The manuscript I have been investigating contains the Tree of Consanguinity, the Tree of Affinity and the Tree of Spiritual Cognition by Johannes Andreae. Its format consists of 7 bifolio\(^1\) resulting in 28 single-sided pages.\(^2\) It is an unbound manuscript that has been recently re-sewn together with a modern paper protective cover not included in the page count. The manuscript is a collection of three different pieces of writing that are based around three different knowledge trees, each containing an illumination, followed by illuminated text. The layout of the manuscript is as follows:

Page 1: blank
Pages 2-3: draft of the Illumination of the Tree of Consanguinity
Pages 4-5: blank
Page 6: Illumination of the Tree of Consanguinity
Page 7: Illuminated Text on the Tree of Consanguinity
Pages 8-9: Black Text
Pages 10-11: Black Text with Red Highlighting
Pages 12-13: Black Text
Page 14: Illumination of the Tree of Affinity
Page 15: Illuminated Text on the Tree of Affinity
Pages 16-19: Black Text with Red Highlighting
Page 20: Illumination of the Tree of Spiritual Cognition
Page 21: Illuminated Text on the Tree of Spiritual Cognition
Pages 22-23: Black Text with Red Highlighting
Page 24: Black Text
Pages 25-28: blank

The manuscript itself measures 9x13 inches and there are scribal lines measuring 6.5x10 inches. Scribal lines were made on all pages of the document, even those that were blank. When we look more closely at the material upon which these trees and their explanations were written,
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\(^1\) New York, Columbia University, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, UTS MS 008. http://www.digitalscriptorium.org

\(^2\) “Thus in a folio each sheet has been folded once” Carter, John. *ABC for Book Collectors*. London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1972, p.100.
we can conclude that this is a paper document. Its paper type is “laid” paper since it has visible chainlines resulting from “the wire mesh at the bottom of the tray in which it is made” (Carter, 58). While watermarks are common in laid paper, we do not find any watermarks in the paper of this manuscript. There are three colors of ink used on this document: black, red and green. The script used is “cursive gothic book hand” and it appears to be either German or Italian.

There are three instances of marginalia on the manuscript. The first of which on page 15 seems to be a note with the term “quo quod” and seems to offer two possibilities for the unclear word due to an ink blot. This appears to be of a different hand than the original author, since the font is different and the width of the writing is thinner than the original script. The second instance of marginalia on page 21 is “ar” providing clarity for what looks to be a puncture hole in the text of arboris. This appears to be in the same hand that completed the manuscript. On page 23 we see a note “nō 6” that, like page 15, is in a different hand and was written with a thinner writing implement than the original writer. We can hypothesize that the original writer may have written the “ar” note but did not write the other two notes due to discrepancies in the handwriting, width of writing implement, and color of ink.
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3 Carter, p. 58.
4 Carter, p. 207.
5 New York, Columbia University, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, UTS MS 008. http://www.digital-scriptorium.org
This manuscript has clearly old, given the foxing on the paper, and the wear especially evident on pages 20-21. The Digital Scriptorium dates it as November 24th, 1493, though I could not make out the script on page 24 well enough to verify that date. If this date is correct, it could not have been written by Johannes Andreae, who died in 1348. I thought it might have be a pre-publication draft that was then used to produce the gloss for the print publication of Pope Boniface VIII’s *Liber Sextus Decretalium*. It is clear that this was an unfinished manuscript because the red highlighting of particular letters was not completed on all pages (p. 8-9, 12-13, 24). And it seemed to me that the existence of a draft on pages 2-3 would have been removed from the other folios if the document were complete. So I am left with two hypotheses: 1) that this was a copy made by a scribe of the gloss that Johannes Andreae contributed to *Liber Sextus Decretalium* or 2) it was a piece of Johannes Andreae’s original work that was then printed en masse in 1473. Even though I think it was a scribal practice copy, I like imagining the life of the original manuscript of Johannes Andreae because the time he was living was one in which the influence of canon law was growing, as were the challenges to papal authority.

Johannes Andreae did not invent the ideas of the Trees of Consanguinity, Affinity and Spiritual Cognition, but he did create these glosses to reflect the canon law understandings of Pope Boniface VIII’s decretals. We can see in the pictures that all three drawings have to do with the authority of the Catholic Church, as evidenced by the Pope’s tiara on the Tree of Consanguinity, the Bishop’s miter on the Tree of Affinity, and the Cardinal’s hat on the Tree of Spiritual Cognition [see images at end of document]. The idea of writing down canon law was not new, even laws of consanguinity. As early as 615 CE Isadore of Seville produced an analysis of the blood lines in families as part of his *Etymologies*. But the arrangement of this
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knowledge in “trees” was something that gained more popularity in the 12th and 13th centuries.\(^8\)

What we can know about the work Johannes Andreae did was that his glosses for *Liber Sextus Decretalium* were published in 45 different editions between 1473 and 1500.\(^9\) It is understandable then, that they would have had a rather wide circulation, and been an interesting challenge for anyone hoping to practice their scribal work.

Johannes Andreae lived during a time of the rising influence on canon law within the church, and his professional credentials as a canon law expert who taught in Padua and in Pisa well-prepared him for employment as one of Pope Boniface VIII’s most well-known canon lawyers.\(^10\) Boniface VIII himself was an expert in canon law, and used his legal knowledge to help administer and extend his power as pope. “Outside of the pages of poets and historians, his [Boniface’s] activities were detailed minutely by an army of lawyers. He spoke for himself through his resounding bulls, for loving the law above all other intellectual activities, it was through it that he best expressed himself”\(^11\) The increasing importance of canon law created a whole class of lawyers, “portrayed here [photo on left] on the fourteenth-century tomb of a professor in the legal faculty of the University of Bologna.”\(^12\) Johannes Andreae was one of those foot soldiers, adding a gloss of the trees in this manuscript to Boniface’s collection *Liber Sextus Decretalium*—to “the five books of the official collection made by Gregory IX he added in 1298 a sixth, the Sext, which brought the Church’s law up to date. The new book included no less than 251 of Boniface’s own

\(^9\) Lima, 54.
\(^10\) Vauchez, “Johannes Andreae”.
Pope Boniface VIII’s legal advances also won him “innumerable enemies” including reproach from Dante in his *Divine Comedy*. Pope Boniface VIII was well-known for his conflict with King Philip IV which led to Boniface’s termination. But this conflict can also be seen as a conflict between canon law and civil law. “Canon law was papal law, and the growing dominance of law within the Church was a key factor in the establishing of the papacy at the heart of the Church.” The rising development of civil law would take Pope Boniface VIII and his canon lawyers like Johannes Andreae by surprise.

Thinking about the life of the original manuscript as being written in Padua, and perhaps moved to Avignon with the papacy made me wonder what the role of books and manuscripts were at that time. To put it in perspective, if *Liber Sextus Decretalium* had stayed in Padua it would have been in a library of less than 426 books in 1396—though the library would continue to grow. If it had moved to the library at Avignon, arguably the largest library in Europe at the time, *Liber Sextus Decretalium* would have been one of “2,059 pieces of the papal library of Avignon in 1369.” It helps think about how relatively few volumes of books there were, though there were certainly more manuscripts than bound books in the mid-14th century.

There were changes to reading itself during this time. “In reality, the very ideology of reading, which in the early Middle Ages had been linked to the religious practice of rumination of the divine word, underwent a total transformation in the new universe of official culture,
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14 Chamberlin, p. 93.
15 Chamberlin, p. 110.
16 Duffy, p. 102.
17 John, 245.
19 Petrucci, p. 208.
henceforth dominated by the image of public teaching”.\textsuperscript{20} This led to changes both in the formation of texts and of libraries. We can see in our manuscript how the illumination on text pages that include red show a red shape that resembles a paragraph sign. Not only was this decorative, but spoke to the changing nature of text itself. “The articulation of the text was placed in relief and emphasized by a rich series of graphic interventions and tools including rubrics, paragraph marks, initials and majuscules of different size, running titles, reminders, indices and alphabetical tables, all of which enclosed, delimited, and cut up the text, rendering it thus accessible in small portions that could easily be found again.”\textsuperscript{21} As texts turned from something to focus on for prayer, like a \textit{Book of Hours}, to teaching documents, so did the texts themselves change for this purpose in the 13\textsuperscript{th} and 14\textsuperscript{th} centuries.\textsuperscript{22}
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