The De divisione of Boethius (= B.) has come down to us in nearly 200 MSS dating from the 10th c. onward. The treatise maintained a position of some importance in the medieval schools and as a result the textual tradition is highly complex, although it remains unstudied for the most part. L. Minio-Paluello investigated and compared some of the early MSS in the course of editing a fragment of B.’s revised Topics translation that sometimes circulated as part of De divisione, and he put forward tentative conclusions as to the bearing of his findings on the history of the transmission of De divisione itself. In what follows I undertake to examine the earliest extant MSS of De divisione known to me, and to reconsider Minio-Paluello’s hypothesis concerning the early period of transmission. The study is in three parts: (a) analysis of the evidence indicating a lost ancient “edition” of De divisione; (b) the text of the treatise as transmitted to us by the oldest MSS; (c) a handlist of MSS containing De divisione. I have adopted the following sigla:

\[ A \] Orléans, Bibl. Mun., 267 (pp. 88-99), s. X-XI
\[ B \] Paris, B.N., NAL 1478 (ff. 80v-90), s. XI
\[ C \] Paris, B.N., lat. 6400E (ff. 76v-83), s. XI-XII
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D Valenciennes, Bibl. Mun., 406 (ff. 80-88v), s. X-XI
E Leiden, Bibl. der Rijksuniv., BPL 84 (ff. 1-7v), s. XI
F Bern, Burgerbibl., 300 (ff. 3-8v, 17), s. XI
G Rome, Bibl. Apost. Var., Ottob. lat. 1406 (ff. 163v-176), s. XI
H Rome, Bibl. Apost. Var., lat. 8591 (ff. 201-216), s. XI
I Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibl., Clm. 6372 (ff. 30-40v), s. X-XI
J Paris, B.N., lat. 11127 (ff. 64v-74), s. X-XI
K St Gall, Stiftsbibl., 830 (pp. 353-369), s. XI
L Montecassino, Arch. della Badia, 191 (pp. 168-184), s. XI
M Rome, Bibl. Apost. Var., Regin. lat. 1649 (ff. 117v-125v), s. XI (to 890b3 only)
N Chartres, Bibl. Mun., 498 (ff. 73-78), s. XIImed.
O Charleville, Bibl. Mun., 187 (ff. 78v-89), s. XII
P London, Lamb. Pal., 339 (ff. 55v-68v), s. XII
Q Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibl., Phill. 1786 (ff. 61-107v), s. X-XI

Alb Albert the Great, comm., ed. F.M. De Loe (Bonn, 1913)

The title of the treatise (+ liber, placed either before or after) is variously reported in the incipits:

\[ \text{de diuisione} F G O: \text{diuisionum} A C H: \text{diuisionis} B D E I J K L Q \]

\[ 1 \ M_i = \text{Migne, PL 64. I have made complete collations from microfilm or microfiche of all named witnesses except L Q, and, with the exception of O (which is clear on film) and N (destroyed in 1944), I have studied (or in the cases of L Q, collated) all MSS by autopsy. Readings in L were subsequently double-checked against microfilm at the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies in Toronto. I have also collated by autopsy but do not report MS Columbia University X88/Ar512. My conclusions are attenuated by the fact that financial limitations have made it possible to study only 40 of the 196 MSS known to me, but given that the earliest extant tradition is already a contaminated one it seemed unlikely that further collations would significantly advance our understanding of B.'s text as opposed to its history of transmission within the medieval schools. It is generally agreed that of the early printed editions the princeps is the best (per Ioannem et Gregorium de Gregoriis fratres, de Forlivio, Venice, 1491-2), of which I have seen only the 1497-8 reprint of Cons. phil., De disc. schol. at the University of Toronto. However, Po reproduces the text of the editio princeps, with 10 corrections adopted from MS Padua, Bibl. Ant., Scaff. XXII,553. Martianus Rota published an edition of the Dialectica (Venice, 1543, apud Iuntas, rpt. 1547, 1559) which Henrichus Loritus "Glareanus" used for the Basel Opera Omnia (1546, apud Henrichum Petram, rpt. 1570); the latter is in fact reprinted in Mi (1847, 1860, 1891). According to Pagallo, Rota corrected the editio princeps against MS Venice Marc. Z.L. 273. I have consulted the 1570 Basel edition and find in it some minor differences to Mi. I do not refer to the textus praemissus in Alb, as it is the text in Mi with occasional corrections introduced by De Loe (v. his praef. 11) and is therefore of no independent value. All column and line references follow Mi except that words at line-ends remain undivided (I do not note omissions and errors in the 1891 impression). See further (full bibliography given below, p. 42 ff.): Brandt, Entstehungszeit 147, n. 2; id., In Isag., praef. lxxi ff.; Schepss, Opuscule 561; Pagallo 74 ff.; 88 ff.; Cappuyns, Boezie 363; Van de Vyver, Etapes 444, n. 4. \]