only as offsets left in the places where they were once used and are for the most part not further identifiable. These offsets are in Cod. 23, 30, 39, and 113 (psalms); Cod. 274 and 281 (prayer books?); Cod. 289 (account book); Cod. 290 and 316 (notes from Stams about deliveries of wine); Cod. 391 (Rudolf of Ems); Cod. 476 and 563 (German charters?); Cod. 660, 712, 758, 953 (grammars?).

Table 1: Detached fragments, some still visible as offsets in the codices formerly containing them, now in the collection of detached manuscript fragments (all are parchment fragments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Host Cod.</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Place of Origin</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Stams</td>
<td>Kempten?</td>
<td>ca. 1440</td>
<td>Hist.</td>
<td>2 charters of abbot Pilgrim of Kempten</td>
<td>E32</td>
<td>F-o2h5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Stams</td>
<td>Stams</td>
<td>1439</td>
<td>Hist.</td>
<td>Charters from Stams</td>
<td>E33–E34</td>
<td>F-17a6 F-hotw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Schnals</td>
<td>Schnals</td>
<td>1409</td>
<td>Hist.</td>
<td>Charter from Schnals</td>
<td>E12</td>
<td>F-vfzz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Stams</td>
<td>Stams?</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>Hist.</td>
<td>Charter from Stams</td>
<td>E9</td>
<td>F-sbh4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Schnals</td>
<td>Tyrol?</td>
<td>IX ½</td>
<td>Theol.</td>
<td>Benedictio maior salis et aquae</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>F-056h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>SJ Hall</td>
<td>Cologne?</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Theol.</td>
<td>Antiphoner</td>
<td>A8</td>
<td>F-xked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>SJ Hall</td>
<td>Cologne?</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Theol.</td>
<td>Antiphoner</td>
<td>A6</td>
<td>F-gmuz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The abbreviated subject categories may be resolved as follows: Gram. = Grammar, Hebr. = Hebrew; Hist. = Historiography; Kom. = Commentary; Lit. = Literary Texts; Mhd. = Mittelhochdeutsch (Middle High German); Theol. = Theology. ID indicates the Fragmentarium ID.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Host Cod.</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Place of Origin</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Shelf-mark</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Stams</td>
<td>Northern France</td>
<td>XII/XIII</td>
<td>Theol.</td>
<td>Antiphoner</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>F-c2u4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Stams</td>
<td>Southern Germany?</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Lit.</td>
<td>Ovid, Tristia</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>F-zjhp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>Stams</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>ca. 1300</td>
<td>Mhd.</td>
<td>Rudolf of Ems</td>
<td>65_6</td>
<td>F-h26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>Schnals</td>
<td>Tyrol</td>
<td>1366</td>
<td>Hist.</td>
<td>Charter from Stams</td>
<td>E4</td>
<td>F-m1tq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>Stams</td>
<td>Baumgarten</td>
<td>ca. 1300</td>
<td>Mhd.</td>
<td>Rudolf of Ems</td>
<td>65_10</td>
<td>F-h26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>Stams</td>
<td>Lower Austria?</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Kom.</td>
<td>Commentary on Aelius Donatus</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>F-35wr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td>SJ Hall</td>
<td>Cologne</td>
<td>ca. XIII</td>
<td>Hebr.</td>
<td>Prayers (Siddur / Maḥzor)</td>
<td>A18</td>
<td>F-gew4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>Schnals</td>
<td>Schnals?</td>
<td>1427</td>
<td>Hist.</td>
<td>Charter for Schnals</td>
<td>E20</td>
<td>F-xbmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>Schnals</td>
<td>Schnals?</td>
<td>1366</td>
<td>Hist.</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>F-uag4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>Stams</td>
<td>Kaufbeuren or Kaisheim?</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>Hist.</td>
<td>Charter from Kaufbeuren</td>
<td>E21</td>
<td>F-7had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454</td>
<td>Stams</td>
<td>Prague</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Gram.</td>
<td>Latin grammar</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>F-h4fs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475</td>
<td>Schnals</td>
<td>Salzburg</td>
<td>XIII and XIV</td>
<td>Liturgy</td>
<td>2 liturgical texts on the same leaf, one with neumes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>F-4okw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>Schnals</td>
<td>Schnals</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>Hist.</td>
<td>Charter from Schnals</td>
<td>E5</td>
<td>F-lhou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>649</td>
<td>Stams</td>
<td>Stams</td>
<td>ca. 1300</td>
<td>Mhd.</td>
<td>Rudolf of Ems</td>
<td>65_8–9</td>
<td>F-h26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>652</td>
<td>Stams</td>
<td>Carinthia or Bavarian-Austrian region?</td>
<td>ca. 1300</td>
<td>Mhd.</td>
<td>Rudolf of Ems</td>
<td>65_7</td>
<td>F-h26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>933</td>
<td>Stams</td>
<td>Stams</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>Hist.</td>
<td>Charter regarding Mariathal</td>
<td>E22</td>
<td>F-7r28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: ULB Tirol, Cod. 310, Front pastedown, offset on the lower, exposed section. Detached parts of the front pastedown are now Frg. B7 [F-zjhp], © Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Tirol.

2.2 Types and forms of preservation of in situ fragments

As mentioned above, most fragments currently form part of the bindings of their host manuscripts. Bookbinders needed parchment or paper for the production of bindings, to be used as filler in the spine, as binding strips, as pastedowns on the insides of the boards, and as front or back flyleaves. Both parchment and paper were costly, so that rather than using new material for these purposes, one turned to leaves previously written on but no longer needed. Older books that were damaged or had become useless were unbound or cut up, turning them into binder’s waste. Given that parchment proved to be more suitable for all these uses, the greater part of reused binder’s waste consists of this material, except for pasteboard bindings, where multiple paper leaves were pasted together, often sheets containing writing or printing, as in Cod. 719. In some cases, entire bindings were made of such waste. Parchment, tougher than paper, was especially suitable for making bindings, which sometimes even involved leaves with illuminations.

The following manuscripts have this type of binding: Cod. 113 (Wilten, missal), Cod. 515 (Stams, psalms [Figure 6]), Cod. 520 (Stams, Cistercian breviary), Cod. 551 (Stams, missal), Cod. 580 (unknown provenance, antiphoner), Cod. 648 (Schnals?), missal), Cod. 674 (Stams, Bible commentary), Cod. 686 (Stams, Cistercian breviary), Cod. 747 (Tyrol, charter), Cod. 897 (Tyrol, missal), Cod. 933 (Stams, charter, now Frg. 22, [F-pd8v and F-hx25]), Cod. 1031 (Neustift, breviary [Figure 5]), Cod. 1087 (Germany, German Bible). A special case is Cod. 1033, consisting of four leaves of binder’s waste showing fragments of sermons (of unknown provenance), which in the nineteenth century were assembled into a codex and assigned a manuscript shelfmark.

2.3 Fragments from the same source in separate bindings

Given that we owe the preservation of many manuscript books, albeit in mutilated form, primarily to the bookbinders, there is ample opportunity not only for codicological findings, but – as stated
before – for learning about the transmission of texts. It is readily understandable that bookbinders would use their materials, whose content was of no matter to them, for multiple distinct bindings. When the manuscripts thus bound were written in different locations, we can gain insight into the location where the binding took place, even if the bindings lack distinctive decoration. These cases could also point to the last location of the reused manuscript prior to its dismemberment, information useful for, among other things, the history of textual transmission.

Some examples from Stams and Schnals may be given. Thus Cod. 89 (Avignon, early fourteenth century, decretals of Gregory IX) and Cod. 90 (southern Germany, late thirteenth century, Gratian) have undecorated bindings each containing fragments of the same manuscript, a copy of Peter Lombard’s commentary on the Book of Psalms. Fragment shelfmark Frg. 65_1–10 [F-ht26] designates several double, single, and half-pages from a manuscript of the chronicle of the world by Rudolf of Ems, taken from the undecorated bindings of six manuscripts and one incunable from Stams: Cod. 348 (France, ca. 1400), Cod. 391 (Stams?, thirteenth century; the fragment is lost, leaving only a visible offset), Cod. 393 (Baumgarten in Alsace, thirteenth century), Cod. 536 (France, thirteenth century, fragment in situ), Cod. 649 (Stams, fourteenth century), and Cod. 652 (Carinthia?, twelfth century), as well as Ink. 106 E 5 (Iohannes Herolt, *Sermones*, Speyer 1483; HC 8488 = GW 12352). The manuscripts on this list were all rebound in the fifteenth century, and the incunable provides the *terminus post quem* for the binding of 1483. The preserved fragments are in nearly undamaged condition; they can be dated to around 1300 (although the internal, typewritten inventory assigns them to the fourteenth). The precise reason for destroying and reusing this manuscript, which contained simple red and blue initials but no other rubrication or illumination, cannot be specified.

Similarly, numerous large fragments from a southern German formulary for letter-writing were used at Stams in the sixteenth century for rebinding Cod. 609 (Tyrol, fifteenth century, with secondary use at Stams of bindings from Ulm) and Cod. 779 (Latsch, 1383). Three volumes, Cod. 373 (*Sammelband*, France and Germany, thirteenth and fourteenth century), Cod. 538 (excerpts, place of writing

unknown, thirteenth century), and Cod. 655 (Sammelband, Tyrol, thirteenth and fourteenth century) were bound in the fifteenth century at Schnals using waste from a twelfth-century manuscript of the Song of Songs with glosses by Walahfrid Strabo.

2.4 The host volumes

The provenance of the manuscript volumes containing fragments is largely proportional to the distribution of provenance in the manuscript holdings overall. This means that many of these manuscripts come from Stams or Schnals, a lesser number from Wilten, the Jesuit College at Hall, or the aulic library in the Wappenkur in Innsbruck. Remarkably few fragments are found in the ULB Tyrol's manuscripts from the canonry of Neustift. This parallels their low frequency in the manuscripts still at Neustift today and is presumably due to the uniform rebinding of large parts of the collection there in the eighteenth century. The places of origin of the manuscripts are widely distributed; besides those created in Tyrol itself, the greater part originate from southern Germany (Bavaria and Swabia), others from eastern Austria, Italy, or France. The localization of the bindings yields similar results. They are mostly Tyrolean, otherwise usually from southern Germany, with the decorated ones often assigned to well-known workshops. For the most part they date from between the thirteenth and the fifteenth century. Besides bindings contemporary with the time of writing, there are many cases of rebinding, some with older manuscripts receiving fragments of younger ones in their new bindings.

2.5 Localization and dating of the fragments

While the fragments can be dated by paleographic methods, determining their place of origin is usually difficult and requires secondary indications, whether internal evidence from their content or information from other sources. Successful localization is mostly restricted to fragments from charters and related materials, such as account books or letters. The catalogue of Innsbruck manuscripts documents a large number of charters from Stams which

10 See note 6.
were previously unknown and can thus offer valuable contributions to the history of that monastery. Much the same can be said for the Charterhouse of Schnals.

Otherwise, localization, at least in rough terms, is most likely to be possible for liturgical fragments such as missals, breviaries, or any kind of songbooks with locally specific contents. An example is the fragment of a missal from Neustift bound in a printed Salzburg breviary, Ink. 156 F 20.

2.6 Use of binder’s waste by Tyrolean bookbinders

The history of bookbinding in Tyrol is still very incompletely documented, especially regarding the libraries of South Tyrol. Only since World War II, and mostly in connection with the cataloguing of manuscript holdings, have bindings received any attention. At present, three centers for the use of binder’s waste can be considered well documented.


2.6.1 The bookbinder Eriber

A bookbinder named Eriber, an immigrant from Bavaria, is known in the relevant literature, but his activity in Tyrol had been largely ignored until recently. He produced bindings in the area of Innsbruck at the end of the fifteenth century. Additional local workshops have been revealed through work on him and his stamps. His known work consists mostly of rebinding Romanesque and early Gothic books for the abbeys of Wilten and Stams.

For Wilten:

Cod. 62 (twelfth century): fragment from an unidentified theological text; rebinding
Cod. 300 (ca. 1300): fragments from a nautical treatise, fourteenth century, and from an unidentified theological text; rebinding
Cod. 470 (twelfth century): fragment from a sacramentary, tenth century; rebinding
Cod. 728 (1482): fragment from a breviary, thirteenth century; first-time binding

For Stams:

Cod. 94 (thirteenth or fourteenth century): German charter dated 1430 from Sankt Georgenberg, concerning Stams, and charter of abbot Georg Ried of Stams (in office 1436–1481)
Cod. 274 (fourteenth century): offset of an unidentifiable fragment

2.6.2 Innsbruck bookbinders

For the second half of the sixteenth century, we are aware of a group of Innsbruck bookbinders, consisting of Gallus Dingenauer, Leonhard and Narziss Schuechl, and members of the Dimbler family. All of them worked for multiple customers, especially the Habsburg court at Innsbruck, the Franciscan monasteries at Innsbruck, Hall, and Schwaz, and the abbeys of Wilten and Stams. The

---

15 On this group, including bindings from multiple Tyrolean libraries (Wilten, Stams, the Franciscans of Schwaz, and the Provincial Archives), see W. Neuhauser, “Die Rolleneinbände des Buchdruckers und Buchbinders Gallus Dingenauer (Meister G–D)”, in De libris compactis Miscellanea, Bruxelles 1984, 133–249, at 189–191, 218; Neuhauser et al., Katalog der Handschriften, Teil 7, 335.
binding of manuscripts was of course only part of their business, whose main focus was naturally work on printed books. In the holdings of the ULB Tyrol, the following manuscripts contain fragments in bindings by these bookbinders, almost always in first-time bindings:

**Gallus Dingenauer, all for Stams:**

Cod. 14 (fourteenth century): fragment from a missal, fourteenth century
Cod. 91 (fourteenth century): fragment from an unidentified theological text, fourteenth century
Cod. 92 (fourteenth century): fragment from an unidentified text, pasted with the written side to the inside cover

**Leonhard Schuechl, all for Wilten:**

Cod. 104 (fourteenth century): fragment from a missal, fifteenth century
Cod. 243 (twelfth to fourteenth century): fragment from an incunable Brixen missal, H 11273
Cod. 375 (Wilten 1417): fragment from a Brixen missal, fifteenth century
Cod. 661 (ca. 1300): fragment from a missal, fourteenth century

**2.6.3 Schnals monastic bookbinders**

The Charterhouse of Schnals, founded in 1326 and suppressed in 1782, produced a relatively limited number of decorated bindings in its own workshop, not all of which include fragments.

Cod. 39 (fourteenth century): binding strips from unidentified theological text, fourteenth century
Cod. 216 (fifteenth century): back pastedown of an undated liturgical fragment; front and back flyleaves from a medical text, fourteenth century
Cod. 284 (1410): front pastedown with written side to the board, as yet undetached and thus undated and unidentified; back pastedown from a grammar, fourteenth century
Cod. 945 (fifteenth century): front and back pastedowns from a tonary, fifteenth century
Cod. 1163 (1505): front and back pastedowns from a *Liber ordinarius officii*, fourteenth century

---


2.7 Use of binder’s waste by bookbinders outside Tyrol

The Jesuit College at Hall, established in 1571, from its founding owned several medieval manuscripts and incunables with bindings that can be assigned to workshops in Cologne.17 Eleven of these 30 manuscripts contain fragments: Cod. 74, 209, 215, 231, 237, 435, 452, 547, 549, 953, and 990. They come from the ‘Rose’ workshop (Cod. 74 and 990), the ‘Dragon I’ workshop (Cod. 209, 215, 231, 237, and 435), and from additional as yet unidentified workshops (Cod. 452, 547, 953, and 990). The fragments are for the most part either from liturgical texts or from charters. Special mention is to be made of two Hebrew fragments, one detached (now Frg. A18 [F-gew4]) and one consisting of two parchment bifolia used as front and back pastedowns in Cod. 74.

The few manuscripts in the ULB Tyrol that come from other identifiable German workshops contain no significant fragments, meaning either that there are none at all or that they are too small to allow any meaningful statements to be made. Most of the manuscripts belonging to the libraries of the Tyrolean monasteries have undecorated bindings; these contain large numbers of fragments, usually of a liturgical nature or from charters. On account of the lack of distinctive decorations, however, it is not possible to determine where the binding took place.

2.8 Overview of languages, contents, and chronology

2.8.1 Languages

The majority of in situ fragments offer text in Latin. This applies not only to liturgical and Biblical texts but also to most of the other topics that occur, such as grammar and law. Only for the charters is the proportion of text in German comparatively high. An exception is represented by the four or five Hebrew fragments. These are found: in two manuscripts from Stams, Cod. 3 (written in Italy) and

---

Cod. 432 (possibly from eastern Austria), which may or may not have been bound at Stams; in Cod. 435 from the Jesuits of Hall, which was written and bound in Cologne; and in Cod. 688, whose provenance and place of binding is Neustift. To be added to these is Ms. Wilten 32 03 18 (olim XXXII A 11)\textsuperscript{18} of the abbey library at Wilten, which we can only guess was written and bound at Wilten. Certainly, monasteries in Tyrol must have owned at least a few Hebrew manuscripts. Two Syriac manuscripts, Cod. 1168 and Cod. 1169, contain fragments likewise written in Syriac, coming from several different source manuscripts in Cod. 1168 and from possibly a single one in Cod. 1169. A gift from an Orientalist, they have no codicological relation to Tyrol.

2.8.2 Contents

Most of the in situ fragments, as is commonly the case, contain bits of charters, or biblical, theological, or liturgical texts (chiefly missals, breviaries, and rituals). Besides these, we find grammatical works like those of Aelius Donatus, and many cases of anonymous or unidentifiable treatises. In contrast, there is little from medical texts or those pertaining to other topics. Fragments from German literary texts are not numerous but can be very important for the history of textual transmission and distribution. Many fragments have not been identified and cannot be without great difficulty, as in cases where the preserved quantity of text is slight (as in binding strips), where the fragment is pasted with the written side to the board and has not been detached, or only an offset remains. For reasons like these, most of the liturgical fragments, for example, cannot be precisely assigned to a diocese or a monastic order.

Authors so far identified:

In manuscripts from Stams:

Theology and canon law: Ambrosius Mediolanensis, Aurelius Augustinus, Gregorius I. papa, Gregorius IX. papa, Sophronius Eusebius Hieronymus, Innocentius

III. papa, Yvo Carnotensis, Nicolaus II. papa, Petrus Lombardus, Raimundus Jordanus (Idiota, Sapiens).
Grammar: Alexander de Villa Dei, Johannes de Garlandia.
Literary works: Publius Ovidius Naso (binding may not be from Stams), Franciscus Petrarca (binding from Stams), Rudolf of Ems (binding from Stams).

In manuscripts from Schnals (now in ULB Tyrol and University Library of Padua):
Theology: Pseudo-Beda, Jacobus de Voragine, Iohannes Marchesinus, Thomas de Aquino, Walahfrid Strabo.
Grammar: Aelius Donatus, Remigius de Autun.
Classics: Quintus Horatius Flaccus (binding from Schnals), Publius Terentius Afer (binding from Germany), Prosper Aquitanus (binding probably from Schnals, redone in Padua).

In manuscripts from Wilten (now in ULB Tyrol and Wilten):
Aegidius Corbeiensis (author of medical texts), Aelius Donatus.

In manuscripts from Neustift (now in ULB Tyrol and Neustift):
Alexander de Villa Dei.

In manuscripts with other provenances:
Sonnenburg: Cod. 277, binding probably from Sonnenburg: Willeramus Eberspergensis.
Hall Valley: Cod. 640, bound in the Hall Valley: Johannes de Sacrobosco.
Unknown provenance: Cod. 321: Sophronius Eusebius Hieronymus.

Figure 4: ULB Tirol, Cod. 376, back pastedown, parchment fragment from a sacramentary, tenth century, © Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Tirol

2.8.3 Chronological distribution

At present, the following statements are possible. The chronological range of the fragments extends from the eighth to the seventeenth century, with 60 objects as yet undated. 33 undated fragments are found in manuscripts from Stams, 13 in those from Schnals, six in ones from the library of Wilten and three in ones from Neustift. Five are in manuscripts with other provenances.

24 objects fall into the category of the oldest fragments, ranging from the eighth to the eleventh century (including three fragments dated to between the eleventh and twelfth centuries: Cod. 263, 587, and 797). Ten of these are in manuscripts from the library of Stams (Cod. 187, 199, 263, 350, 389, 515 [Figure 6], and 586), another seven in manuscripts from Schnals (Cod. 129, 180, 359, 535, 587, 699, 586).
Figure 6: ULB Tirol, Cod. 515, exterior of back cover, parchment fragment used as binding: psalter, eleventh century, © Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Tirol

and 797), two fragments are contained in manuscripts from Wilten (Cod. 376 [Figure 4] and 470), one in a manuscript from Neustift (Cod. 1031 [Figure 5]), and four fragments in manuscripts of other provenances (Cod. 321, 629, 634, and 928).

From the twelfth century (including those dated to between the twelfth and thirteenth centuries), there are 22 fragments belonging to three provenance groups: thirteen from Stams, six from Schnals and three with other provenances.

74 objects date from the thirteenth century or are doubtful between the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Most of these are in manuscripts from Stams (39), followed by those from Schnals (29), other provenances (4), and one item each from Neustift and Wilten.

The fourteenth century and the transition to the fifteenth century provide 139 fragments, making this the most strongly represented period. 78 are in manuscripts from Stams, 44 from Schnals, four from Wilten, three from Neustift, and 10 have other provenances.

The objects dated to the fifteenth century number 61, of which 35 are in manuscripts from Stams, 13 from Schnals, one from Wilten, two from Neustift, and 10 from other provenances.

As might be expected, there are very few manuscript fragments dated to the sixteenth or seventeenth century, and they are mainly paper fragments. Of ten instances in total, six are found in Stams manuscripts, two in those from Schnals, and two in manuscripts with other provenances. Despite their comparatively young age, these items are of interest precisely because they pose questions concerning the use of binder’s waste and the repair of bindings in the Early Modern period, given that some of them are in bindings first made in the Middle Ages.

3. Conclusion

This classification of fragments covers the ca. 390 fragments in situ in manuscript codices that are currently documented in the catalogue. A more precise localization, dating, and identification of the contents would require more profound investigation than was possible during cataloguing. Smaller libraries like the ULB Tyrol often have difficulties in adequately cataloguing and presenting their fragment collections, which is barely possible, if at all, with the
limited personnel available.\textsuperscript{19} External financing has helped publish some of the collection, such as the detached fragments discussed here, which will be published with descriptions on \textit{Fragmentarium} in 2020, thanks to the support of the Austrian National Bank. Likewise, the ULB Tyrol’s musical and Hebrew fragments (for the ULB Tyrol) are currently the subject of a research project. Yet for the most part, at the ULB Tyrol, as in many other institutions, the majority of fragments are not covered by current projects and do not even have a rudimentary description. There is much work to be done, and resources are limited.