

**THE USES OF ANGLO-SAXON MANUSCRIPTS
C. 1066-1200**

MARK JONATHAN FAULKNER

ST JOHN'S COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

D. PHIL THESIS
TRINITY TERM 2008

THE USES OF ANGLO-SAXON MANUSCRIPTS c. 1066-1200

Mark Jonathan Faulkner
St John's College, Oxford

D. Phil
Trinity Term 2008

This thesis examines the uses of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts in the 150 years immediately following the Norman Conquest. By focusing on the most common types of use evident in the manuscripts, it explores how readers actually interacted with books. It also treats manuscripts as cultural artefacts through which it is possible to observe the literary and social consequences of the Conquest.

The Introduction summarises our current understanding of the literary culture of this transitional period. Chapter II, 'Destruction and Conservation', examines claims that Norman elites destroyed Anglo-Saxon manuscripts; finding these claims unjustified, it investigates the circumstances in which manuscripts were lost and identifies how readers evaluated the contents of pre-Conquest books. Chapter III, 'The Movement of Pre-Conquest Manuscripts', looks at the consequent loan, exchange and sale of pre-Conquest manuscripts after 1066.

Chapter IV, 'Updating Pre-Conquest Manuscripts', discusses difficulties which Norman readers encountered with pre-Conquest books, including script, abbreviation, orthography and textual redaction, and examines how these technical features could be modernised. It also investigates more practical modernisations to liturgical books, chronicles and cartularies. Chapter V, 'Glossing and Annotating', concerns readers' reactions to the texts found in pre-Conquest manuscripts, particularly vernacular homilies and translations. It argues that the post-Conquest classroom was essentially trilingual, though Latin became the *lingua franca*.

Chapter VI, 'Record-Keeping in Pre-Conquest Manuscripts', explores the use of pre-Conquest manuscripts – copies of the gospels, liturgical books and patristic texts – as repositories for records. Chapter VII, 'The Veneration of Pre-Conquest Manuscripts', continues this exploration of the symbolic capital of pre-Conquest books by examining how Norman churchmen supported the veneration of particular manuscripts as secondary relics, and introduced new traditions regarding other books.

The Conclusion refocuses the findings of this thesis on two key issues: early medieval reading practices and English literature between 1066 and 1200.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>TABLE OF CONTENTS</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</i>	<i>v</i>
<i>CONVENTIONS OF TRANSCRIPTION</i>	<i>x</i>
<i>A NOTE ON TRANSLATIONS</i>	<i>x</i>
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
THE SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE NORMAN INVASION.....	2
THE NORMAN CONQUEST AND ENGLISH BOOK COLLECTIONS.....	6
ENGLISH AND FRENCH IN ENGLAND AFTER 1066	10
METHODOLOGIES	18
OUTLINE.....	19
CHAPTER II: DESTRUCTION AND CONSERVATION	22
DID NORMAN CHURCHMEN DESTROY ANY PRE-CONQUEST MANUSCRIPTS?.....	22
PHYSICAL EVIDENCE FOR THE DESTRUCTION OF MANUSCRIPTS DURING THE ANGLO-NORMAN PERIOD	30
EVALUATING AND CONSERVING PRE-CONQUEST BOOKS.....	36
CHAPTER III: THE MOVEMENT OF PRE-CONQUEST MANUSCRIPTS	49
THE MOVEMENT OF MANUSCRIPTS BEFORE 1066.....	50
THE LOAN OF EXEMPLARS AFTER 1066	55
THE DONATION AND SALE OF PRE-CONQUEST MANUSCRIPTS AFTER 1066	65
THE THEFT AND PLUNDER OF PRE-CONQUEST MANUSCRIPTS AFTER 1066	66
CHAPTER IV: UPDATING PRE-CONQUEST MANUSCRIPTS	72
ALTERATIONS TO MAKE PRE-CONQUEST SCRIPT MORE EASILY LEGIBLE	72
ALTERATIONS TO SPELLING	76
ALTERATIONS TO TEXTUAL REDACTIONS	87
ALTERATIONS TO REFLECT DIFFERENT LITURGICAL NEEDS	95
TEXTUAL CONTINUATION	99
CHAPTER V: GLOSSING AND ANNOTATING	107
ÆLFRIC'S <i>GRAMMAR</i> AND <i>GLOSSARY</i> AFTER 1066	107
LATIN SCHOOL TEXTS AFTER 1066.....	113
PRE-CONQUEST VERNACULAR MANUSCRIPTS AFTER 1066	128
CHAPTER VI: RECORD-KEEPING IN PRE-CONQUEST MANUSCRIPTS	151
ADDING LEGAL RECORDS TO GOSPEL BOOKS	152
RECORDS IN LITURGICAL AND CEREMONIAL BOOKS.....	163
RECORD-KEEPING IN OTHER MANUSCRIPTS	168
ADDING LETTERS TO MANUSCRIPTS AT WORCESTER AND ELSEWHERE.....	172
CHAPTER VII: THE VENERATION OF PRE-CONQUEST MANUSCRIPTS	178
POST-CONQUEST ATTITUDES TO ANCIENT MANUSCRIPTS	178
VENERATION IN PRACTICE: THE DURHAM <i>LIBER VITAE</i>	189
CHAPTER VIII: CONCLUSION: READING PRACTICES AND THE PLACE OF ENGLISH	200
ENGLISH LITERATURE, 1066-1200	203
READING THE BOOK, 1066-1200	208
QUO VADIS?	212
<i>BIBLIOGRAPHY</i>	215
<i>INDEX OF MANUSCRIPTS</i>	258

<i>INDEX OF PRE-CONQUEST DOCUMENTS</i>	268
<i>INDEX OF POST-CONQUEST DOCUMENTS</i>	268
<i>INDEX OF PAPAL DOCUMENTS</i>	269

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I have incurred many debts while writing this thesis. First, and most directly, I must acknowledge the patience and assistance of the staffs of Cambridge University Library, of the libraries of Clare College, Corpus Christi College, the Fitzwilliam Museum, Gonville and Caius College, Jesus College, Pembroke College, St John's College, Sidney Sussex College, Trinity College and Trinity Hall, of Trinity College Dublin, of the British Library, of Lambeth Palace Library, of the library of St John's College, Oxford, of the Beinicke Library and of the Pierpont Morgan Library, but above all, the staff of the Bodleian Library, and Duke Humfrey's Library in particular. It is difficult to imagine a better atmosphere in which to have produced this thesis. I thank the many scholars who have answered my impertinent queries: Julia Crick, Michael Fox, David Ganz, Tom Hall, Jonathan Harrison, Paul Hayward, Matt Hussey, Patrick O'Neill, David Rollason, Winfried Rudolf, Rebecca Rushforth, Richard Sharpe, Bill Stoneman, Elaine Treharne and Jon Wilcox. Several significant intellectual debts must be also acknowledged here: Roger Dalrymple, without whom I'd never have read many medieval texts; Margaret McDonald, without whom I'd never have read English; and my parents, Jean and Jeff, without whom I'd never have read anything at all. I also thank the Arts and Humanities Research Council, St John's College, Oxford, the Oxford English Faculty, and the Teachers of Old English of Britain and Ireland for financial support. The graduate community at St John's deserves thanks for its remarkable tolerance. I am most grateful to my two supervisors, Malcolms Parkes and Godden. MBP took me under his wing at an early stage; this thesis would have been inconceivable without his guidance. Malcolm Godden saw the project to completion, and through his comments and support immeasurably improved it. All errors that remain are of course my own. But my greatest

thanks are due to Betsy, without whom this may have been possible but would not have been nearly so enjoyable.

Tnyford
In die sanctorum martyrum Marcellini et Petri

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>ASC</i>	Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.
Ā	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 173, fols. 1-56.
A (=G*)	London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi, fols. 39-47.
B	London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi, fols. 1-35 + Tiberius A. iii, fol. 178.
C	London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i, fols. 112-164.
D	London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv, fols. 3-9, 19-86.
E	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 636.
F	London, British Library, Cotton Domitian viii, fols. 30-70.
H	London, British Library, Cotton Domitian ix, fol. 9.
(translation from Garmonsway, G. N. (1953), <i>The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle</i> . Everyman's Library 624. Dent.)	
<i>AG</i>	Scott, J., ed. (1981), <i>The Early History of Glastonbury: an edition, translation, and study of William of Malmesbury's De antiquitate Glastonie ecclesie</i> . Woodbridge.
<i>Anselmi Opera</i>	Schmitt, F. S., ed. (1940), <i>S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi opera omnia</i> . 6 vols. Edinburgh.
ANTS	Anglo-Norman Text Society.
BAR	British Archaeological Reports.
Bates	Bates, D., ed. (1998), <i>Regesta regum Anglo-Normannorum: the acts of William I (1066-1087)</i> . Oxford.
BHL	(1898-1901), <i>Bibliotheca hagiographica latina antiquae et mediae aetatis</i> . Society of the Bollandists. 2 vols. Brussels.
BL	British Library.
BM	Bibliothèque Municipale.
BNF	Bibliothèque Nationale Française.
Cant CC	Christ Church, Canterbury.
Cant StA	St Augustine's, Canterbury.
CCCC	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College.
CCCM	Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis.
CCM	Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum.

CCSL	Corpus Christianorum Series Latina.
<i>Cdv</i>	Aldhelm, <i>Carmen de uirginitate</i> ed. Ehwald, R. (1919), <i>Aldhelmi Opera</i> . MGH Auctorum Antiquissimorum 15. Berlin. 350-471.
<i>CH 1</i>	Clemons, P., ed. (1997), <i>Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: the first series: text</i> . EETS s. s. 17. London.
<i>CH 2</i>	Godden, M. R., ed. (1979), <i>Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: the second series: text</i> . EETS s. s. 5. London.
CL	Classical Latin.
CPL	Dekker, E., ed. (1995) <i>Clavis Patrum Latinorum</i> . 3rd ed. Turnhout.
CSASE	Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England.
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum.
CUL	Cambridge, University Library.
D&C	Dean and Chapter.
DML	Latham, R. E., <i>et al.</i> , eds. (1975-), <i>Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources</i> . 11 fascicles to date. London.
EEMF	Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile.
EETS	Early English Text Society.
fd.	Founded.
<i>GASA</i>	Riley, H. T., ed. (1867), <i>Gesta abbatum monasterii Sancti Albani: a Thoma Walsingham, regnante Ricardo Secundo, ejusdem ecclesiae praecentore, compilata</i> . RS 28. 3 vols. London.
<i>GDB</i>	Great Domesday Book.
<i>GGWP</i>	Davis, R. H. C. and M. Chibnall, eds. (1998), <i>The Gesta Guillelmi of William of Poitiers</i> . OMT. Oxford.
<i>GP</i>	Winterbottom, M. and R. M. Thomson, eds. (2007), <i>William of Malmesbury, Gesta pontificum Anglorum</i> . 2 vols. OMT. Oxford.
<i>GR</i>	Mynors, R. A. B., R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom, eds. (1998-1999), <i>William of Malmesbury, Gesta regum Anglorum</i> . 2 vols. OMT. Oxford.

- HA Greenway, D. A., ed. (1996), *Henry, Archdeacon of Huntingdon: Historia Anglorum*. OMT. Oxford.
- HBS Henry Bradshaw Society.
- HCY Raine, J. ed. (1879), *The Historians of the Church of York and its Archbishops*. RS 71. 3 vols. London.
- HE Colgrave, B., and R. A. B. Mynors, eds. (1969), *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*. OMT. Oxford.
- Hemingi Hearne, T., ed. (1723), *Hemingi chartularium ecclesiae Wigorniensis*. 2 vols. Oxford.
- HN Rule, M., ed. (1884), *Eadmeri Historia novorum in Anglia*. RS 81. London.
- JW McGurk, P., R. R. Darlington, and J. Bray, eds. (1995-), *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*. OMT. 2 vols. to date. Oxford.
- J-W Jaffé, P. and W. Wattenbach (1885-1886), *Regesta pontificum Romanorum, ab condita Ecclesia ad annum. mcxcviii*. Leipzig.
- LDB Little Domesday Book.
- LDE Rollason, D. W., ed. (2000), *Symeon of Durham, Libellus de exordio atque procursu istius, hoc est Dunelmensis ecclesiae*. OMT. Oxford.
- LE Blake, E. O., ed. (1962), *Liber Eliensis*. Camden Society 3rd Series 92. London.
- Lewis & Short Lewis, C. T. and C. Short (1958), *A Latin Dictionary*. Rev. ed. Oxford.
- LoS Skeat, W. W., ed. (1966), *Ælfric's Lives of Saints*. EETS o. s. 76, 82, 94, 114. Reprinted as 2 vols. London.
- Magennis Magennis, H., ed. (2002), *The Old English Life of St Mary of Egypt*. Exeter.
- ME Middle English.
- MED Kurath, H., S. M. Kuhn and R. E. Lewis, eds. (1952-2001), *Middle English Dictionary*. Ann Arbor, MI.
- Memorials Arnold, T., ed. (1890), *Memorials of St Edmund's Abbey*. RS 96. 3 vols. London.

Napier	Napier, A. S., ed. (1883), <i>Wulfstan: Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien nebst Untersuchungen über ihre Echtheit</i> . Sammlung englischer Denkmäler in kritischen Ausgaben 4. Berlin.
<i>New Pal Soc</i>	Thomson, E. M. <i>et al.</i> (1903-1930), <i>The New Palaeographical Society: facsimiles of ancient manuscripts</i> . London.
occ.	occurs (as a witness etc.).
OE	Old English.
OMT	Oxford Medieval Texts.
OV	Chibnall, M., ed. (1969-1980), <i>The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis</i> . OMT. 6 vols. Oxford.
<i>Pal Soc</i>	Thompson, E. M., and E. A. Bond (1873-1883), <i>The Palaeographical Society: facsimiles of miniatures and inscriptions</i> . London.
<i>Pdv</i>	Gwara, S., ed. (2001), <i>Aldhelmi Malmesbiriensis Prosa de virginitate: cum glosa Latina atque Anglosaxonica</i> . CCSL 124. 2 vols. Turnhout.
<i>PL</i>	Migne, J. P., ed. (1884-1864), <i>Patrologiae cursus completus ... series latina</i> . 221 vols. Paris.
Pope	Pope, J. C., ed. (1967) <i>Homilies of Ælfric: a supplementary collection</i> . EETS o. s. 259, 260. 2 vols. Oxford.
RS	Rolls Series.
S	Sawyer, P. H., ed. (1968) <i>Anglo-Saxon Charters : an annotated list and bibliography</i> . London.
s. a.	<i>sub anno</i> .
<i>SC</i>	Madan, F. <i>et al.</i> (1895-1953), <i>A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford</i> . 7 vols. Oxford.
SK	Schaller, D. and E. Könsgen (1977), <i>Initia carminum Latinorum saeculo undecimo antiquiorum</i> . Göttingen.
<i>SMO</i>	Arnold, T., ed. (1882-1885), <i>Symeoni monachi opera</i> . RS 75. 2 vols. London.
Sw.	Sweet, H., ed. (1871-1872), <i>King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care</i> . EETS o. s. 45, 50. 2 vols. London.
TCC	Cambridge, Trinity College.

- VA* Faricius, *Vita S. Aldhelmi* ed. Winterbottom, M. (2005), ‘An Edition of Faricius, *Vita S. Aldhelmi*’, *Journal of Medieval Latin* 15, 93-147.
- VCH* *Victoria County History*.
- VW* William of Malmesbury, *Vita Wulfstani* in Winterbottom, M. and R. M. Thomson, eds. (2002), *William of Malmesbury Saints’ Lives: lives of SS. Wulfstan, Dunstan, Patrick, Benignus and Indract*. OMT. Oxford. 8-155.
- Zup. Zupitza, Julius, ed. (1966), *Aelfrics Grammatik und Glossar: Text und Varianten*. 2nd ed. Berlin.

All biblical quotations, unless otherwise stated, are from Weber R., ed. (1994), *Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatem versionem*. 4th ed. Stuttgart.

CONVENTIONS OF TRANSCRIPTION

In general, I have cited directly from the manuscripts, giving a transcription that records as much information as possible. I have not normalised any forms. The following conventions have been used:

(a)	a erased
<i>a</i>	a expanded from abbreviation
\a/	a interlined
<u>a</u>	a entered in rasura, or by alteration of existing letter form
[.]	a letter that cannot be read
<.> <i>flam</i> < <i>ma</i> >	a letter implied, but not indicated by an abbreviation (e. g. <i>flam</i> = <i>flam</i> < <i>ma</i> >)
	a line break in the manuscript, or two interpretamenta are on separate lines.

Thus, *despicabili*~~t~~\er/ indicates that *despicabilis* was altered to *despicabiliter* by the alteration of **s** to **t** and the interlineation of **er**.

A NOTE ON TRANSLATIONS

All Old and Middle English texts are cited in their original language, without translation. For Latin texts, where the cited edition includes a translation, I have generally cited the translation. In other cases, I cite the Latin and give my own translation in a footnote. For reasons of space, I have not generally translated lemmata, glosses, incipits, rubrics or penitentials, unless the translation is germane to my argument. Quotations in modern languages other than English are not translated.

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

This thesis was inspired by an encounter with the facsimile of the ‘Old English Illustrated Hexateuch’ (London, British Library, Cotton Claudius B. iv),¹ while still a master’s student. I came to the facsimile interested in the way Anglo-Saxons had read Genesis, but was immediately struck by the remarkable activities of two or more annotators of the twelfth century who had filled blank spaces with digests of patristic commentary on the Hexateuch, mostly in Latin,² which were attributed to various authorities including one ‘Normannus’. I left the facsimile fascinated by what set of attitudes to vernacular manuscripts could underlie such an act of appropriation.

The annotations were given scant attention in the introduction to the facsimile,³ and had been the subject of no published papers.⁴ I was also struck that the ongoing use of pre-Conquest manuscripts had seldom occasioned comment or study.⁵ There were a few exceptions. Neil Ker had included a list of vernacular manuscripts with later signs of use, grouped by date, in the introduction to his *Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon*,⁶ which was subsequently filled out and slightly expanded by Angus Cameron.⁷ In his list of manuscripts produced in England between 1066 and 1130, Richard Gameson stressed that some pre-Conquest books were ‘revised and used’ during this period, and some with

¹ Dodwell and Clemons 1974.

² English notes printed Crawford 1922, 419-22; Crawford 1923, with linguistic commentary.

³ Dodwell and Clemons 1974, 15. As far as I can see, Withers’ new monograph mentions the annotations only once: Withers 2007, 63.

⁴ However, a book-length study is forthcoming from A. N. Doane and W. P. Stoneman who conclude that the project was ‘a self-conscious act of cultural appropriation’ perpetuated by one Normannus, whose *obit* is recorded in the St Augustine’s martyrology for 24 July; see also two abstracts: Stoneman 1984; van Lier 2005.

⁵ The use of manuscripts is generally only a minor aspect of palaeography; see the brief comments in Bischoff 1990, 202-4. By contrast, historians of the printed book have become very interested in marginalia; see, for example, Jackson 2001.

⁶ Ker 1957, xlviii-l.

⁷ Cameron 1974. See also Sauer 1997.

particularly extensive alterations are themselves listed in the catalogue.⁸ Finally, a posthumously published article by Phillip Pulsiano discussed sketches, scribbles and other marginalia in a variety of manuscripts.⁹ An exhaustive study seemed necessary, which would include as many manuscripts, vernacular and Latin, as I could feasibly examine.¹⁰ That study underlies this thesis.

As a result, this thesis provides the first full-length study of early medieval insular book use, and will – I hope – give a flavour of the distinctive practices which could prevail at particular religious houses as well as some sense of national trends. It is also, I think, the first full-length study of insular literary culture between 1066 and 1200, and provides new evidence with which to write a history of English literature during this period.

THE SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE NORMAN INVASION

It is always tempting to infer a causal link between a major historical event and social changes which seem to have been coeval with it. Such inference has characterised the historiography of the Anglo-Norman period from Eadmer and William of Malmesbury,¹¹ to Freeman and Round, to Douglas and Le Patourel, though ‘any debate among present-day historians is now concerned rather with the details of the changes, which varied regionally ... than with any attempt to attribute sweeping changes to the Norman Conquest’.¹² Nonetheless, this inference remains the controlling influence on the accepted literary history of the period. Orthodoxy would have it that the Norman invasion killed English as a literary vernacular and dented its currency as a spoken language, and that ‘a completely fresh start

⁸ Gameson 1999, 4 and n14. Glasgow, University Library, Hunterian 431 (V. 5. 1) [no. 303]; London, British Library, Cotton Domitian vii (‘The Durham Liber Vitae’) [no. 377] and Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 150 (‘The Salisbury Psalter’) [no. 875] have their own entries in the handlist.

⁹ Pulsiano 2002; Pulsiano 2007.

¹⁰ So far, I have seen about 350 surviving Anglo-Saxon manuscripts or fragments.

¹¹ See, for example, Otter 1999, esp. 565n1.

¹² Chibnall 1999, 142.

was made' in terms of book-collecting after 1066,¹³ and this 'fresh start' represented not a response to the exigencies of inheriting wholly unfamiliar collections of books, but an 'intentional policy orchestrated by the first generation of Anglo-Norman prelates'.¹⁴

However, many historians have begun to challenge the commonplace that the Norman Conquest had a major effect on English cultural production in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries.¹⁵ Describing book production as 'an entirely harmless activity',¹⁶ Francis Wormald showed that Romanesque illumination was being executed in England during Edward the Confessor's reign and that Anglo-Saxon-style illumination survived the Norman Conquest and was still being practised in the 1120s. The Normans also appreciated the sumptuousness of Anglo-Saxon art, especially metalwork, which led them to purloin whatever appealed to them.¹⁷ Moreover, though the Normans did overhaul the fabric of almost every pre-Conquest foundation, the replacement buildings they erected were characterised by the heterogeneity of their stylistic influences, chief among which was 'Anglo-Saxon tradition'.¹⁸ Anglo-Latin hagiography also became more heterogeneous with the arrival of men familiar with different literary conventions and styles.¹⁹ It has now been decisively established that the Norman Conquest did not lead to the replacement of local pre-Conquest liturgical feasts with those dictated by Norman calendars;²⁰ insular calendars were simply tidied up and modernised. It has even been suggested that the architecture of the rebuilt

¹³ Ker 1960, 7.

¹⁴ Thomson 1986, 27.

¹⁵ For another survey of this scholarship, see Thomas 2003, 367-76.

¹⁶ Wormald 1944, 133. See also Alexander 1966.

¹⁷ Dodwell 1982, 216-34.

¹⁸ Fernie 1986, 77.

¹⁹ Townsend 1991. See also Greenfield 1981. This emphasis on the hybridisation that the Conquest fostered also underlies Thomson's view that it brought about the 'Europeanisation' of insular literary culture: Thomson 2006a.

²⁰ Pfaff 1992b; Heslop 1995. However, when Abbot Thurstan of Glastonbury attempted to replace the house's 'Gregorianum cantum' with 'cuiusdam Willelmi Fiscanensis cantum' in 1083, there was a brutal riot: see Knowles 1940, 114-5. Only *AG* c. 78 (pp. 156-9) and *JW* s. a. 1083 (where he is apparently copying William) state that the riot was caused by Thurstan's interference in the liturgy.

monasteries of Ely and Winchester reflects the continuation of Anglo-Saxon liturgical practices.²¹ Moreover, a strong case has been made that the Normans enthusiastically adopted the cults of Anglo-Saxon saints, because the economic prosperity of their churches depended on it.²² Despite ample demonstrations to the contrary for a wide variety of types of cultural production, the expectation that military cataclysms cause major cultural change continues to structure instinctive assessments of the impact of the Norman Conquest on English book production.

To explore the influence of 1066 on literary culture, this thesis posits a broad division of post-Conquest readers into two groups: foreigners and natives or people of native descent. The first group, predominantly Normans, generally occupied senior positions in the church and the secular elite, but were also scribes and librarians. They would have had different literary tastes, a different sense of ecclesiastical organisation,²³ and a different vernacular to the native English. However, the arrival of this group had been foreshadowed during Edward the Confessor's reign and even earlier. He had appointed a number of Lotharingian bishops,²⁴ and Norman monasteries had owned land in England since at least 1017, when King Cnut gave an estate at *Rammesleah* in Sussex to the monks of Fécamp.²⁵ There had been diplomatic intercourse between England and Normandy since at least the reign of Edgar.²⁶ The second group consisted of the monks, canons and priests beneath this

²¹ Klukas 1984.

²² Ridyard 1986; Rollason 1989, 215-39. An alternative explanation has it that the boom in the hagiography of English saints after 1066 was the result of the anxieties of English monks and nuns about how the Normans would feel about their native saints: see Hayward 1998.

²³ See, for example, Hugh the Chanter's account of the changes which Thomas of Bayeux (1070-1100) made to the structure of the chapter at York: Johnson 1961, 18-21.

²⁴ This included Hermann of Sherbourne (1045-1078), Giso of Wells (1060-1088) and Walter of Hereford (1060-1070). Leofric of Exeter (1046-1072) was probably born in England (or Wales?) but educated in Lotharingia. In general, see Ortenberg 1992, 41-94, esp. 57-9; Corradini 2005.

²⁵ S949, S982: Haskins 1918.

²⁶ In general, see Douglas 1964, 159-80; Musset 1977. For literary connections, see Lapidge 1972, 101-2; Musset 1974.

elite, who were mostly English.²⁷ They were familiar with Anglo-Saxon cultural traditions and the English vernacular, but would have been increasingly aware of continental influences and noted that their culture was being subjected to scrutiny. Among other reactions, this awareness led to a nostalgia for the past, a desire for its preservation, and a commitment to adapt to new developments. Here again, the Conquest merely exacerbated existing trends, since Edward the Confessor's reign had seen the arrival of a number of French (not necessarily Norman) landowners 'of modest wealth ... [who] settled on a manor in provincial England'.²⁸ This broad grouping provides a useful analytical tool, though there undoubtedly existed a whole spectrum of people whose upbringing, experience and expectations fell somewhere between those of the foreign-born and the native religious.

In this introduction, I want to look again at what we know about the literary effects of the Conquest. Several phenomena need to be explored: (1) manuscripts containing unabridged patristic texts became much more common after 1066; (2) some vernacular manuscripts, but few vernacular texts, were produced between 1066 and c. 1200; (3) the earliest texts in French to be composed in England date from the reign of Henry I (1100-1135), but few Anglo-Norman French texts survive in English manuscripts earlier than the late twelfth century; (4) when vernacular literature emerges again in the early thirteenth century, it seems indebted to pre-Conquest English literature. I shall group my observations into two sections, the first concerning book collections, and the second concerning language.

²⁷ Thomas 2003, 200-235. The obvious exceptions are new monasteries like Shrewsbury (fd. 1083), which was colonised with monks from Sées, and refoundations like Chester, which was filled with monks from Bec after the expulsion of the secular canons in 1092/3.

²⁸ Lewis 1994, 124.

THE NORMAN CONQUEST AND ENGLISH BOOK COLLECTIONS

We might expect post-Conquest literary culture to have been a hybrid of pre-Conquest English and Norman literary culture, which responded to other changes in international taste developing at the time. Unfortunately, neither pre-Conquest English nor pre-Conquest Norman literary culture is particularly easy to define, and much of the evidence has not been collected or studied in any systematic way.

Anglo-Saxon literary taste must be reconstructed from surviving manuscripts, booklists and studies of the sources used by Anglo-Saxon authors.²⁹ David Ganz's despairing formulation – 'in the Anglo-Saxon era, books were assembled at various places for various reasons, but evidence for these collections and their contents is usually lost' – is just about as far as the evidence lets us go with any certainty.³⁰ Gneuss's *Handlist* lists some 640 pre-Conquest manuscripts and fragments which survive in English libraries and another 250 in international libraries;³¹ a large number of these are liturgical books. The book collections of houses founded on the continent by insular missionaries in the eighth century provide useful secondary evidence for the literary culture of the early Anglo-Saxon period, and strongly suggest that the works of the church fathers were common in early Anglo-Saxon book collections.³² It has usually been inferred that such books were destroyed during the Viking invasions,³³ but some may have survived into the later Middle Ages. The corpus of Anglo-Saxon booklists provides only slim pickings, since most are lists of books rather than

²⁹ See, in general, Gneuss 1996; Ganz 2006; Lapidge 2006. For the sources used by Anglo-Saxon authors, see the *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici* database (<http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/>, accessed 13/06/08), and the ongoing Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture project.

³⁰ Ganz 2006, 91.

³¹ Gneuss 2001; Gneuss 2003. It should be noted that Gneuss includes 'manuscripts certainly written in England up to 1100' and manuscripts written in Scotland, Wales, Cornwall, Ireland or on the European continent 'if they certainly or very probably found their way to England by 1100'.

³² Lapidge 2006, 148-66.

³³ For discussion of this possibility, see Lapidge 1996.

comprehensive booklists.³⁴ For example, Alcuin's long *Versus de patribus, regibus et sanctis Euboricensis ecclesiae* (781x793) includes an account of the books bequeathed to him by Ælberht, bishop of York, but the poem names authors and not *tituli*.³⁵ Moreover, the itemisation of five books given by Æthelstan to Durham in the *Historia sancti Cuthberti* is not really a booklist *per se*,³⁶ while other lists contain mainly liturgical books³⁷ and others are only tenuously localised.³⁸ There is also a danger of extrapolating untenable conclusions from the few substantial surviving booklists, particularly since it seems that books changed owner much more frequently during the Anglo-Saxon period than later (witness, for example, the ease with which Leofric acquired the collection he presented to Exeter).³⁹ For this reason, it is probably better to speak of 'book collections' rather than 'libraries' when discussing the Anglo-Saxon period. Michael Lapidge concluded:⁴⁰

The typical Anglo-Saxon monastic library probably owned fewer than fifty volumes, all of which could be housed in a simple book-chest. [. . .] To judge from the combined evidence of inventories, surviving manuscripts, and citations [. . .] the typical Anglo-Saxon library consisted of a core of staple patristic texts, scarcely exceeding twenty titles: Gregory, *Dialogi*, *Hom. xl in evangelia*, *Moralia in Iob*, and *Regula pastoralis*; Isidore, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, *De natura rerum*, *Etymologiae*, and *Synonyma*; Jerome, *Epistulae*; and possibly the *Comm. in evangelium Matthaei*; Augustine, *De civitate dei*, *De trinitate*, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, *Enchiridion*, and *Epistulae* and *Sermones* in selections [. . .] one may add several individual works: Cassian, *Conlationes*; and Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica*, as well as a small corpus of Christian Latin poets who were read as school texts: Arator, *Historia apostolica*; Juvenecus, *Euangelia*; Prosper, *Epigrammata*; and Caelius Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale*.

³⁴ Lapidge 1985. The corpus is surprisingly small, given Orderic's statements that it was Anglo-Saxon custom to produce an inventory of monastic property after the death of the abbot (OV ii. 238, iv. 174).

³⁵ Edited Godman 1982, lls. 1536-62. The date is discussed xxxix-xlvii.

³⁶ Johnson-South 2002, §26 (p. 65).

³⁷ Lapidge 1985, nos. VI (liturgical books belonging to the church of Sherburn in Elmet, s. xi med), VII (liturgical books belonging to Bury St Edmunds in the time of Abbot Leofstan (1044-1065)).

³⁸ Lapidge 1985, nos. XI (booklist from an unidentified centre, possibly Worcester, s. xi ex), XIII (booklist from Peterborough, s. xi/xii).

³⁹ For Leofric, see below 50-2. Note also Webber's comment, 'with hindsight, the late eleventh and twelfth centuries may be perceived as representing an important stage in the emergence of institutional libraries as more permanent, of not necessarily coherent or physically discrete entities. [...] The practice of supplying books with an inscription of communal ownership was beginning to become more common, particularly among the Cistercians and Augustinians': Webber 2006, 123.

⁴⁰ Lapidge 2006, 127.

This seems to go further than the surviving evidence will permit, but it is difficult to quibble with the overall tenor of the summary. At any rate, the arriving Norman prelates do not seem to have found such collections sufficient.

It is even more difficult to establish what books were being copied and read in pre-Conquest Normandy. Orderic's claim that Norman literary culture began only with Duke William II and Lanfranc has never been properly examined.⁴¹ Surviving books and booklists have enabled a preliminary assessment of the holdings of the abbeys,⁴² but there has been almost no work on the collections of the cathedrals. Moreover, studies of the holdings of abbeys (with the exception of Alexander's study of Mont-Saint-Michel) have not attempted to date books with any great precision. Thus, a great deal of research is required before we will have an accurate assessment of the holdings of Norman houses before 1066. Consequently we also have little idea of the physical make-up of a typical Norman book, which would help us imagine how incoming elites responded to the appearance of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts which they encountered. The lack of detailed studies of early Norman book production also makes it impossible to say whether any Norman books were imported to England before 1066, though we do know there were Anglo-Saxon books in Normandy before 1066, the 'Missal of Robert of Jumièges' being the most famous example.⁴³

⁴¹ 'The subject offered me is the deeds of the Normans, who [...] up to the time of William the Bastard devoted themselves to war rather than to reading or writing books' (OV ii. 3); 'it was from this master [Lanfranc] that the Normans first learned the liberal arts. [...] For at an earlier period under the six dukes of Normandy scarcely any Norman spent his time in liberal studies' (OV ii. 250).

⁴² The evidence from Fécamp, Le Bec, Mont-Saint-Michel, Saint-Evroul, Lyre, Jumièges, Saint-Wandrille and Saint-Ouen is studied in Nortier 1966. She excludes Caen, Evreux and La Croix-Saint Leufroy, Cerisy for want of evidence. For more recent work on Mont-Saint-Michel and Fécamp, see Alexander 1970; Branch 1979. Brief comments on Saint-Evroul and Jumièges are to be found, respectively, in Chibnall 1969-80, i. 11-23; van Houts 1992-1995, i, pp. xxii-xxxi.

⁴³ Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale, Y. 6 (274). An inscription on fol. 228r, perhaps in Robert's own hand, records that he gave the book to Jumièges while he was bishop of London (1044-1051). See Wilson 1896, pl. XV.

In addition, Orderic reports that 'by his mother's gift also he [Robert of Grandmesnil] acquired for the monks of St. Évroul a great Psalter, richly illuminated which is still in almost daily use by the choir as they chant psalms to the glory of God. This is the book that Emma, wife of the English king Ethelred, gave to his brother Robert

In England, things become more certain after the Conquest. There was an undeniable and rapid increase in the number of books copied, though this increase is not particularly evident before the 1080s, as can be seen in the table below:⁴⁴

	<i>Books produced in England</i>	<i>Books imported into England</i>	<i>Total number of books acquired</i>
<i>c. 1066 - 1090</i>	66	8	74
<i>c. 1080 - 1100</i>	104	20	124
<i>c. 1090 - 1110</i>	115	30	145
<i>c. 1100 - 1120</i>	180	29	209
<i>c. 1110 - 1130</i>	328	21	349

Most of these books contained patristic texts. These were lacking in both English and Continental collections before the middle of the eleventh century.⁴⁵ The predominance of patristic texts thus reflects a continental vogue, driven by the new generation of Norman churchmen. Acquisitions seem to represent a “two tier” system – a small number of widely copied works surrounded by a vast penumbra of other much rarer texts’.⁴⁶ To judge from texts surviving in ten or more manuscripts from the period 1066 to 1130, the canon of works ‘ða ðe niedeðearfosta sien eallum monnum to witanne’ consisted of Ambrose’s *De mysteriis* and *De sacramentis*; Augustine’s *Confessiones*, *De Trinitate*, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, *In euangelium Iohannis* and *Sermones*; Bede’s *De tabernaculo*; Gregory’s *In Ezechielem* and *Moralia in Iob*; Jerome, *Epistolae*; and Paul the Deacon’s *Homiliarium*.⁴⁷ By contrast, a staggering 569 texts

archbishop of Rouen; his son William carried it off from his father’s chamber, as sons do, and gave it to his beloved wife Hawise whom he sought to please in all things’ (OV ii. 42).

⁴⁴ Figures from Gameson 1999, 5. Though the dating of individual books may be queried, the overall trends evident in the statistics are undeniable.

⁴⁵ Webber 1997.

⁴⁶ Gameson 1999, 39. Thomson comments on ‘the contrast between the apparently unco-ordinated, highly differentiated methods, and the remarkably standardized result’: Thomson 2006a, 5.

⁴⁷ This list is derived from Gameson 1999, 42. Note the differences between this canon and that recommended to a female recluse by Goscelin of Canterbury in his *Liber Confortatorius* (1080x1082). Goscelin specifically recommends the commentaries of Jerome, Augustine and Gregory, the *Life of St Anthony*, Augustine’s *Confessions* and *De ciuitate Dei*, the histories of Eusebius, Cassiodorus and Orosius, and Boethius’s *De consolacione philosophiae*: Hollis, Barnes et al. 2004, 163-4. This may be a gendered canon. There is also little overlap with the corpus of manuscripts commissioned by Thierry of Mathonville, abbot of Saint Évrout (1050-1057). According to Orderic, Thierry arranged the manufacture of copies of liturgical and biblical books, the complete works of

survive only in a single manuscript from the period 1066 to 1130; and probably less than a hundred texts survive in multiple copies. It seems that formidable resources and energy were directed towards the acquisition of books after the Conquest, but beyond the acquisition of a few key texts, having books was more important than having a particular book. The drive to acquire new books seems to have overridden any prejudice about scribal traits, since English hands are often found beside Norman in the manuscripts of the post-Conquest period.⁴⁸ Though the Conquest provided an impetus for the increased production of manuscripts, there are signs that taste may have been changing in England before 1066.⁴⁹

ENGLISH AND FRENCH IN ENGLAND AFTER 1066

Two eleventh-century manuscripts, both now on the Continent, can claim to be the earliest insular manuscripts to contain French glosses.⁵⁰ These examples are exceptional; the other French glosses in pre-Conquest manuscripts date from the twelfth century.⁵¹ Literature in French did not surface in England until the reign of Henry I (1100-1135), when the monk Benedeit composed a verse translation of the Voyage of St Brendan, which it appears was initially dedicated to Henry's first queen, Mathilda, then rededicated to his second wife, Adeliza of Louvain.⁵² Philippe de Thaon wrote a manual for the computus in verse (internally datable to 1113) which he dedicated to his uncle, a chaplain in the royal

Pope Gregory, as well as treatises of Jerome, Augustine, Ambrose, Isidore, Eusebius, Orosius and other fathers (OV ii. 48-50).

⁴⁸ Best illustrated in Ker 1960, pls. 2-3; Thomson 2006a, fig. 2.

⁴⁹ For example, fragments such as Cambridge, University Library, Add. 4406 (74) (Priscian, *Institutiones Grammaticae*, s. xi^{med}-xi²) and Cambridge, University Library, Add. 6220 (14) (Augustine, *De trinitate*, s. xi¹) might be used to demonstrate that the new vogue for patristic texts reached England before the Conquest. The 'Winchcombe Psalter' (Cambridge, University Library, Ff. 1. 23), with its anticipation of the Romanesque, provides evidence for the arrival of continental artistic styles before 1066.

⁵⁰ Paris, BNF, lat. 8092 (s. xi^{2/4}, England, prov. France s. xi²?) contains three French glosses to Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* (fol. 13v) in a hand of the second half of the eleventh century: Lapidge 1982a, 4n19. Paris, BNF, nouv. acq. lat. 586, fols. 16-131 (s. x² or xi¹), a copy of the *Excerptiones de Prisciano*, contains ten French glosses, nine of which are in drypoint: Porter 1999; Porter 2005. Porter argues that these glosses were executed by a French monk Herbert, who was at Abingdon in the mid-eleventh century. For French / Romance loans in late Old English, see Gretsich 1999, 403-23.

⁵¹ See below 126-7.

⁵² Dean 1999, no. 504. Edited Waters 1928. Translated Burgess 2002. See Merrilees 1981; Sneddon 2001.

household,⁵³ and later a bestiary, dedicated to Adeliza between 1121 and 1135.⁵⁴ Modern scholars have attributed four other works to Philippe: two alphabetic lapidaries, a set of sybilline prophecies and a debate between the body and soul.⁵⁵ The royal patronage and elite audience of these works is very notable,⁵⁶ though it is difficult to know whether we should infer that ‘the reign of Henry I saw the production of a considerable amount of didactic writing in French’.⁵⁷ Since the earliest surviving copy of the *Chanson de Roland* is English,⁵⁸ it has often been suggested that Norman patrons were inspired only to commission manuscript copies of oral French texts when they became aware of England’s rich vernacular literature.⁵⁹ French was presumably the first language of most of the readers of these French texts, but it was not long before French became an acquired, high-status, language in England.⁶⁰ It can only ever have been a spoken vernacular in a very narrow coterie.⁶¹

English, by contrast, must have remained the spoken vernacular of most of the population after the Conquest. Several types of evidence also attest the ongoing vitality of English amongst the literate: (1) the production of a surprising number of vernacular manuscripts and a few vernacular texts after 1066; (2) the use of Old English to record some post-Conquest legal transactions, and the copying, alteration and forgery of pre-Conquest legal instruments in the vernacular; (3) the use of vernacular texts as sources by post-Conquest writers; and (4) indications that Old English texts remained comprehensible well into the fourteenth century.

⁵³ Dean 1999, no. 346. Edited Mall 1873; Short 1984. See also Pickens 1970.

⁵⁴ Dean 1999, no. 347. Edited Wallberg 1900.

⁵⁵ Dean 1999, nos. 355, 356, 383, 692. For the attributions, see Shields 1979; Shields 1993.

⁵⁶ For Adeliza of Louvain (c. 1103-1151) as a patron, see Holmes 1964; Holmes 1965, 50-52.

⁵⁷ Legge 1963, 26.

⁵⁸ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 23 (s. xii¹ or xii^{2/4}); see Parkes 1985.

⁵⁹ Most thoroughly explored by Howlett 1996.

⁶⁰ Hunt 1991, i. 12.

⁶¹ Berndt 1969; Kibbee 1991, 5-26.

Post-Conquest copies of Old English texts have only recently begun to receive due attention.⁶² Their value as evidence for the role of English after the Norman Conquest is potentially huge, but the manuscripts resist easy analysis.⁶³ Most do not carry any indication of their provenance, and it has proven very difficult to make convincing arguments to localise their production.⁶⁴ They tend to be scruffy, unpractised productions, but it is difficult to say whether those that survive were typical of post-Conquest vernacular books. Their scruffiness may suggest that they were produced outside recognised centres of Latin book production. Nevertheless, it has been convincingly shown that many post-Conquest copies

⁶² Swan and Treharne 2000. A research group, ‘The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1066-1220’, was subsequently formed, based at the University of Leicester. This group is not concerned with the ongoing use of manuscripts written before 1060. See also Treharne 1998; Treharne 2001; Treharne 2003a; Swan 2005; da Rold 2006; Swan 2006; Treharne 2006c; Treharne 2006b; Treharne 2006a; Swan 2007a; Swan 2007b; Treharne 2007. I would like to thank Elaine Treharne for sharing a number of these pieces with me before their publication.

The following post-Conquest manuscripts contain copies of Old English texts: Cambridge, University Library, Ii. 1. 33 (s. xii²) [Homilies]; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 302 (s. xi/xii) [Homilies]; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 303 (s. xii¹) [Homilies]; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 367, pt. 2, fols. 1, 2, 7-10 (s. xii²) [Ælfric, *De temporibus*]; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 367, pt. 2, fols. 3-6, 11-29 (s. xii) [Homilies]; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 383 (s. xi/xii) [Laws]; Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 14. 52 (335) (s. xii^{ex}) [Homilies]; Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 9. 17 (819), fols. 1-48 (s. xi/xii) [Ælfric, *Grammar* etc]; Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 17. 1 (987) (s. xii^{med}) [Psalter]; London, British Library, Cotton Caligula A. xv, fols. 142-153 (s. xi/xii) [Ælfric, *De temporibus*]; London, British Library, Cotton Claudius D. iii, fols. 55-140 (s. xiiiⁱⁿ) [OE Benedictine Rule]; London, British Library, Cotton Domitian viii, fols. 30-70 (s. xi/xii) [ASC F]; London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. ix (s. xii¹) [Homilies]; London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. x, fols. 102-151 (s. xii¹) [OE Benedictine Rule etc]; London, British Library, Cotton Julius A. ii, fols. 136-144 (s. xii^{med}) [OE *Dicts* etc]; *London, British Library, Cotton Otho A. xiii, fols. ‘202-216’ (s. xii²) [Homilies]; London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D. xiv (s. xii/xiii) [Homilies]; London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius A. xv, fols. 4-93 (s. xii^{med}) [*Soliloquies* etc]; London, British Library, Harley 55, fols. 5-13 (s. xii^{med}) [Laws]; London, British Library, Harley 6258B (s. xii/xiii) [Medical]; London, British Library, Royal 1 A. xiv (s. xii²) [OE Gospels]; London, Lambeth Palace Library, 487 (s. xiii^{1/4}) [Homilies]; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 180 (s. xi/xii) [OE Boethius]; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343 (s. xii²) [Homilies]; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 38 (s. xii²) [OE Gospels]; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 116 (s. xii¹) [Homilies]; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud misc. 636 (s. xii¹) [ASC E]; Rochester, Cathedral Library, A. 3. 5 (Strood, Rochester-upon-Medway Studies Centre, DRc/R1), fols. 1-118 (s. xii¹) [Laws]; Worcester, Cathedral Library, F. 174 (s. xiiiⁱⁿ) [Ælfric, *Grammar* etc].

⁶³ The evidence of these manuscripts for the importance of English among the literate after 1066 is confirmed by some of the pre-Conquest manuscripts I have seen. For example, Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 15. 32 (945) (1035/6, Winchester NM), contains a late-eleventh-century instruction to a copyist in Old English (‘7 ic bidde ðe þæt þu me writ þas VII uers 7 send me’, p. 35), referring to computistical verses. Dublin, Trinity College, 174 (B. 4. 3) (saints’ lives, s. xi^{ex}, Salisbury) has a s. xi/xii vernacular ex libris (‘of searbyrig ic eom’, fol. ir). Cambridge, Pembroke College, 88 (Laidcenn, *Egloga*, s. x¹, France or England, prov. Cant StA s. x², prov. Bury) has a vernacular scribble from the time of King Stephen (fol. 167v). Some of these manuscripts are included in the Leicester project’s ‘List of Manuscripts’ (<http://www.le.ac.uk/ee/em1060to1220/catalogue/mssportal.htm>, accessed 13/06/08).

⁶⁴ Traxel’s arguments about the origin of Cambridge, University Library, Ii. 1. 33 are a good example of the kind of special pleading necessary to localise these manuscripts. Traxel 2004, 159-207.

of pre-Conquest texts are far-ranging and intelligent adaptations rather than *litteratim* copies. Moreover, a small number of texts survive which we can be certain were composed between 1066 and 1200. In verse, we have the lyrics of Godric, the *Poema Morale*, the *Proverbs of Alfred* and the *Ormulum*,⁶⁵ and in prose, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (preserved, from 1080, only in the Peterborough copy and the small, independent fragment *H*), the ‘Canterbury Annals’ and at least two homilies.⁶⁶ In addition, a large number of post-Conquest books which are predominantly in Latin also contain small amounts of English, in the form of glosses, versions of basic sacramental texts like the *Pater Noster*, proverbs and lyrics.⁶⁷ This evidence shows the Norman Conquest did not put a stop to English texts being composed, copied and, presumably, read;⁶⁸ for a more precise assessment of the evidence we must await the findings of the Leicester project. The conservatism of the language of many of these

⁶⁵ The lyrics of Godric of Finchale (c. 1070-1170) are preserved in the *vita* by Reginald of Durham and elsewhere; edited Dobson and Harrison 1979, 103-9. The earliest copy of the *Poema Morale* dates from the late-twelfth century, and Zupitza has argued that its rhymes preclude a pre-Conquest date; see Hill 1977. Similar arguments can be made about the *Proverbs of Alfred*, though Arngart’s dating of 1150x1165 cannot be substantiated: Arngart 1978. Orm seems to have been working at the *Ormulum* from the 1160s: Parkes 1983. *Pace* Kendall, there does not seem to be any need to believe *Durham* was composed after the Conquest: Kendall 1988 for 1984. Poems like *The Grave* and *The Worcester Fragments* may also be post-Conquest compositions, but it is not possible to be certain.

⁶⁶ The Peterborough Chronicle appears to be an original composition from at least 1122, and is the only witness to the text from 1080: Clark 1970; Irvine 2004. *ASC H* (a single-leaf fragment, now London, British Library, Cotton Domitian ix, fol. 9) contains annals for 1113 and 1114: Earle and Plummer 1952, i. 243-5, ii. xxxvii. The ‘Canterbury Annals’, preserved in the ‘Canterbury Computus’ (London, British Library, Egerton 3314, fols. 9-72 + Cotton Caligula A. xv, fols. 120-153), were initially compiled in 1073, and begin with the birth of Dunstan in 925 and run until 1202. The annals until 1109 are in English, then in Latin with the exception of annal 1130: Baker 2000, 129-34. The two homiletic texts are preserved in London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D. xiv, fols. 151v-157v, 159r-165r: printed Warner 1917, 134-9, 140-5. The first is a translation of a homily by Ralph d’Escures, bishop of Rochester (1108-1114) and archbishop of Canterbury (1114-1122); the second consists of two sets of renderings of excerpts from the *Elucidarius* of Honorius Augustodunensis, a text composed after 1096. For commentary, see Handley 1974.

Some Old English homilies that survive only in post-Conquest manuscripts may not have been composed until after 1066, though proof is often wanting. Examples include the lives of SS Margaret, Giles and Nicholas in CCC 303, the *Vita S. Neoti* in Cotton Vespasian D. xiv and the Life of St Quintin in Cotton Vitellius A. xv. Similar arguments can be made about the Old English *Dicts of Cato*, and the translation of the *Peri Didaxeon* preserved in Harley 6258B.

⁶⁷ Inventoried in Laing 1993.

⁶⁸ Jocelyn de Brakelond reports that Samson, abbot of Bury St Edmunds (1135-1211), read *scripturam* in English *elegantissime*: Butler 1949, 40. It has been suggested this literature was composed in the Anglo-Saxon period, and was perhaps Ælfric’s *Life of St Edmund*: Clanchy 1993, 205.

manuscripts, contrasted with the changes which were evidently occurring in the spoken language, shows that ‘standard’ Old English retained some of its force after 1066.⁶⁹

Moreover, a large number of legal documents in the vernacular or containing the vernacular survive that were composed between 1066 and the end of King Henry II’s reign in 1189.⁷⁰ The Conqueror had begun by issuing writs in English, but switched to Latin shortly after (perhaps in 1070);⁷¹ nonetheless, surviving documents show that English continued to be used in some documents, presumably because it was felt to be appropriate or necessary.⁷² These records also attest that there were men skilled enough in the vernacular to draft documents in English after the Conquest. These men may have cut their teeth by examining pre-Conquest vernacular documents (predominantly writs, since diplomas were usually in Latin). Such skills could be essential to the defence of property titles after 1066. Indeed, when such vernacular documents were copied into medieval cartularies, they were sometimes translated into Latin so non-natives could read them, but sometimes copied *verbatim* or in updated English.⁷³ Sometimes such translations were allowed to co-exist with the original in a confected bilingual document; sometimes only the Latin was copied and survives.⁷⁴ A small number of pre-Conquest diplomas now survive only in a vernacular copy,⁷⁵ and it is a nice question whether these were translated from Latin or faked in English

⁶⁹ On ‘Standard Old English’, see Gneuss 1972; Hofstetter 1988; Gretschi 2001. For discussion of developments in the English language during the transitional period, see Malone 1930; Fischer 1996; Fischer 1997; Kitson 1997.

⁷⁰ Listed by Pelteret 1990.

⁷¹ Bates 1998, 43-75.

⁷² For one example, see Pelteret 1997.

⁷³ Late copies of Old English documents provide a substantial portion of the corpus which will lie behind the Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English; see Lowe 1992; Lowe 1993; Franzen 1996.

⁷⁴ See Rumble 2002.

⁷⁵ S72 (Æthelred, king of Mercia, to St Peter’s minster, *Medebamstede*, A. D. 680); S74 (Æthelred, king of Mercia, to the church of St Peter, Gloucester, A. D. 682); S98 (King Æthelbald, king of Mercia, to Bishop Milred and St Peter’s minster, Worcester, 743x745); S223 (Æthelred, *ealdorman*, and Æthelflæd to the church of St Peter, Worcester, 884x901); S325 (Æthelwulf, king, to Winchester Cathedral, n. d.); S333 (Æthelberht, king of Wessex, to church of Sherborne, A. D. 864); S342 (Æthelred, king of Wessex, to Ælfstan, *ealdorman*, ?A. D. 870); S385 (King Edward and the community at Winchester to Bishop Denewulf, c. A. D. 909); S451 (King

during the post-Conquest period, when a cursory acquaintance with vernacular writs had convinced post-Conquest churchmen that a vernacular diploma would appear more authentic than one in Latin. The co-existence of post-Conquest vernacular documents and Latin translations of pre-Conquest vernacular documents attests the complex linguistic situation after 1066, but as yet these documents have not been the subject of prolonged study.

Furthermore, late medieval annotations in Old English manuscripts suggest that, with an effort, Old English remained comprehensible to some readers well into the fourteenth century.⁷⁶ This evidence must be set alongside library catalogues which occasionally described particular Old English manuscripts as old, worthless and incomprehensible.⁷⁷ Several Old English manuscripts even have inscriptions to this effect.⁷⁸ However, Latin and French manuscripts could also be considered old, worthless and incomprehensible, as a catch-all entry in the Exeter inventory of 1327 shows.⁷⁹ Indeed, one manuscript in the inventory was considered useless except for its Old English gloss.⁸⁰ It is clear that some literate people could read Old English in the twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and some could not. Whether an Old English book survived these centuries was thus dependent on the interest and competency of many generations of medieval librarians.

Æthelstan to St John's, Beverley, n. d.); S813 (King Edgar to St Mary's, Sherborne, 970x975); S1032 (King Edward to Horton Abbey, A. D. 1061); S1054 (King Edward to Fecamp, 1042x1047); S1062 (King Edward confirms a grant by Ælfgifu Emma to Old Minster, 1042x1065).

⁷⁶ The evidence is listed by Cameron 1974. For discussion, see Irvine 1987, 57-84.

⁷⁷ For example, the Glastonbury catalogue of 1247 describes some Old English manuscripts as *vetusti et inutiles*: Sharpe, Carley et al. 1996, B39.17, B39.218-220.

⁷⁸ Cambridge, University Library, Ii. 1. 33, fol. 29r has the inscription 'hoc uolumen continet multam copiam sermonum in anglico non appreciatum propter ydiomata incognita': see Traxel 2004, 131-4.

⁷⁹ An entry records 'multi alii libri vetustate consumpti Gallice, Anglice, et Latine scripti, qui non appreciantur, que nullius valoris reputantur'; Oliver 1861, 301-10 at 309.

⁸⁰ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 191 (s. xi^{3/4}, Exeter) has a thirteenth-century title 'De ordine canonicorum. Martilogium. Liber inutilis exceptis omnibus expositionibus in anglico' (p. 1). It was evidently bound with Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 196 (s. xi², Exeter), a copy of the Old English Martyrology, when the inscription was entered.

Yet many post-Conquest Latin historians, such as the compiler of the *Liber Eliensis*, evidently used vernacular sources.⁸¹ Some of these sources survive, like the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, but others do not, like the Old English poem on battles, portions of which Henry of Huntingdon translates in his *Historia Anglorum*.⁸² Post-Conquest hagiographers also drew on vernacular texts. William of Malmesbury's *Vita Wulfstani* admits to translating an Old English original by Coleman.⁸³ Osbern and William of Malmesbury both claim to use an English life in their *Vitae Dunstani*.⁸⁴ The *Gesta Herewardi* purports to draw on a vernacular text by Leofric, Hereward's father.⁸⁵ The non-survival of such source texts might be taken to suggest that English became devalued as a literary language after 1066, and that the original texts were considered obsolete as soon as a Latin equivalent became available.⁸⁶ However, many twelfth-century writers took care to claim English (or British) sources. It is difficult to know whether these sources ever existed. Often, as in Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia regum Britanniae*, the claim was entirely spurious. Similarly, Marie de France claims to have translated her *Fables* from an English translation of Aesop by King Alfred,⁸⁷ and the author of the Anglo-Norman romance *Waldef* (first half of the thirteenth century) claims not only that he is translating from an English source, but also that the authors of the *Brut*, *Tristram* and *Aelof* did the same.⁸⁸ These examples could easily be multiplied.⁸⁹ At the very least, this

⁸¹ Blake 1962, xxvii-xlii.

⁸² Greenway 1996, cii. See also Rigg 1991.

⁸³ Winterbottom and Thomson 2002, 8-155. John of Worcester (s. a. 1062) appears to draw on Coleman independently. The idea that Coleman translated Paul the Deacon's *Vita sancti Gregorii* in its entirety seems to be without basis. The antecedent of William's clause 'quod a Colemanno in patriam linguam ... uersum' is clearly *dictum* not *uita*, hence 'ut pleraque alia' (*VW* i. 6. 2) probably means Coleman included other verbal imitations of Paul's *vita* in his Life of Wulfstan.

⁸⁴ Stubbs 1874, 70; Winterbottom and Thomson 2002, i. Pro 7 (discussed xviii-xxxiv).

⁸⁵ Hardy and Martin 1888-1889, i. 339.

⁸⁶ However, when they were seeking the canonisation of Wulfstan in 1203, the Worcester monks sent the English life to Pope Innocent III: Darlington 1928, 148-150; Mason 1990, 278-81.

⁸⁷ Epilogue, lls. 9-19: ed. Spiegel 1987, 256-9.

⁸⁸ Holden 1984, lls. 1-59.

⁸⁹ For Geoffrey's influence on Gaimar, see Short 1994. Possible imitations of the trope in hagiography include the *Passio sancti Albani* of William of St Albans, the *Vita sanctae Heleni* by Jocelin of Furness, the *Vita sancti*

trope implies that English vernacular literature was held in high regard after 1066. A full study seems a desideratum.⁹⁰

English and French seem to have co-existed after 1066. The Norman Conquest threw together people with two different vernaculars; French speakers formed the majority of the political and ecclesiastical elites, but these elites also contained men whose vernacular was English or was neither English nor French, such as Lanfranc, a native of Pavia.⁹¹ English speakers remained an overall majority of the population, and this may occasionally have seemed threatening to the Normans. Of necessity, Latin probably became the *lingua franca* of monasteries and episcopal houses, where incomers joined English communities that were already heterogenous. But the immigrants could not afford to ignore or disdain the existing traditions of the houses to which they came. Monuments such as the Eadwine Psalter show that by the middle of the twelfth century Anglo-Norman ecclesiastical culture could be presented as trilingual.⁹² Much of the evidence we have discussed here has not been studied adequately; much of it seems decidedly equivocal, but there is a strong presumption that in at least some circumstances, English was not despised but valorised after 1066.⁹³ As a result of the Norman invasion, English, Latin and French all had their own unique claims as literary and practical languages in England after 1066. This is the complicated background against which a study of the use of pre-Conquest books must be written.

Oswaldi by Reginald of Durham and Aelred of Rievaulx's *Vita sancti Niniani*. For these examples, see Wilson 1941; Wilson 1952, 92-113.

⁹⁰ A thesis on the use of Old English sources by Latin writers was begun by Richard Hewitt, of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

⁹¹ Anticipated linguistic difficulties were one reason why Normans may have been reluctant to accept preferment in the English church. See OV ii. 272; Clover and Gibson 1979, 30. For Lanfranc's description of the English as *barbari*, because they used an unfamiliar language, see Cowdrey 2003, 178.

⁹² Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 17. 1 (987); see Gibson, Heslop et al. 1992. For background, see Clark 1976; Frankis 2000.

⁹³ A particularly unusual example is the so-called 'Rouen Sentence' (Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale, I. 49 (524), fol. 95v), where a scribe copied a sentence from the Old English Orosius to test his hand in a ninth-century manuscript. According to Ker, the manuscript was at Fécamp shortly after its production, and the hand is that of a twelfth-century scribe imitating a tenth-century model: Ker 1957, no. 375 (p. 448). See also Mossé 1955.

METHODOLOGIES

The study of the use of pre-Conquest books after 1066 raises a number of awkward methodological questions that scholarship predominantly concerned with the production of manuscripts has not had to address. We must also define the terms and scope of our study.

This thesis will ostensibly cover the period 1066 to 1200, the immediate post-Conquest period, because this is the period during which pre-Conquest manuscripts were most heavily used. I have tended to call this 144 years the ‘post-Conquest’ or ‘Anglo-Norman’ period, though England and Normandy were briefly ruled by different monarchs during these years. I have also taken a rather liberal definition of the term ‘Anglo-Saxon manuscript’. At best, palaeography can date a manuscript to the quarter century of its production, hence we cannot actually tell whether a book with script datable ‘s. xi^{3/4}’ or ‘s. xi²’ was written before or after 1066. Consequently, I have tended to treat all books with such script as Anglo-Saxon, since it seems certain that it took the Norman invaders at least a few years to organise the resources at their disposal and direct them towards the production of new books. I have generally followed Ker for the dating of vernacular manuscripts,⁹⁴ Gneuss for pre-Conquest Latin books,⁹⁵ and Gameson for post-Conquest books,⁹⁶ unless I have found reason to disagree with the traditional dating.

There are also severe terminological difficulties in describing particular types of use. It is surprisingly difficult to describe a sign of use without at the same time encoding a judgement about its purpose. For example, ‘annotation’ tends to imply that there is a relationship between the addition and the original text (as in annotated editions of literary texts), while ‘scribble’ suggests that the addition is casual, scruffy and was executed by

⁹⁴ Ker 1957; Ker 1976b; Blockley 1982.

⁹⁵ Gneuss 2001; Gneuss 2003.

⁹⁶ Gameson 1999.

someone who treated the manuscript with less than respect. ‘Sketch’ similarly implies dalliance. ‘Interlineation’ is preferable to ‘correction’, which implies the comparison of one manuscript to another, when many interlineations do not have such simple origins. It is obviously easier to be precise when one has had the time to examine a particular manuscript in great detail; unfortunately, since it is the avowed purpose of this study to examine as many manuscripts as possible, this luxury has not always been available. In these situations I have preferred to describe any intervention as ‘marginalia’,⁹⁷ regardless of its position in the manuscript, and hope that a future scholar will assess its exact role and purpose.

OUTLINE

This thesis attempts to analyse the major ways in which post-Conquest readers used Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. The ways in which medieval readers handled books have not been heavily studied, and so an empirical account of the uses of manuscripts is itself quite a novel undertaking. However, this thesis mainly treats manuscripts as the physical embodiment of literary culture, and uses them to read the complex cultural interactions of the post-Conquest period.

Since this thesis takes part in such an inchoate field of study I do not think it is possible or desirable to build grand narratives. Nor, given the difficulty of localising pre-Conquest manuscripts, is it appropriate to identify localised patterns of book use. Accordingly, this thesis examines different types of use discretely, and – within chapters dedicated to particular types of use – identifies patterns, acknowledges eccentricities and develops micro-narratives.

The subject of Chapter II is mainly the Norman bishops, abbots and precentors who came to England with little idea of what books they would find there. It refutes the

⁹⁷ In using ‘marginalia’ this way, I follow Jackson 2001, 7-8, 13.

suggestion that these men destroyed pre-Conquest manuscripts, either from malice or carelessness, by illustrating the processes through which they became familiar with the contents of Anglo-Saxon books, drawing particularly on the evidence of rubrication. It shows that these manuscripts were subsequently rebound and incorporated into inventories and library catalogues, and generally treated little different from newly-produced manuscripts.

Chapter III shows that pre-Conquest manuscripts were desirable acquisitions after 1066, whether through theft, donation or purchase. Anglo-Saxon books also circulated between houses for copying, indicating that precentors valued Anglo-Saxon resources. It attempts to trace whether the events of 1066 had any lasting impact on the circulation of books.

Chapter IV turns to readers' initial reactions when they opened pre-Conquest manuscripts in the twelfth century. It argues that script, abbreviation and orthography would have all seemed peculiar, but shows how readers could update these features to make them less of a barrier. Attentive twelfth-century readers could also be surprised by the kind of text some pre-Conquest books contained, often finding a different redaction to that with which they were familiar. Textual hybridisation inevitably resulted. Such textual corrections have a lot in common with alterations made to liturgical manuscripts, and to chronicles and cartularies, which were also modernised after 1066.

Chapter V focuses on the way readers registered their response to pre-Conquest manuscripts by glossing and annotating. Vernacular texts appear prominently, and the chapter argues that the post-Conquest classroom was trilingual. Habits of reading Latin school texts were also applied to vernacular texts. Homiliaries and other texts of spiritual

instruction were mediated and modernised with glosses in English and Latin. Such glosses show that readers appreciated Old English literature during the Anglo-Norman period.

Chapters VI and VII examine the symbolic capital which Anglo-Saxon books developed after 1066, and after the fixing of legal memory as *tempore regis Edwardi*. Chapter VI is particularly concerned with the practice of storing records in gospel books, liturgical books and patristic manuscripts, and tries to understand why a particular book was chosen to house a particular record, and how the age or cultural associations of the book contributed to the decision. Chapter VII shows that Anglo-Norman churchmen appreciated the saintly associations of pre-Conquest books like the Lindisfarne Gospels, and promoted other books as cult objects by associating them with men like Bede, Augustine of Canterbury, Dunstan and Oswald. It closes with an account of how the power of such books could be harnessed by different factions during disputes.

Chapter VIII, the conclusion, focuses on two areas to which the evidence collected in this thesis is especially relevant: the literary history of the period between 1066 and 1200, and the study of medieval reading practices, exploring how this thesis might help literary critics understand the circulation and readership of early medieval texts. It closes with some reflections on why the date and cultural consequences of 1066 still matter.

CHAPTER II: DESTRUCTION AND CONSERVATION

It has often been assumed that Norman churchmen treated the Anglo-Saxon religious and their traditions with contempt, and that hostility and intolerance characterised their first encounters with Anglo-Saxon culture. This chapter shows emphatically that this was not the case, and, by examining historical sources and surviving books, develops a picture of post-Conquest librarians and readers as pragmatists, who balked at the wanton destruction of usable manuscripts but were not shy to dismember obsolete books to provide spare vellum. Through a study of rubrics added to many Anglo-Saxon books, it shows that post-Conquest librarians, some of whom were certainly foreigners, carefully appraised the books which belonged to their houses, and that this process of identifying texts often led to other alterations, especially to the often haphazard *ordinatio* of pre-Conquest books. In due course, Anglo-Saxon books were rebound and inventoried in library catalogues, where they were treated identically to newly-produced books.

DID NORMAN CHURCHMEN DESTROY ANY PRE-CONQUEST MANUSCRIPTS?

Though St Albans Abbey received at least two bequests of books before the Conquest,¹ though its refoundation during the period of the Benedictine reform makes it likely that the abbey once possessed books copied by or for its own monks,² and though the pre-Conquest

¹ In his will (S1488), Archbishop Ælfric of Canterbury (d. 1005) included several clauses that benefited the abbey of St Albans. Ælfric asked the king to confirm that the monastery held the estate of *Cynesbyrig* (which probably consisted of a hide at Flamstead (Herts.) and five hides at *Watlingceaster*, i. e. St Albans). Ælfric granted St Albans an estate in London and lands at Tew and Osney in Oxfordshire. Finally, he bequeathed to St Albans his tent ‘7 his bec ealle’. For the text, see Kelly 2000, no. 133 (ii. 517-22).

Another document (S1532) records that a certain Wulf, now unidentifiable, left a missal to the abbey, as well as ecclesiastical vestments. For the text, see Keynes 1993b, 18-19; Crick 2007, nos. 13, 13A (198-200, 200-4).

² Byrhtferth of Ramsey records that St Albans was one of the monasteries which King Edgar offered Oswald to reform (*HCY* i. 427). Edgar’s offer must predate Oswald’s refoundation of Ramsey, which probably occurred in 965.

It has been suggested that it was at this time that St Albans acquired the exemplar for its post-Conquest illustrated *Psychomachia* (London, British Library, Cotton Titus D. xvi) and the manuscripts through which Ralph of Dunstable (*fl.* s. xii²) knew the Christian Latin poets Sedulius, Arator and Prosper: Thomson 1982b, i. 10.

book collection may also have contained older manuscripts,³ almost no pre-Conquest St Albans books survive. Indeed, only a single manuscript survives that can be convincingly associated with pre-Conquest St Albans: New York, Pierpont Morgan Library 926.⁴ The disparity between the paucity of surviving manuscripts and the riches implied in the secondary sources has sometimes been explained with reference to the character of Paul of Caen, who was abbot between 1077 and 1093:⁵

To me it seems more than coincidental that only a single pre-Conquest manuscript survives that is attributable to St Albans [. . .] To some extent this may reflect the fact that, before the Conquest, St Albans was remoter from the royal court and its immediate influence than it was later. But its first Norman abbot seems to have made a particularly vigorous attempt to obliterate the insular tradition in liturgy and learning there which he is on record as heartily despising.

This is a reference to a famous passage in the *Gesta abbatum monasterii Sancti Albani* of Matthew Paris (c. 1195-after 1259):⁶

Quod vero nullo modo potest excusari, tumbas venerabilium antecessorum suorum, Abbatum nobilium – quos rudes et idiotas consuevit appellare – delevit, vel contemnendo eos quia Anglicos, vel invidendo, quia fere omnes stirpe regali, vel magnatum praeclaro sanguine, fuerant procreati (*GASA* 62).

The same passage accuses Paul of losing land at *Barthona* because he treated its occupier with disdain, and of failing to translate the relics of King Offa. Paul may have been a harsh, unforgiving abbot,⁷ but it seems unlikely that he treated his predecessors or the English monks with contempt. It is more plausible that his destruction of the tombs of his predecessors and failure to translate the relics of Offa are later house traditions which

³ By the reign of Æthelred, the monks were claiming St Albans had been founded by King Offa: Crick 2001. Offa also founded (or is claimed to have founded) Bath, Bedford, Cookham, Crowland and Winchcombe. No eighth-century manuscripts survive from any of these foundations, though Offa is associated with the gift of a Wearmouth-Jarrow pandect to Worcester: see S118 and below 156.

⁴ Hartzell 1975; Thomson 1982b, no. 64. There is an outside possibility that the title page of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 206 (s. x¹) was supplied at St Albans s. xi/xii (see below 39-40).

⁵ Thomson 1982b, i. 10.

⁶ 'He destroyed the tombs of his venerable predecessors, noble abbots whom he was accustomed to call uncultured and uncouth, something which cannot be in any way excused, either treating them with contempt because they were English, or regarding them with envy because they were nearly all sprung from the royal line, or from the noble blood of the magnates'. For further commentary, see Knowles 1940, 118-9.

⁷ Anselm wrote Paul a letter from Bec congratulating him on his appointment as abbot and urging moderation in his treatment of monks (*Ep.* 80). Though the letter is conventional, it gives some sense of Paul's unsympathetic character.

developed to explain why there were no Anglo-Saxon tombs in the new abbey, dedicated in 1115. Indeed, the *Gesta abbatum* is uncertain whether the abbey ever possessed the relics of Offa, describing how Abbot Willigod failed to secure Offa's corpse because he was so filled with sorrow at the death of the king (*GASA* 7). In the *Vitae duae Offarum*, by contrast, Matthew Paris states that Offa was buried in a small chapel at Bedford on the river Ouse and that his remains were subsequently carried off by the river and goes on to berate the monks for their ingratitude to their founder.⁸ Paul cannot fairly be blamed for failing to translate Offa's bones, which calls into question the use of this passage to explain the loss of pre-Conquest St Albans manuscripts.

Indeed, the pre-Conquest history of St Albans Abbey is now notoriously obscure,⁹ and it is a brave scholar who draws any conclusions from the fragile evidence. Though both William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon briefly refer to the foundation of St Albans by King Offa (*GP* iv. 179, *HA* 246-7), our main source for the history of the abbey is the *Gesta abbatum Sancti Albani*. No early St Albans cartulary survives.¹⁰ The *Gesta abbatum* is generally unreliable and its transmission awaits study. Whether the *Gesta* drew on a mid-twelfth-century source remains disputed. Until an adequate edition of the text appears, its testimony must be treated with caution.¹¹

However, various types of evidence suggest there was institutional continuity at St Albans in the years around 1066. This makes it unlikely that Paul attempted to eliminate native traditions. With its fusion of Dorchester and Canterbury interests, Pierpont Morgan

⁸ Wats 1640, 32.

⁹ *VCH Herts* iv. 367-416; Williams 1917; Biddle 1977; Brooke 1977; Taylor 1995; Crick 2007. I am especially grateful to Dr Crick for her generosity in sharing sections of her book with me in advance of its publication.

¹⁰ The most important witnesses to the text of the St Albans cartulary, which did not reach its final form until after 1157, are Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, 7965-73 (3723) and London, British Library, Cotton Nero D. i (Matthew Paris's *Liber additamentorum*). For the Brussels manuscript, see Keynes 1993a.

¹¹ I hope to publish an article discussing the circulation of the *Gesta* shortly. For convenience, I cite here from Riley 1867.

926, probably produced in the second half of the eleventh century, can be associated with St Albans on liturgical grounds.¹² It reflects the needs of the community both before and after the Conquest.¹³ This is most evident in the contrast between Parts IV and V. Part V (fols. 74-78) contains liturgical materials for the feast of St Birinus.¹⁴ St Albans had been subject to the bishop of Dorchester before the Conquest, and he had to confirm bequests to the abbey.¹⁵ The St Albans monks would therefore have interested themselves in Dorchester's founder. However, after the Conquest, St Albans was affiliated with Canterbury, a tie perhaps formed during Stigand's archiepiscopate and strengthened by the avuncular relationship between Lanfranc and Paul of Caen.¹⁶ These affiliations are evident in Part IV (fols. 69-73), which contains the *Vita S. Alexi*. It has been suggested that the cult of St Alexis was introduced to England from Bec by Lanfranc, but, though probable, this cannot be proved.¹⁷ However, Canterbury influence is made more likely by the addition of a partial text of Anselm's dedicatory preface to the *Monologion* in the prickly script associated with Christ Church (fol. 69).¹⁸ It is possible the scribe was a monk of Canterbury or Bec recently transferred to St Albans.¹⁹ Pierpont Morgan 926 should be taken as evidence that there was

¹² Traces of the usual thirteenth-century St Albans ex libris, damaged during cropping, remain at the top of fol. 1r.

¹³ The manuscript is composite, and we cannot be sure that its five parts were bound together earlier than the fourteenth century, when a table detailing the contents of the whole volume was added (fol. i^v), though it is notable that none of the leaves at the end of the individual booklets show a degree of wear consistent with prolonged independent existence. The table of contents shows that the manuscript then ended with Cicero, *De amicitia*. No surviving insular copies of this text are earlier than the second half of the twelfth century: Munk Olsen 1982, i. 114 (Lael).

¹⁴ Hartzell 1975, pl. 3 (fol. 74r). For St Birinus, see Love 1996, xlix-lxxxviii.

¹⁵ See Crick 2007, 25-7.

¹⁶ The *Gesta* emphasises the importance of Paul's working relationship with his uncle. Paul became abbot 'procurante dicto Archiepiscopo Lanfranco' (*GASA* 52), the abbey was rebuilt 'Lanfranco efficaciter iuvante' (*GASA* 54), Wallingford Priory was founded 'consilio Lanfranci archiepiscopi' (*GASA* 56), while books were produced 'Lanfranco exemplaria ministrante' (*GASA* 58). In addition to providing practical support, Lanfranc set the tone for monastic observance at St Albans. The *Gesta* claims his *Constitutions* were implemented in the abbey (*GASA* 52), and Lanfranc may even have composed them with St Albans in mind: Knowles and Brooke 2002, xxxiii-v.

¹⁷ Mölk 1978; Hunt 2005, 219-20.

¹⁸ Thomson 1982b, pl. 5 (fol. 69r).

¹⁹ For this suggestion, see Thomson 1982b, i. 14.

more continuity between the earlier foundation of St Albans and Paul of Caen's abbacy than has hitherto been thought, and that Paul is unlikely to have been hostile to the pre-Conquest book collection.

There is further palaeographical evidence that Paul did not attempt to eliminate pre-Conquest practices at St Albans: manuscripts from his abbacy contain hands trained in English Caroline Minuscule. London, British Library, Harley 865, a late-eleventh-century collection of patristic texts that was at St Albans by the mid-twelfth century and probably written there, is mainly copied in this script,²⁰ as are the Gorehambury fragments, which come from a large monastic lectionary which covered the *temporale* and the *sanctorale*.²¹ Archaeological evidence supports this codicological evidence: the new abbey was constructed gradually and the pre-Conquest church was allowed to stand until the early twelfth century when the majority of the new abbey was complete.²² Anglo-Saxon transepts remain a striking feature of the abbey church, 'a very rare and extraordinary sight in a Norman building'.²³ The Norman abbey was not built over the late Anglo-Saxon burial ground.²⁴ Among the benefactors of St Albans during Paul's abbacy were a certain Ligulf and his wife, who were almost certainly English (*GASA* 60-1). At the election of Richard d'Aubigny in 1097, English monks still comprised a significant proportion of the bretheren, though they were growing old and dying off (*GASA* 66). The codicological, archaeological and literary evidence suggests that Paul did not attempt to eliminate Anglo-Saxon customs at St Albans and cannot be blamed for the destruction of pre-Conquest St Albans manuscripts.

²⁰ Wormald 1945, 135; Pächt, Dodwell et al. 1960, 277 n. 3; Thomson 1982b, no. 22 and pls. 2-4 (fols. 4v, 6r, 19r).

²¹ Hertford, Hertfordshire Record Office, Gorehambury X. D. 4. B + X. D. 4. C: Thomson 1982b, i. 77 and pl. 259. The fragments are now the wrappers for two sixteenth-century court books from the manor of Kingsbury in Hertfordshire, and it for this reason they have been assigned to St Albans.

²² Biddle and Kjølbye-Biddle 2001, 73.

²³ Brooke 1977, 51.

²⁴ See the map in Biddle and Kjølbye-Biddle 2001, 67.

There are two other, more likely, explanations for the non-survival of pre-Conquest St Albans manuscripts: the loss of manuscripts between the death of Leofstan in 1065 and the appointment of Paul, and the loss of manuscripts during the later Middle Ages. The disparity between the *Gesta's* statements about the level of book production during Paul's abbacy and the limited number of surviving manuscripts datable to this period suggests St Albans manuscripts were lost after his abbacy and not during it. The *Gesta* describes Paul's provisions for the production of books in some detail:²⁵

Inter cætera autem, contulit quidam nobilis, armis strenuus, natione Neuster, huic ecclesiæ, tempore et persuasu hujus Abbatis Pauli, duas partes decimarum de suo dominio in villa de Hatfeld, quæ cessit ei in sortem distributionis; et assignavit, sic volente Abbate Paulo, scripturarum amatore, ad volumina ecclesiæ facienda. Erat autem miles ille litteratus, diligens auditor et amator Scripturarum. Ad quod officium additæ sunt quædam decimæ in Redburna; et constituit quædam duaria dari scriptoribus, de eleemosyna fratrum et Cellarii, quia prompta fuerant, ad edendum, ne scriptores impedirentur [...] Ibique fecit Abbas ab electis et procul quæsitis, scriptoribus scribi nobilia volumina, ecclesiæ necessaria; solaque civitate, qua affluebat, contulit præfato militi Roberto, ad cappellam suam in curia de Hathfeld, duo paria vestimentorum, unum calicem argenteum, missale, cum aliis libris necessariis [...] Postquam autem præfato militi librarium suum, primo paratum, liberaliter contulerat, continuo in ipso, quod construxit, scriptorio libros prælectos scribi fecit, Lanfranco exemplaria ministrante (*GASA* 57-8).

No Robert has yet been identified.²⁶ Paul also presented books to the abbey. According to the *Gesta*, Paul gave twenty-eight notable volumes, along with eight psalters, a collectar, an epistolary, a gospel lectionary (*librum in quo continetur Evangelia legenda per annum*), two jewelled gospel-books, not without (*sine*) ordinals, customaries, missals, tropers, more collectars and other books (*GASA* 58). Paul's bequest seems to have consisted mainly of service-books,

²⁵ 'Among other gifts, a certain Norman nobleman, skilled in arms, persuaded by Abbot Paul, gave this abbey two parts of the tithe from his lands (*suo dominio*) in the vill of Hatfield which had fallen to him in the luck of the draw (*sortem distributionis*). In accordance with the wishes of Abbot Paul, who was a lover of the scriptures (*scripturarum amatore*), he assigned the tithe to the making of books for the church. He was a literate knight, a careful listener and lover of the scriptures. To this gift were added certain tithes from Redbourn; and he (Paul?) established a daily food ration to be given to the *scriptores*, from the alms of the brothers and the cellarer because these were ready prepared for eating (*quia prompta fuerant ad edendum*), lest the *scriptores* be impeded [by hunger] [...] Then the abbot caused noble volumes, necessary to the church, to be written by *scriptores* chosen and sought from afar. With his accustomed graciousness, he gave the aforementioned knight Robert two sets of vestments, a silver drinking cup [and] a missal with other necessary books for his chapel in Hatfield (*in curia de Hathfeld*) [...] After he had generously given the aforementioned knight the books first produced (*primo paratum*), he caused to be written selected (*prælectos*) books in the *scriptorium* which he constructed, Lanfranc supplying the exemplars'. For an alternative translation and commentary, see Thomson 1982b, i. 13.

²⁶ *GDB*, fol. 135r records that Hatfield (Herts.) was in the possession of the abbot of Ely TRE and TRW.

just as the books produced in the new *scriptorium* were predominantly *ecclesiae necessaria*. Perhaps high-grade liturgical books belonging to St Albans had been plundered in the aftermath of the Conquest. However, patristic texts were also being read at St Albans at this time. After Paul's death, Anselm wrote to the monks to address a dissension that had arisen amongst the brothers (*quandam dubitationem inter vos ortam esse cum aliqua dissensione*) concerning the Latin and Greek terms for 'substance' and their impact for the understanding of Christ's incarnation (*Anselmi Ep.* 204). However, only two books or fragments of books – the Gorehambury fragments and Harley 865 – survive that have been attributed to Paul's abbacy, though the low number may reflect the difficulty of dating St Albans books accurately.²⁷ Nonetheless, the disparity between the *Gesta* and this surviving evidence strongly suggests that many St Albans manuscripts were lost after Paul's abbacy.

Equally, pre-Conquest St Albans manuscripts may have fallen into disrepair or been plundered after the death of Abbot Leofstan in 1065. When Paul became abbot in 1077, the monastery was 'almost entirely run to ruin' (*GP* iv. 179) and 'nearly run to ruin almost inside and out' (*HN* 15). These comments suggest that the abbey's muniments suffered substantial depredations before Paul became abbot. Some manuscripts may have been lost after the

²⁷ See Gullick 1990, 78n18 ('my belief is that in his text Thomson has probably dated at least some of these manuscripts too late by up to a quarter of a century'). Gullick would redate Scribe A to the first decade of the twelfth century.

Another piece of evidence suggests that many St Albans manuscripts may be earlier than has been previously considered. Herbert Losinga wrote to an abbot Richard requesting a Josephus, formerly damaged but now 'put to rights and bound' (*correcto et ligato*). By the time Herbert wrote again, shortly after the death of Anselm in 1109, the Josephus is no longer among the books he requests. The implication may be that Richard (who it seems probable was Richard d'Aubigny, abbot of St Albans, rather than Richard, abbot of Ely) had sent the Josephus in the interim. The Josephus sent by Richard is probably the two-volume St Albans copy of Josephus's *Antiquities* and *Wars*, now London, British Library, Royal 13. D. vi + vii, or more likely its exemplar. Royal 13. D. vi + vii may therefore have been produced before 1109. This is problematic, because the manuscript has usually been dated at least a decade later. For the letters, see Goulburn and Symonds 1878, i. 251, 268. (Interestingly, the transmission of Herbert's letters depends on a transcript of a lost St Albans manuscript: Wahlgren-Smith 2005, 231-2). On the St Albans copy of Josephus, see Pächt, Dodwell et al. 1960, 156-57, 168 (where the artist is judged to be a 'close assistant of Alexis master'); Kauffmann 1975, no. 32 (c. 1120-1130) and ills. 88 and 89 (Royal 13. D. vi, fols. 61v and 77v); Thomson 1982b, no. 36 and pls. A, 38-41 (Royal 13. D. vi, fols. 115v, 1r, 61v, 3r, 186r), no. 37 and pls. B, 42-44 (Royal 13. D. vii, fols. 170v, 1r, 16r, 28r).

death of Leofstan. His death, probably shortly before the Conquest,²⁸ coincided with the death of Wulfwig of Dorchester, the diocesan, so it is not implausible that – as the *Liber Eliensis* claims – Stigand took the abbey under his own control (*in manu sua receperat*, *LE* ii. 98).²⁹ The Domesday Book reports that Stigand held two St Albans manors in 1066: Redbourn and Napsbury (*GDB* fol. 135v). He may have held other estates which later passed to the Conqueror’s allies.³⁰ William I confirmed to St Albans privileges as they were held by Archbishop Stigand.³¹ According to Ely tradition, Stigand appointed a certain Ecgfrith as abbot, who subsequently fled to join Stigand in Ely with the relics of St Alban and the abbey’s treasures (*LE* ii. 103). The elopement of an Abbot Ecgfrith to Ely with the *thesauris ecclesiae illius* would provide a convenient explanation for the lack of surviving high-grade liturgical books from St Albans, but it is less certain whether patristic manuscripts or classbooks would have counted among the *thesauris*.³² However, it is not clear whether the Ely tradition can be relied upon. The *Gesta* does not mention an Ecgfrith, but identifies Paul’s predecessor as one Abbot Frederick, and Frederick, abbot of St Albans, witnessed the Conqueror’s ‘constitution’ concerning the primacy in 1072,³³ suggesting credence should be given to the *Gesta*. Almost nothing is known of him, though, to judge from the statements of William of Malmesbury and Eadmer, his effect on the monastery must have been damaging. Books may well have been lost during his abbacy.

²⁸ The *Gesta* cannot decide if Frederick, Leofstan’s ostensible successor, was appointed in 1064 or 1066 (*GASA* 44). For what follows, compare Crick 2007, 27-30.

²⁹ For Stigand, see Brooks 1984, 304-13; Smith 1994.

³⁰ Odo of Bayeux held sixteen hides at Tew in Oxfordshire in 1086 (*GDB* fol. 155v). *GDB* reports the estate was in the hands of Æthelnoth of Kent TRE, though *GASA* (53) claims the estate was lost by Abbot Frederick. For the suggestion that Odo benefited from the alienations of Earl Godwine and Archbishop Stigand rather than alienating lands himself, see Bates 1975, 9.

³¹ Bates 1998, no. 249 (p. 758).

³² On the type of books seized as plunder after the Conquest, see below 67-70.

³³ Bates 1998, no. 68 (pp. 311-4).

Though St Albans undoubtedly possessed a number of manuscripts before the Conquest, none of these survive, but this is not because of the prejudices of Abbot Paul, real or imagined. The effects of the Conquest were felt unusually strongly at St Albans as a result of the deaths of both its abbot and diocesan bishop shortly before 1066. Some books may have been taken by monks who broke their vow of stability during the uncertain years after 1066.³⁴ Others may have been taken by Stigand, Ecgfrith or Frederick, and in due course passed to other houses. Some may simply have suffered from neglect. In this, the situation at St Albans is not atypical.

PHYSICAL EVIDENCE FOR THE DESTRUCTION OF MANUSCRIPTS DURING THE ANGLO-NORMAN PERIOD

Historians and literary critics have often commented on likely losses of pre-Conquest art and literature.³⁵ Theft, fire, and the metalworker's furnace doubtless took their toll, but there is little sign that post-Conquest churchmen deliberately destroyed Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. However, post-Conquest binders were happy to use leaves from dismembered or damaged manuscripts in binding newly-produced books. The manuscripts lost in this manner seem to have been ancient copies of common Latin texts or liturgical books, not 'The Lost Literature of Medieval England'.

There is no evidence that disdainful Norman churchmen encouraged or permitted the destruction of pre-Conquest manuscripts to make parchment available for palimpsesting.³⁶ To judge from the three examples known to me, pre-Conquest manuscripts do not appear to have been recycled in this way until the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries,

³⁴ On such alienations, see below 66-7.

³⁵ Wilson 1952; Dodwell 1973; Dodwell 1982; Henderson 1982.

³⁶ Though this did occasionally happen on the Continent, where, for example, a palimpsested leaf from an eleventh-century copy of the Old English Orosius was used by a late-eleventh-century Trier scribe to copy the last leaf of a life of St Gertrude (Rome, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. Lat. 497, fol. 71). See Ker 1957, no. 391 (p. 459); Bately 1964. On palimpsests more generally, see Lowe 1964; Bischoff 1990, 11-12; DeClercq 2007.

though the act of palimpsesting the vellum need not immediately have preceded the rewriting. It would seem that these pre-Conquest manuscripts were palimpsested because they were written in outdated scripts, like Uncial or Square Minuscule, and thus considered obsolete. For example, a mid-thirteenth-century collection of the works of William de Montibus contains one quire in noticeably thicker vellum which bears very faint traces of a text in early continental minuscule.³⁷ It is very difficult to decipher enough script to determine what the underlying text was, though the suggestion that it was a sacramentary is not implausible, since the underlying script is quite large (the rulings are c. 13mm apart).³⁸ A second example is a scruffy thirteenth-century collection of school texts, which was entirely copied on palimpsested vellum.³⁹ The first three quires (each of eight) are formed from twelve leaves of a late eighth-century insular gospel book (or perhaps bible), palimpsested and folded sideways.⁴⁰ By contrast, the last quire (a ten) appears to be formed from palimpsested leaves of a more recent manuscript, written in textura.⁴¹ Finally, palimpsested leaves from a copy of Virgil's *Aeneid* in Phase II Square Minuscule,⁴² along with a single palimpsested leaf of a twelfth-century gradual⁴³ and other leaves, were used in the fourteenth century to copy a variety of poems and other short texts that now bracket a copy of the Bury chronicle of John of Taxter to 1265, which has been continued to 1296.⁴⁴ By contrast, there is no evidence of post-Conquest scribes dismembering, palimpsesting and rewriting Anglo-Saxon manuscripts.

³⁷ Cambridge, Trinity Hall, 24, fols. 70-112. Fols. 78-83 are the palimpsest leaves.

³⁸ James 1907, 39-41. See also Lowe 1972, no. 1680.

³⁹ London, British Library, Additional 21213. The manuscript may have been at Fünfkirchen in Hungary by the fourteenth century; see Lowe 1972, no. 169.

⁴⁰ The written area of the gospel-book appears to have measured c. 250x175mm, and borne 26 lines of text, probably in two columns. The Eusebian passages were marked in the margin.

⁴¹ The underlying script is most legible on fol. 27r, but it is not possible to decipher more than a few words.

⁴² London, College of Arms, Arundel 30, fols. 5-10 and 208. See Dumville 1987, 144; Rushforth 2002, 191-2.

⁴³ Arundel 30, fol. 2: Hartzell 2006, no. 196 (p. 339).

⁴⁴ Gransden 1964, xxxviii-xlii.

However, it is clear that post-Conquest scribes did not regard Anglo-Saxon manuscripts as inviolate. For example, someone erased one page of a tenth-century copy of the Old English *Solomon and Saturn* bound at the front of the ‘Red Book of Darley’ to make space for a Latin formula of excommunication, scruffily copied in two twelfth-century hands, without rulings.⁴⁵ Why and when *Solomon and Saturn*, perhaps already in very imperfect shape, was bound at the front of the liturgical book has not yet been determined,⁴⁶ and how its function there changed sufficiently to permit its partial erasure is equally unclear.⁴⁷ Moreover, there is some evidence that post-Conquest readers were in the habit of plundering the margins of pre-Conquest manuscripts for small strips of vellum.⁴⁸

Indeed, it is evident that fragments from Anglo-Saxon books were used in the binding of post-Conquest manuscripts from at least the turn of the eleventh century. The practice was not new: Anglo-Saxon binders seem to have been happy to use leaves from outdated manuscripts or reject leaves in bindings as flyleaves.⁴⁹ The fragments which post-

⁴⁵ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 422, p. 14; printed Liebermann 1898-1916, i. 435.

⁴⁶ The first hand of the excommunication formula on p. 14 recurs on p. 49, copying the end of a mass for St Helen. Three leaves are missing from the two quires, and the text ends imperfectly: the collation is 1⁸ (wants 7 after p. 12), 2⁸ (wants 3 after p. 18 and 6 after p. 22).

⁴⁷ London, British Library, Egerton 874, fols. 67r/5-69v does not present a parallel example, despite Hartzell’s suggestion that ‘a distinct portion of the original text was erased and notated texts entered’: Hartzell 2006, no. 150 (p. 275). Egerton 874 is a ninth-century, continental copy of Caesarius of Arles, *In Apocalypsin*, and fols. 68v-69v now contain antiphons and responsories for the feast of St Augustine of Canterbury, a single chant for the feast of Gregory the Great (both s. xi²) and an ink drawing of a man’s head (s. xii^{med}). Fols. 67r/5-14, 67v and 68r all contain traces of erased chants. However, it would seem that the scribe’s exemplum for *In Apocalypsin* had an evident lacuna after ‘facta enim dissensione foris erit homo’, the words with which the text now breaks off, and he left what he considered to be sufficient blank space to copy the missing text should another exemplar be found. A similar lacuna occurs in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 30, fols. 44r/17-45v (Glastonbury, 940x956), and Morin suggests this is because Hatton 30 was copied from Egerton 874: Morin 1942, ii. 249n21. If this hypothesis is correct, the leaves in Egerton 874 were blank when the eleventh-century scribe added the chants.

⁴⁸ In Cambridge, University Library, Ee. 2. 4 + Oxford, Bodleian Library, Lat. th. c. 3, fols. 1, 1*, 2 (Smaragdus, *Expositio in Regulam S. Benedicti*, s. x^{med}, W or SW England? (Glastonbury?)), the lower margins of fols. 57, 69, 90, 94, 102, 103, 131, 151 have been cut away, generally with no loss of text; fol. 86 was torn out. The last line of fol. 102ra ([p]eccator[us] essem[us] ille p[ro] nobis mortuus) was resupplied in a mid-twelfth-century hand, which shows the lower margin had been clumsily removed by this date. For the text, see Spannagel 1974, 178/17-18.

⁴⁹ Two mid-tenth-century St Augustine’s manuscripts (London, British Library, Cotton Cleopatra A. iii and London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius A. xix) had flyleaves from a s. viii² copy of Augustine, *De consensu Evangelistarum* [CPL 273], which were probably introduced the first time the manuscripts were bound. The flyleaves are now kept as London, British Library, Cotton Cleopatra A. iii*. Similarly, the front and end

Conquest binders introduced into bindings usually came from very ancient manuscripts or outdated liturgical books. A scruffy late-eleventh- or early-twelfth-century copy of the Latin version of Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca*,⁵⁰ an account of early Christian monachism in Egypt, now has two leaves bound at the front: an early-eighth-century fragment of the *Psalterium Romanum* (fol. i),⁵¹ and a leaf containing lore concerning the psalms in a contemporary hand (fol. ii).⁵² The psalter leaf was part of the binding very shortly after the manuscript was produced, as a contemporary *probatio pennae* on the recto shows; the Origen leaf should be understood either as a reject leaf from another manuscript, recycled as a second flyleaf, or as a blank flyleaf, used almost immediately for another text. Unfortunately, it is not clear when a fragment of an eighth-century manuscript of Cassiodorus's commentary on the Psalms entered the binding of a Ramsey volume produced during the second half of the twelfth century and containing commentaries on the Apocalypse, a life of St Botolph and a tract on fasting by Ambrose.⁵³ The use of these fragments in bindings is an interesting contrast to the respect accorded to ancient manuscripts, no matter how imperfect or fragile, at other centres, particularly Durham.⁵⁴ Indeed, a leaf from the 'Royal Bible' (a bible which is perhaps to be identified as one of the manuscripts which Thomas of Elmham reports were venerated at St Augustine's Abbey in the fifteenth century) had found its way, along with a fragment of

flyleaves (fols. 1, 120) of London, British Library, Royal 5 E. xi, a s. x/xi copy of Aldhelm's *Prosa de virginitate* from Christ Church, seem to be rejected leaves, replaced contemporaneously with fols. 116, 117 (leaves 4, 5 in the last quire), probably on account of their inferior vellum.

⁵⁰ Cambridge, University Library, Ff. 5. 27; see Bishop 1953, 433. The text is related to the so-called *Paradisus Heraclidis*, printed PL 74, cols. 243-342.

⁵¹ Bishop 1954; Lowe 1960, 19; Wright 1961, 445.

⁵² The text on the leaf is split into four sections: 'de dictis origenis', 'de differentia missarum et psalterii', 'interpretatio alleluia' and 'gloriae interpretatio'. The first corresponds with the opening of Jerome's *Tractatus LIX in Psalmos* [CPL 592], though this may not be its immediate source. I have not been able to identify the other portions of text.

⁵³ Cambridge, St John's College, 209 (H. 6). The fragment is now kept as Aa. 5. 1 (267), fol. 67; for its significance, see Bailey and Handley 1983.

⁵⁴ See below, Chapter VII.

a gospel list from Corbie, into the binding of a tenth-century copy of John the Deacon's *Vita S. Gregorii* by the turn of the eleventh century.⁵⁵

These examples are easily multiplied. Fragments of a fourth-century manuscript of Cyprian's letters were used along with fragments of a late-ninth-century copy of the Old English Martyrology in the binding of a collection of school texts from the second half of the twelfth century.⁵⁶ The boards of a copy of Bede's commentary on Songs produced at Christ Church in the first half of the twelfth century have offsets from a sixth- or seventh-century manuscript of Arator's *Historia Apostolica*.⁵⁷ Unfortunately the fragments which left the offsets do not survive,⁵⁸ and the boards, though contemporary, appear to have been reversed in the fourteenth century,⁵⁹ which makes it difficult to determine when the pastedowns were introduced into the binding. Moreover, though the fragments of a late-eighth-century English bible and mid-eighth-century sacramentary from Chelles once used in the binding of a late-twelfth- or early-thirteenth-century manuscript containing the metrical life of Edward the Confessor can only have entered this binding after the manuscript's production, some stray pentrials suggest they may have been loose or in another binding for some time preceding this.⁶⁰ There is thus ample evidence that post-Conquest binders were willing to use single leaves from ancient manuscripts as flyleaves. It is probable that they were simply recycling irreparably damaged books, and not maiming serviceable volumes.

Leaves from obsolete liturgical manuscripts were also used in bindings, but to judge from the surviving evidence, less frequently. Four leaves from a tenth-century Breton sacramentary were part of the binding of a late-eleventh- or early-twelfth-century Exeter

⁵⁵ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 381. The bible fragment has now been reclassified as Lat. bib. b. 2 (P). For Elmham, see below 186-7.

⁵⁶ London, British Library, Additional 40165B. The fragments are now kept as Additional 40165A.

⁵⁷ Oxford, Bodleian Library, e Mus. 66. For the script of the Bede, see Bishop 1953, 438; Dodwell 1954, 123.

⁵⁸ Ker, Lowe et al. 1944.

⁵⁹ Pächt and Alexander 1966, iii, no. 87.

⁶⁰ Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, 153/203; the fragments are now 820/810(h) and 820/810(k).

copy of Gregory's *Homiliae xl in euangelia* by the second half of the twelfth century.⁶¹ Leaves from a troper of disputed date (perhaps pre-Conquest, but conceivably as late as the end of the eleventh century) are now part of the binding of a late-eleventh- or early-twelfth-century copy of Julianus Pomerius which may be from Winchester.⁶² Leaves from recent, non-liturgical manuscripts were also occasionally used in bindings,⁶³ as were reject leaves from newly-copied books,⁶⁴ but, significantly, there are few examples involving the use of vernacular manuscripts.⁶⁵

The evidence shows that post-Conquest binders were just as pragmatic as their Anglo-Saxon predecessors, and recycled leaves from ancient, irreparably damaged books as binding material. However, the marked predominance of ancient books, rather than late Anglo-Saxon liturgical books or 'the lost literature of medieval England' suggests that natural wastage and not deliberate destruction created this supply of useful scrap vellum. This, in turn, suggests that the identification of books that were too fragile or aged to be useful was based on a careful evaluation of a particular book collection and not mindless caprice; and it is to this careful evaluation we now turn.

⁶¹ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 314, fols. ii, iii, 98, 99.

⁶² Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 126, fols. ii, iii, 60, 61. Mention should also be made of the fragments of a s. xi² gradual which are in the binding of Dublin, Trinity College, 371 (D. 1. 26), a copy of Æthicus Ister's *Cosmographia* from the second half of the twelfth century (below 54), but these do not appear to have entered the binding until after Eastrý's time.

⁶³ Fragments of scholia on Terence (fols. i, ii) have been part of Cambridge, St John's College, 164 (F. 27), a tenth-century collection of hagiography of St Benedict, since at least the early twelfth century to judge from the title of this date on fol. i^r. The flyleaves are not listed by Gneuss, though the probability must be that they were in England before his cut-off of 1100.

⁶⁴ A rejected leaf from a late-eleventh-century manuscript of Augustine's *Enchiridion* [CPL 295] (which now itself only survives in fragments as Oxford, Bodleian Library, Lat th. d. 33 + Oxford, St John's College, Ss. 7. 2, pastedowns) was used in the binding of the oldest surviving manuscript of the Rule of St Benedict (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 48, fol. 77) at Worcester. See Pollard 1975, no. 2 (pp. 140-2).

⁶⁵ Twenty leaves (fols. i-x, 1-10) from an eleventh-century copy of Ælfric's *Homilies* were used as flyleaves of a thirteenth-century copy of Petrus Comestor (Cambridge, Jesus College, 15 (Q. A. 15)). The manuscript was at Durham by 1391: Durham lettermark '(P)E' (fol. 1r); Botfield 1838, 22 (P), 99 (P). Professor Jonathan Wilcox has prepared a description for the 'Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile' series, and I am grateful to him for sharing this description with me before its publication. One might also mention London, British Library, Additional 40165 A.2 (above 34) and London, British Library, Harley 2110, fols. 4* and 5* (below 63).

EVALUATING AND CONSERVING PRE-CONQUEST BOOKS

During the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the responsibility of caring for a monastery's book collection (as well as its music) fell to the precentor.⁶⁶ However, with the exception of egregious men like Eadmer (d. 1124) and William of Malmesbury (d. 1143), we know little about the individuals who held this role. Some post-Conquest precentors were foreigners, such as Osbern (d. 1094), a Norman, who was precentor at Christ Church; and Goscelin (d. after 1114), a Fleming, who was precentor at St Augustine's. Confronted with an unfamiliar collection of books, the first task for such men must have been discovering and recording what texts were in which books. We can observe this process in a number of pre-Conquest manuscripts, and through the career and activities of Symeon of Durham.

Symeon seems to have first come to England with William of St Carilef in 1091 and became Durham's cantor at some point thereafter. He died around 1130, still apparently taking an active part in Durham's book production and library administration.⁶⁷ Symeon copied books and wrote charters,⁶⁸ sometimes copying a work in its entirety, but often merely writing an example passage for another scribe to follow.⁶⁹ He was frequently responsible for adding rubrics, initials, quire signatures, quotation marks and content notes, and also made corrections, presumably by comparing a manuscript to its exemplar.⁷⁰ Symeon introduced supply leaves into two manuscripts, one of which was pre-Conquest.⁷¹ He also made additions to manuscripts,⁷² some of which had belonged to the Community of St

⁶⁶ Fassler 1985; Sharpe 2006. We can infer the existence of a similar office at secular houses.

⁶⁷ Gullick 1994; Gullick 1998. For evidence that Symeon was cantor in 1126, see Farmer 1957, 76.

⁶⁸ e. g. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 175; Durham, D&C Muniments 2. 1 Pont. 1.

⁶⁹ e. g. London, British Library, Harley 491, fols. 3-46 (where he copied fol. 3r/1-8); London, British Library, Harley 4688 (where he wrote fols. 1-7r/7).

⁷⁰ e. g. Durham, Cathedral Library, A. IV. 16, fols. 66-109; Durham, Cathedral Library, B. II. 8.

⁷¹ Durham, Cathedral Library, B. IV. 13; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 819. Bodley 819 is a late-eighth-century copy of Bede's commentary on Proverbs.

⁷² e. g. a list of the works of Augustine added to Durham, Cathedral Library, B. IV. 7, fol. 2rv; and an inventory of the donations of Bishop William of St Carilef added to Durham, Cathedral Library, A. II. 4, fol. 1r.

Cuthbert for centuries, such as the *Liber vitae*.⁷³ Symeon's activities clearly demonstrate the cantor's involvement in assaying and maintaining the pre-Conquest Durham books, and how this work interacted with the mainstream of book production. We can trace the work of other, anonymous, precentors in surviving manuscripts.

Cambridge, St John's College, 101 (D. 26), fols. 1-14, is a copy of the twelfth book of Cassian's *De institutis coenobiorum* written at St Augustine's Abbey in the mid-tenth century.⁷⁴ It is not clear if it remained there through the Middle Ages. These fourteen folios appear to consist of a quire of eight followed by a quire of ten, lacking its fourth, eighth, ninth and tenth leaves; the first quire is signed 'i.' on the last verso, which implies Book Twelve was not originally part of a complete copy of the text. Book Twelve was originally preceded only by an unnumbered list of chapters under the heading 'CAPIT', but a scribe of the first half of the twelfth century added the title 'incipit liber de spiritu superbie 7 de eius natura' (fol. 1v) before the beginning of the text proper, in black protogothic minuscule.⁷⁵ Similarly, titles were added to two copies of Isidore, *De fide catholica contra Iudaeos* [CPL 1198], produced during the second half of the tenth century.⁷⁶ Both manuscripts were definitely at Exeter in 1506,⁷⁷ and probably there in 1327,⁷⁸ though only one copy is mentioned in Leofric's

⁷³ See below, 189-98.

⁷⁴ Bishop 1957, 330.

⁷⁵ I have been unable to find an exact parallel for this title, though it was probably fairly common: compare Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct D. infra 2. 9 (Cant StA, s. x²), fol. 97v ('QUOD OCTAUUM CERTAMEN ADVERSUS SPIRITUM SUPERBIAE SIT. ET DE NATURA EIUS') and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 730 (Buildwas, s. xii^{ex}), fol. 56va ('Incipit de superbia liber duodecimus. Quod octauum certamen aduersus spiritum superbie sit. et de natura eius').

⁷⁶ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 319; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 394, fols. 1-84.

⁷⁷ Bodley 319 is the 'Liber de Miraculis Christi, 2 fo. 'Quare mortuus', Oliver 1861, 367. The first words of fol. 2r are actually 'Quia mortuus'. Bodley 394, fols. 1-84, is the 'Ysodorus ad Florentium, 2 fo. 'De latere', Oliver 1861, 372.

⁷⁸ Bodley 319 is probably the 'Ad Florentinam de Miraculis Christi: 'Quia Christus', valued at 1s, in the 1327 catalogue: Oliver 1861, 303. Bodley 394 is almost certainly the 'Ad Florentinam: 'Judei nepharia', valued at 2s: Oliver 1861, 303. 'Iudei nefaria' are the eighth and ninth words of the text proper, but in Bodley 394 *Iudei* has a large capital I, which caused the cataloguer to mistake these words for the incipit of the text proper.

donation list.⁷⁹ None of the original rubrics in either book gave any indication of the identity of the text or its author, so a late-eleventh or early-twelfth-century scribe added the title ‘LIBER SANCTI ISIDORI ad FLORENTIAM [...] MIRACULIS XPI’ in rough black rustic capitals to Bodley 394 (fol. 1r), and a somewhat earlier scribe added ‘Liber de miraculis xpi’ to Bodley 319 (fol. 1r).⁸⁰ The task of identifying and titling texts in pre-Conquest manuscripts went on well beyond the twelfth century.⁸¹

Often damage to the beginning of a manuscript meant it was not clear what text the book contained. London, British Library, Royal 4 A. xiv contains a composite commentary on Psalms CIX to CL (fols. 1-105r), and a sermon on Numbers XX.10 (fols. 105r-6v), both written in the same mid-tenth-century Square Minuscule.⁸² The manuscript now consists of thirteen quires, but the first quire has the contemporary signature ‘XXVII’ (fol. 8v), which suggests that the book originally contained commentary on all 150 psalms.⁸³ Nonetheless, the first recto has the title ‘INCIPIT TRACTATUS SANCTI IERONIMI PRESBITERI IN LIBRO PSALMORUM’ in red display script of the type practised at Worcester during the late eleventh century.⁸⁴ This title suggests that the manuscript was acephalous (having lost its first twenty-six quires) by the late eleventh century, meaning it would not have been clear

⁷⁹ ‘Liber Isidori de miraculis Christi’: Lapidge 1985, X. 47.

⁸⁰ Interestingly, though both books were at Exeter from at least 1327, there is no evidence they were ever compared. Late eleventh-century corrections in Bodley 394 alter readings which it shared with Bodley 319 (e. g. *depreca(ns)\tus/* est, fol. 1v/19; *de mort(al)i)e/ liberauit*, fol. 2r/6 etc). However, it has been suggested Bodley 319 was the exemplar for London, British Library, Royal 5 E. xvi (Salisbury, s. xi^{ex}): Webber 1992, 68.

⁸¹ e. g. the thirteenth-century ‘Incipit Epistole alquini’ added to London, British Library, Harley 208, fol. 1r. Untitled unique compositions presented a particular problem, and could often only be given a generic title, even after a thorough perusal of the text, e. g. the late-twelfth-century title ‘Glosariu[m] cu[m] int[er]p[re]tatio[n]e anglie [...]’ added to London, British Library, Cotton Cleopatra A. iii, fol. 4r.

⁸² Dumville 1991, 48. A vernacular charm and two lines of Latin were added in the mid-twelfth century (fol. 106v): charm printed Storms 1948, no. 4.

⁸³ Though the script of Royal 4 A. xiv is undeniably similar to the mid-tenth-century Square Minuscule of the text of the psalms and their interlinear Old English and marginal Latin glosses in London, British Library, Royal 2 B. v (‘The Regius Psalter’), fols. 8-187r, Ker’s suggestion that Royal 4 A. xiv is ‘a companion volume’ to Royal 2 B. v is misleading: Ker 1957, 320. Royal 2 B. v has five remaining quire signatures (fols. 15v, 23v, 55v, 63v and 71v) which are comparable with those in Royal 4 A. xiv, but originally only consisted of twenty-three quires. It is unlikely these twenty-three quires were among the twenty-six quires missing from Royal 4 A. xiv.

⁸⁴ Ker 1957, no. 250 (p. 320). The manuscript was certainly at Worcester after the Dissolution: Atkins and Ker 1944, no. 5.

what the text was to a casual reader. The rubricator probably ascertained the identity of the work from the closing rubric: 'EXPLICIT TRACTAT[US] SANCTI HIERONIMI IN LIBRO PSALMORUM' (fol. 105r). He may also have touched some initials with red (fol. 1r), suggesting he was concerned with the *ordinatio* more generally.

Two further examples can be adduced. The first is a ninth-century Northern French copy of Julian of Toledo, *Prognosticon futuri saeculi* [CPL 1258], which was in England during the first half of the tenth century, as corrections in insular minuscule of this date show (e. g. fol. 1r/15).⁸⁵ The title page was supplied on an added bifolium (fol. ii^v) during the first half of the twelfth century after the excision or loss of the first leaf of the first quire.⁸⁶ A contemporary scribe also supplied the end of the text (fols. 136-139r) in a quire of uncertain construction,⁸⁷ and made a few corrections (e. g. fol. 1v/5). The contrast between the script, ornament and spelling of the supplied title page and the first leaf of the text proper is quite striking. The second example concerns a collection of texts pertaining to the liberal arts, probably English, from the first half of the tenth century.⁸⁸ It may have been the copy of the *Peri Hermeneias* which Leland saw at Malmesbury.⁸⁹ The title-page of Martianus Capella's *De dialectica* (Book IV of his *De nuptiis*) was supplied at the turn of the eleventh century (fol. 1r).⁹⁰ Fol. 1 is the first leaf of the first quire and fol. 1v contains the beginning of the text proper in the original hand. Since there is no sign of erasure, fol. 1r must have been left blank for some reason, with the opening page of the text (if there ever was one) on a

⁸⁵ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 399. For its origin, see Bischoff 1998, no. 819.

⁸⁶ Budny 1997, pl. 102.

⁸⁷ Q18, probably an eight (wants 2, 5, 6) or perhaps a six (wants 5), as James would have it. The text supplied is 'cuiusdam uestantis [*sic*] ... nullus est finis': Hillgarth 1976, 122/16-126/18.

⁸⁸ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 206.

⁸⁹ Thomson 1982a, 10.

⁹⁰ Budny 1997, pl. XIII. The supplied text is Willis 1983, 105/21-106/19.

separate bifolium, or at the end of a preceding quire, now lost.⁹¹ The glosses on the supplied title page come from the Remigian tradition, unlike those for the rest of the text, suggesting the scribe had to use an independent exemplar.⁹²

The act of identifying texts and rubricating pre-Conquest manuscripts often led scribes to make more extensive alterations. For example, Cambridge, Pembroke College, 83 is a ninth-century copy of Bede on Luke, to which an estate record was added at Bury around the end of the eleventh century (fol. [i]).⁹³ Since the original manuscript is written in a type of Caroline Minuscule similar to that known to have been practised at Saint-Denis, where Abbot Baldwin (1065-1097/8) had professed as a monk, it is likely the manuscript reached Bury through his agency.⁹⁴ A twelfth-century hand rubricated the preface and the *capitula* to Book I in black protogothic minuscule.⁹⁵ Additionally, the first half of the manuscript was overhauled by a scribe who made few textual alterations, but corrected unassimilated spellings, enforced word division using a vertical broken bar [!], altered abbreviations (especially the use of word-internal &), placed an **r** above the **rt** ligature, reinked or transcribed faded words and replaced insular ‘dot and slash’ *signes de renvoi* with ones drawn from the Greek alphabet. This hand is very difficult to date precisely, but there is no doubt it is twelfth-century. Subsequently, a hand of the early thirteenth century

⁹¹ The post-Conquest scribe was evidently struggling to fit the required text on fol. 1r since the text block is wider than it is in the manuscript proper, and the prefatory verses are partly written with two verse lines to one manuscript line.

⁹² Budny 1997, i. 212.

⁹³ For the record, see below 170-1.

⁹⁴ Vezin 1986, 38-9.

⁹⁵ ‘Incipit epistola accae episcopi ad bedam presbiterum de postulanda expositione in lucam;’ (fol. [i]v); ‘Explicit epistola accae episcopi ad bedam presbiterum; item epistola bedae presbiteri | ad accam episcopum | de responsione;’ (fol. 2r); ‘Explicit epistola bedae; Incipiunt | capitula libri primi;’ (fol. 4r). He let the original rubrics ‘PRAEFATIO’ (fol. 4v) and ‘EXPLICIUNT CAPITULA’ (fol. 7v) stand, but, not entirely grammatically, altered the opening rubric to name the author of the work and its dedicatee: ‘INCIPIT EXPOSITIO\nis/\bedae/ IN LUCAM \ad accam episcopum/ LIBER .I.’ (fol. 7v). He seems to have left alone the opening and closing rubrics for the six individual books.

supplied most of Book VI in two quires of eight and one quire of four.⁹⁶ Similarly, the original rubrication of a ninth-century continental manuscript of Augustine's *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* and *Contra Iulianum* was overhauled during the first half of the twelfth century,⁹⁷ but only after it had been used as an exemplar.⁹⁸ The rubricator and a number of contemporary scribes also made textual corrections and supplied the last quire of the manuscript, a six (fols. 153-158). A full textual collation of this book and the copies made from it might help determine when the last quire was supplied and when the manuscript was corrected. These two manuscripts show that the identification of works was accompanied by a thorough analysis of the integrity of manuscript texts.

Moreover, post-Conquest scribes investigating the content of Anglo-Saxon books often made improvements to the *ordinatio* of such books. For example, post-Conquest readers often found that pre-Conquest copies of Prudentius's *Psychomachia* did not contain the textual apparatus they expected, especially the running captions. Early copies of

⁹⁶ Fols. 210-28 ('hi sunt ... amen'): Hurst 1960, vi. 185-2460.

⁹⁷ London, British Library, Additional 23944: 'EPISTOLA AURELII AUGUSTINI AD VALERIUM COMITEM' (fol. 1r, added); 'EXPLICIT EPISTOLA' (fol. 1v, original); 'INCIPIT LIBER DE NUPTIIS ET CONCUPISCENTIA' (fol. 1v, original); 'EXPLICIT AURELII AUGUSTINI LIBER AD VALERIUM COMITEM . DE NUPTIIS ET CONCUPISCENTIA' (fol. 14v, original); 'ITEM AD EUNDEM LIBER .II. CONTRA | QUEDAM EXCERPTA DE LIBRIS IULIANI PELAGIANI HERETICI QUAE MISSA FUERANT | EIDEM VALERIO AB ALIQUO EIUSDEM HERESIS . CONTRA PARTES LIBRI PRIORIS' (fol. 14v, added in blank space); 'EXPLICIT LIBER .II. CONTRA EXCERPTA DE LIBRIS IULIANI' (fol. 36r, added *in rasura*); 'ITEM EPISTOLA AURELII AUGUSTINI AD CLAUDIANUM EPISCOPUM' (fol. 36r, added in *rasura*); 'EXPLICIT EPISTOLA' (fol. 36r, added in margin via *signe de renvoi*); 'AURELII AUGUSTINI LIBER .I. INCIPIT CONTRA IULIANUM PELAGIANUM HERETICUM' (fol. 36r, added in margin); 'EXPLICIT LIBER .I. INCIPIT LIBER .II.' (fol. 53r, original); 'EXPLICIT LIBER SECUNDUS . INCIPIT LIBER TERTIUS' (fol. 68v, partly *in rasura*); 'EXPLICIT LIBER III. INCIPIT LIBER IIII' (fol. 87v, original); 'EXPLICIT LIBER IIII SANCTI AGUSTINI EPISCOPI CONTRA IULIANUM HERESIS PELAGIANI DEFENSOREM. INCIPIT CONTRA EUNDEM LIBER .V.' (fol. 111r, original); 'EXPLICIT LIBER QUINTUS. INCIPIT LIBER SEXTUS' (fol. 131r, original); 'EXPLICIT LIBER SEXTUS QUI ET ULTIMUS. BEATI AURELII AUGUSTINI.' | CONTRA IULIANUM . PELAGIANUM HERETICUM' (fol. 157r, on supply quire).

⁹⁸ This is evident from a collation of the rubrics with Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 145 (s. xi^{ex}) [B₁]; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 134 (Rochester, not after 1123) [B₂], and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Add. C. 181 (Bury, s. xii^{med}) [B₃]. Like Additional 23944, B₁ did not originally have rubrics for the prefatory epistle to *De nuptiis* (fol. 1r), the opening of Book II of *De nuptiis* (fol. 12v) and for the prefatory epistle (fol. 30v) and beginning of the *Contra Iulianum* (fol. 31r), but these were evidently added before it was the (indirect) exemplar for B₂ and B₃, because these reproduce the inserted rubrics. The added rubrics in Additional 23944 are different to those added to B₁, but both are evidently responses to the same problem. For the relationship of these manuscripts, see below 55-6; Ker 1960, 54-7.

Prudentius's poem had been lavishly illustrated, and each illustration had been supplied with a caption.⁹⁹ These captions proved to be a useful guide to the action of the poem and, by the time of the Norman Conquest, had become an integral part of unillustrated manuscripts. Hence, when an Anglo-Saxon manuscript did not contain the captions, post-Conquest readers often added them. For example, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson C. 697 is a North-Eastern French manuscript from the third quarter of the ninth century, which also contains Aldhelm's *Enigmata* (fols. 1-13v), the so-called *Versus cuiusdam Scotti de alphabeto* (fols. 13v-14v),¹⁰⁰ and Aldhelm's *Carmen de uirginitate* (fols. 17r-64r). The manuscript contains a few glosses in the hand identified as that of Dunstan (e. g. fol. 17r),¹⁰¹ suggesting it was at Glastonbury by the mid-tenth century. It was at Bury later in the medieval period.¹⁰² The text of the *Psychomachia* (fols. 64r-78v) was originally copied without its preface, but with twelve one- or two-word rubrics which identify the appearance of particular virtues and vices on the battlefield. A late-eleventh- or early-twelfth-century scribe remedied the first deficiency by copying the text of the preface onto a bifolium and inserting it into the middle of the eighth gathering (fols. 62-63),¹⁰³ so that it stood before the beginning of the *Psychomachia* (fol. 64r). When he copied the preface, he incorporated the picture captions at the relevant points, in red rustic capitals. He then added twenty-one captions to the opening 169 lines of the poem

⁹⁹ See Stettiner 1895, 219-400.

¹⁰⁰ CPL 1562; Lapidge and Sharpe 1985, no. 731.

¹⁰¹ Bishop 1968, 399; Budny 1992, 138.

¹⁰² Pressmark 'A. 119' (fol. 1r): James 1895, no. 18 (p. 45); James 1926, no. 21 (p. 253). See also Rushforth 2002, 195-6.

¹⁰³ The scribe was probably Norman, since his hand shows marked similarities to Watson 1984, pl. 23 (Jumieges, 1049x1072). These similarities include the admission of uncial **d**, a form of the *-ur* suspension mark in which the suspension is parallel to the head of **t**, and an **x** in which the lower left hand limb curves to the right. However, the supplied bifolium is ruled in plummet, which suggests he was writing after c. 1100.

The text of the added preface has a number of mildly distinctive readings: *via est* for *via* [1], *tantum cognitus* for *cognitus tantum* [44], *uigeta* for *uictam* and *in aluo* for *in aluo* [47] and *fideliu pectorem* for *pectorem fideliu* [52]. Only the first reading is recorded in the apparatus of Cunningham 1966.

(fols. 64-67r) to supplement the brief pre-existing rubrics.¹⁰⁴ He used red minuscules for the captions, and created a red initial for the line to which the rubric referred.¹⁰⁵ It is evident that the scribe exercised great care when he inserted the preface and added the captions, but that the demands of the work proved too heavy, since he did not add captions for the remaining seven hundred lines of the poem.¹⁰⁶ This careful examination of pre-Conquest manuscripts also led precentors to supply such books with tables of contents, rebind them, and describe them in library catalogues, thus integrating them with the new books they were rapidly producing.

Some books containing multiple texts were supplied with tables of contents during the Anglo-Norman period. The most interesting example is a Christ Church manuscript of the mid-eleventh century.¹⁰⁷ The manuscript has been characterised as primarily ‘a type of reference book, preserving texts of interest to the community’.¹⁰⁸ A table of contents was added during the first half of the twelfth century at the beginning of the manuscript (fol. 117r; the leaves are now misbound).¹⁰⁹ The table is selective, and ends with a catch-all clause (‘item alia plura tam anglice quam latine’) but presumably includes the items felt to be most significant in the early twelfth century: the Benedictine Rule glossed in Latin, the ‘regula

¹⁰⁴ Most of the captions refer to the same lines as the illustrations which they caption in the illustrated manuscripts, but a few are unparalleled in the corpus collated by Stettiner: ‘Explicit inuocatio. Incipit expositio’ (l. 21); ‘Mala libidinis pudicitia enumerate’ (l. 90); ‘Patientia deuictis uitis <...>’ (l. 172); ‘in turmas effreno uolitat aequo’ (l. 175). The captions have no consistent affiliation with any of the manuscripts collated by Stettiner.

¹⁰⁵ Most of the time, he simply interlined his new caption above the lines to which it referred. If there was a pre-existing rubric where he wanted to copy a caption, he used the words of the rubric in the caption when it was possible (lls. 40, 113), but otherwise, he erased the pre-existing rubric (lls. 21, 49, 109, 178). The captioning also obliged him to erase and recopy two lines of the poem (lls. 20, 48).

¹⁰⁶ Another indication of the importance of the picture captions to reading the *Psychomachia* comes from a deluxe illustrated copy belonging to Malmesbury Abbey; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 23, pt. 1. A post-Conquest scribe (perhaps s. xi/xii) partially translated three section captions into English, seemingly at random: he rendered ‘multitudinem uitiorum auaritia nigro lacte nutrit’ as ‘her seo galnysse tytrode hir cyn on hire sylfre’ (fol. 24v, before l. 464), ‘auaritia stupefacta fatescit’ as ‘her se iytserere’ (fol. 29r, before l. 584), and ‘discordia uirtutibus insidatur et capitur’ as ‘her hi suf’ (fol. 33v, before 681). Forty-seven captions had been translated before the Conquest.

¹⁰⁷ London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. iii; see Gneuss 1997; Cooper 2006.

¹⁰⁸ Magennis and Clayton 1994, 85-6.

¹⁰⁹ Printed Gneuss 1997, 23.

elurici bata glosata anglice' (apparently the *Regularis concordia*), an alphabetised guide to the interpretation of dreams, and rules regarding activities appropriate to different phases of the moon.

Pre-Conquest books were also rebound after 1066. A copy of Aldhelm's Prose *De virginitate*, written at Christ Church, Canterbury around the turn of the tenth century, and glossed in several stages during the first half of the eleventh century has two titles pasted to fol. [iv]^r.¹¹⁰ The second, which measures 35x197mm and reads 'Aldelm^{us}. De laude Virginitat[is]', was previously attached to the spine.¹¹¹ The style is comparable with the titles along the spines of a number of manuscripts in twelfth-century bindings.¹¹² Another example, a copy of Cassian, *De institutis coenobiorum* [CPL 513], comes from Exeter.¹¹³ A scrap now attached to fol. iii^v, bearing the title 'D[E] [INSTI]TU[TIO]NE MONA[CH]orum', probably came from a limp vellum binding. The scrap is now badly damaged, but the hand probably dates from the late eleventh or early twelfth century.

It would also seem that post-Conquest precentors sometimes bound Anglo-Saxon booklets with other, newly-produced materials. We have already discussed a mid-tenth-century booklet containing the twelfth book of Cassian's *De institutis monachorum* that was rubricated at the turn of the eleventh century.¹¹⁴ This booklet had been bound with nine quires of saints' lives produced during the second half of the twelfth century by the first half of the thirteenth century, when a table of contents describing both the Cassian and the

¹¹⁰ London, British Library, Royal 5 E. xi (s. x/xi, OE glosses s. xiⁱⁿ, xi^{med}; all Canterbury CC). It is also noteworthy that the capitula are now preceded by a full-page drawing, entitled 'SANCTI ÆLDELMUS EPISCOPUS', of Aldhelm reading his *Prosa de virginitate*. The drawing appears to be twelfth-century. For Aldhelm's reputation in the twelfth century, see below 63.

¹¹¹ Phillip Pulsiano suggests the first is from another manuscript, though does not give reasons: Pulsiano 1996, 51.

¹¹² e. g. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 86 ('EXAMERON'), and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 23 ('INCIPI [...] IOH[...]E | IN COLL[...]IONIBUS PAT[...]') . See Pollard 1962, esp. 17-8 and pls. I and II.

¹¹³ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct D. infra 2. 9 (s. x², Cant StA, prov. Exeter), fols. 1-110. It is in the Exeter catalogues of 1327 and 1504: Oliver 1861, 304, 367. For the origin, see Bishop 1957, 327; Bishop 1971, no. 7.

¹¹⁴ Cambridge, St John's College, 101 (D. 26), fols. 1-14; see above 37.

hagiographical texts was added at the beginning of the manuscript.¹¹⁵ It has been suggested that the *vitae*, which begin with a life of Sergius and Bacchus [BHL 7602], were produced at a dependency of Angers,¹¹⁶ but the lives may equally have been of interest to a house which had some relics of these saints, or in whose calendar their feast appeared.¹¹⁷ One wonders what connection the compiler saw between Cassian's advice for overcoming the sin of pride and the saints' lives in the twelfth-century compendium. An examination of the sewing stations might show whether the Cassian was originally bound with other booklets and was separated from its original context for relocation alongside new materials, or whether it was simply kept loose, in which case it may have been considered in danger of being lost or damaged on account of its fragility.

A similar example may be Cambridge, Trinity College, O. 2. 30 (1134), fols. 129-172, a mid-tenth-century copy of the Rule of St Benedict, produced at St Augustine's Abbey in Canterbury.¹¹⁸ It is now bound with copies of Pseudo-Augustine, *De unitate sancte trinitatis*, Isidore, *De fide catholica* and various other texts in a hand of the turn of the eleventh century (fols. 1-72), which belonged to the Augustinian canons of Southwark in the sixteenth century;¹¹⁹ and a mid-twelfth-century copy of Eadmer's *Vita et miracula S. Dunstani* (fols. 73-128).¹²⁰ The couplet 'Asculta fili retinendo in te senili; | Iugiter asculta . retine bona . desere stulta;' was added in red ink on fol. 129r in a hand very similar to the hand which copied the

¹¹⁵ 'Ista continentur in hoc uolumine | de spiritu superbie | passio sanctorum sergii 7 Bachi quod est nonus octoberis | Vita gregorii nazazeni . quod vii kl martii celebratur | uita beatissimi Remigii francorum apostoli | uita \sanchi/ mauritii presbiteri | liber uersificatus de sancto felice martire' ([ii]°).

¹¹⁶ Bishop 1957, 331.

¹¹⁷ It may be significant that only the lives of Sergius and Bacchus and Gregory Nazanzenis are assigned to specific dates. Of the calendars printed by Wormald, only those for Evesham and Malmesbury include Sergius and Bacchus for 7 October: Wormald 1946. No calendar includes Gregory Nazanzenis for 26 March.

¹¹⁸ Bishop 1957, 324-6. Four Latin homilies were added at the end of the manuscript at the turn of the tenth century (fols. 169v-172). These are now edited Hall 2006.

¹¹⁹ 'Liber beate Marie Overy' (fol. 1r).

¹²⁰ Misidentified by James, and the (seventeenth-century) author of the table of contents (fol. [iii]°), as the work of Osbern.

majority of Eadmer's *Vita*, suggesting Part II was associated with the Rule of St Benedict from an early date, and was perhaps even produced with this purpose in mind.¹²¹ However, I have found no sign that any other reader of Parts I, II or III annotated any other part of the manuscript, so the suggestion must remain tentative.

Another example may be Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 115, a homiliary produced at Worcester during the second half of the eleventh century. The homiliary contains three main sets of additions: an inserted leaf (fol. 65) bearing an exhortation against idol worship,¹²² and a short homiletic excerpt,¹²³ in a two late-eleventh-century hands; a quire (fols. 140-7), containing a homily on the pains of hell in a hand somewhat earlier than the manuscript itself;¹²⁴ and two further quires, bound at the end of the book (fols. 148-55), containing prognostics in a mid-twelfth-century hand.¹²⁵ Fol. 65 was evidently a purposefully-produced supplement. However, it is less clear when or why the other leaves were bound with Hatton 115. Though the late-twelfth-century table of contents (fol. v') does not mention any of these items, its scribe seems only to have included articles with a rubric which he could copy. Moreover, the pattern of wormholes affecting the quire containing the homily and the rubbing to its outer leaves seem to indicate it existed independently at some stage. However, the presence of Tremulous Hand interventions in both the homily and the quires containing the prognostics, as well as the manuscript proper, may suggest that these leaves were bound with Hatton 115 when he glossed the manuscript, and that a post-Conquest Worcester precentor made the decision to bind them with Hatton 115. The

¹²¹ There are no wormholes on either fols. 128v or 129r. This suggests it is unlikely either had a prolonged independent existence, though it should be admitted there are few, if any, wormholes evident in the manuscript as a whole.

¹²² Frank and Cameron 1973, B3. 5. 2 (unprinted).

¹²³ 'Ne dear ic for godes ege soðes suwian ac licie | swa hit licige.' soð ic wylle secgan gyme se | þe wylle. For þam se bydel ðe forsuwað | his hlaforðes gewill boda. a he him mæg | wenan hetelices leanes.' I have ignored later alterations in this transcription. The text corresponds to Napier 1883, 191/20-23.

¹²⁴ Scragg 1992, no. 9.

¹²⁵ See Treharne 1998, 237-9.

evidence of these three manuscripts shows that post-Conquest precentors bound Anglo-Saxon booklets with later manuscripts, and sometimes commissioned purposeful supplements to augment pre-Conquest books.

Not unnaturally, once they had identified the contents, precentors also began to describe pre-Conquest books in library catalogues. It was generally unproblematic to include Latin manuscripts produced in Anglo-Saxon England, but vernacular manuscripts presented an interesting dilemma, since pre-Conquest booklists had not routinely distinguished between English and Latin books. Two approaches developed: Burton,¹²⁶ Christ Church,¹²⁷ and Durham all list groups of *libri anglici*,¹²⁸ while catalogues from St Augustine's,¹²⁹ Bury,¹³⁰ Exeter,¹³¹ Flaxley,¹³² Glastonbury,¹³³ Leominster,¹³⁴ Peterborough,¹³⁵ and Rochester all list

¹²⁶ The list of c. 1175 contains a group of English manuscripts at the end, though they do not have a separate heading: 'Omeliarium anglicum'; 'Psalterium anglicum'; 'Passionale anglicum'; 'Dialogum Gregorii et historiam Anglorum, anglice'; 'Apolloniam, anglice'; 'Euangelistas, anglice'; 'Ymnarium, anglice': Sharpe, Carley et al. 1996, B11.63-69.

¹²⁷ Only one English manuscript appears in the twelfth-century catalogue, a 'Donatus Anglice', presumably a copy of Ælfric's *Grammar*: James 1903, no. 27 (p. 8). However, there is a group of seventeen *Libri Anglici* in the early-fourteenth-century catalogue, as well as two vernacular manuscripts listed among the Latin books: James 1903, nos. 304-20, 296-7 (pp. 51, 50).

¹²⁸ The late-twelfth-century catalogue has a section headed 'libri anglici', which includes 'Omeliaria vetera duo. Unum novum'; 'Elfledes boc'; 'Historia Anglorum Anglice'; 'Liber Paulini Anglicus'; 'Liber de Nativitate Sanctae Mariae Anglicus'; and 'Cronica duo Anglica': Botfield 1838, 5. By contrast, the 1391 catalogue of the Spendement lists some of these books among the Latin manuscripts, which are organised by genre: Botfield 1838, 30, 33.

Another list, London, British Library, Cotton Otho C. i, vol. 2, fol. 149r, which may be the work of the Tremulous Hand, reads 'Libri dialogorum gre[...] [ui]tas patrum. Item Bede de gestis anglorum | Item vita et m[...]ynomina [si] ysydori. Item Boecius | De consola[...]' Opposite the beginning of line 2 is '[...]glice', which should probably be read as 'anglice'. See Franzen 1991, 65, 78-9.

¹²⁹ In the late-fifteenth-century catalogue, London, British Library, Cotton Claudius B. iv is described in an added entry as 'Genesis anglice. 2o fo. and sylðus d. 1 G. 1': James 1903, no. 95 (p. 201).

¹³⁰ Sharpe, Carley et al. 1996, B13.164, B13.251. The first item is in the second (contemporary) part of the list, s. xii^{ex}; the second item in the third (s. xii/xiii) part.

¹³¹ The 1327 Exeter catalogue is printed by Oliver 1861, 301-10. It includes a 'Martirologium Latinum et Anglicum: 'Circumcisio', valued at 2s (p. 304) [Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 196]; a 'Psalterium interlineare glosatura de Anglico, precii 2s' (p. 308); a 'Penitentialia vetus et alia plura, cum Anglico in fine 'In principio' (p. 309) [Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 190]; and 'multi alii libri vetustate consumpti Gallice, Anglice, et Latine scripti, qui non appreciantur, que nullius valoris reputantur' (p. 309).

¹³² The early-thirteenth-century catalogue mentions 'duo libri anglici' and a 'phisicus liber anglice': Bell 1992, Z7.69-70, Z7.73.

¹³³ The catalogue compiled in 1247/8 includes 'Item [si] Pentatecum Moysi et Iosue et Iudicum] duo anglica. uetusta et inutilia. \supra/'; 'Liber Orosii a ii° Latina lingua, b tercius in anglica uetusti set leg<ibiles>'; 'Liber de diversis sermonibus anglicis'; 'Item sermones anglici'; 'Passionale sanctorum anglicae scriptum'; '\Item

individual vernacular books among the Latin manuscripts.¹³⁶ Both approaches suggest precentors considered vernacular manuscripts might have a different readership to Latin books.

This chapter has shown that the Norman Conquest cannot be blamed for the destruction of ‘the lost literature of medieval England’, or even for any milder forms of cultural vandalism. In their willingness to use leaves from ancient books as waste material for binding, post-Conquest precentors were simply following Anglo-Saxon precedent. Nonetheless, pre-Conquest manuscripts were not considered inviolate and could, like any other manuscript, become a quarry from which to mine vellum. Yet a close study of rubrication has shown that precentors made a great effort to identify mysterious pre-Conquest texts, and that this was frequently a springboard for other improvements to pre-Conquest manuscripts, often to their *ordinatio*. Once they were clear what they had, precentors began to rebind and catalogue pre-Conquest manuscripts, and could, as the next chapter shows, begin to loan their books out as exemplars or trade them for copies of other texts. This appraisal of Anglo-Saxon books was one of the major bibliographical achievements of the Anglo-Norman period.

quidem liber anglice/’; ‘Medicinale anglicum’: Sharpe, Carley et al. 1996, B39.17, B39.186, B39.218-21, B39.276. B39.218-20 are bracked together with the comment ‘uetust<i>, inutil<es>’.

¹³⁴ An added entry in the inventory of c. 1192 describes a ‘rotula cum uita sancti Guthlaci anglice scripta’: Sharpe, Carley et al. 1996, B75.16.

¹³⁵ The late-eleventh-century list includes ‘vitae sanctorum anglicae’ and ‘Elfredi regis liber anglicus’: Friis-Jensen and Willoughby 2001, BP2.48, BP2.59.

¹³⁶ The catalogue of the library (1122/3) in the *Textus Roffensis* includes a cancelled ‘Pastoralis anglicus in .i. uolumine’ and a ‘Sermonalia anglica in .ii. voluminibus’: Sharpe, Carley et al. 1996, B77.51, B77.83.

CHAPTER III: THE MOVEMENT OF PRE-CONQUEST MANUSCRIPTS

It is easy to show that manuscripts changed hands during the post-Conquest period, but much more difficult to quantify these movements and identify patterns. Both before and after 1066, manuscripts were loaned from house to house with the expectation that they would be returned after consultation or copying; exchanged; donated and bequeathed; and stolen and sold. Unfortunately, it is very difficult to distinguish between some of these phenomena purely from the evidence of the surviving books. Though textual collation and palaeographical considerations can be used to show a manuscript was loaned to a particular house for copying, this process is extremely time-consuming and not particularly exact.¹ A patron who donated a book to a favoured house may have purloined the book from another establishment, hence the Waltham Chronicler's complaint that the Normans were accustomed to amputate the limbs of God's son in one country in order to offer them to the same God in another.² Plundered manuscripts present a particular challenge, since they are now scattered among the libraries of continental Europe, and financial constraints force the scholar to rely on printed descriptions more than is desirable. Finally, though the anecdotal evidence of medieval texts often provides an interesting counterweight to the surviving books, its reliability can be questionable. Despite these problems, something can be known about the movements of manuscripts after 1066, and how this differed from before the Conquest.

¹ Even with full collation, it can be very difficult to establish whether a particular book was copied directly from another or from a textually-identical manuscript, which may not have survived. Consequently, I have not performed any collation myself, but have confined myself to reporting the suggestions of other scholars. I hope to examine the textual tradition of some of the texts most widely-copied in Anglo-Norman England in a separate project.

² Watkiss and Chibnall 1994, 59. The comment refers specifically to Rufus's gifts to Caen.

THE MOVEMENT OF MANUSCRIPTS BEFORE 1066

It is very difficult to construct even a basic picture of the complex networks through which books circulated during the Anglo-Saxon period. For example, St Wulfstan's teacher, Earnwig (who was perhaps the abbot of Peterborough of that name, 1041-1052), is said to have presented a sacramentary to King Cnut and a psalter to Queen Emma, which they in turn gave to Emperor Henry III of Germany (1039-1056) and which he subsequently presented to Ealdred, then bishop of Worcester, on his mission to Cologne in 1054 (*VW* i. 1. 4).³ We cannot reconstruct a comparable history for any surviving manuscript. Nonetheless, it is possible to show that manuscripts circulated for copying, as well as changing hands more permanently through bequests, purchase and theft, even if we cannot always stipulate how a house acquired a particular manuscript.

The collection of manuscripts presented by Bishop Leofric to Exeter on his death in 1072, presumably mostly acquired in the years following his appointment in 1046, is the best evidence of how large collections of books were assembled in the pre-Conquest period. Leofric's bequest provides an excellent comparison for the activities of post-Conquest churchmen like Abbot Baldwin of Bury,⁴ Paul of Caen at St Albans,⁵ and William of St Carilef, Bishop of Durham,⁶ who helped augment the book collections of their houses, albeit mostly with newly-produced books. It is surprising that Leofric's collecting habits have not been examined in this light before.⁷ Many of the books which Leofric donated to Exeter

³ For discussion, see Heslop 1990, 159-62.

⁴ Webber 1998.

⁵ Thomson 1982b, i. 11-14.

⁶ Browne 1988.

⁷ Other studies include Lloyd 1972; Drage 1979; Gameson 1996; Treharne 2003b; Hill 2005b. We must discount here the argument that Leofric hijacked a pre-existing Exeter book collection and presented it back to the Cathedral: Conner 1993; Conner 2000. Conner's argument is based on two groups of manuscripts which share scribes and later Exeter provenance, the presumption being that both groups are most likely to have been written at Exeter. However, the shared scribes can simply be taken as evidence that Leofric was able to acquire groups of manuscripts from particular collections, not just individual manuscripts here and there. Conner's

bear an inscription and anathema, and the Exeter canons also had an inventory made of his gifts.⁸ A comparison of manuscripts containing a donation inscription, manuscripts listed in the inventory of Leofric's gifts to the chapter, and manuscripts copied in the style of Caroline minuscule practised at Exeter yields some interesting results. Seven surviving manuscripts identifiable in the inventory have a donation inscription.⁹ One manuscript – Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41 – has a donation inscription but is not identifiable in the inventory. None of the books included in the inventory and copied in the Exeter hand (and thus presumably written at Exeter) have a donation inscription, except the copy of the Old English Gospels written at Exeter, which, as a gospel book, may be an exception.¹⁰ Moreover, only four surviving manuscripts have been identified in the inventory which were not written at Exeter and do not have an *ex libris*.¹¹ All have lost leaves which might once have contained an *ex libris*. It seems therefore that Leofric regarded it as essential to add a donation inscription to books he had acquired from elsewhere and only to books he had acquired from elsewhere. This suggests that the presence of a post-Conquest *ex libris* in an Anglo-Saxon manuscript might indicate some uncomfortableness about its acquisition.

more recent argument that because a particularly high proportion of Exeter's continental manuscripts come from Northern France, they must have been acquired thence by King Æthelstan and presented to the cathedral is unconvincing; plenty of Northern French manuscripts of English provenance reached England after Æthelstan's reign.

⁸ The standard edition of this list is Lapidge 1985, no. X (pp. 64-9).

⁹ Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 11. 2 (241); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct D. 2. 16; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct F. 1. 15, pt i; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct F. 1. 15, pt ii; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct F. 3. 6; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 579; and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 708.

¹⁰ Cambridge, University Library, Ii. 2. 11 + Exeter, Cathedral Library, 3501, fols. 0-7. Five books written in an Exeter hand do not appear in the inventory: Cambridge, University Library, Hh. 1. 10; Cambridge, University Library, Ii. 2. 4; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 201, pp. 179-272; London, British Library, Cotton Cleopatra B. xiii; and London, Lambeth Palace Library, 489.

¹¹ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 190; Exeter, Cathedral Library, 3501, fols. 8-130; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 394 and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 849. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 718 should also perhaps be considered here.

Leofric's books came from a variety of sources. A quick survey reveals a wide range of origins:¹² two are from St Augustine's (TCC B. 11. 2; Auct F. 1. 15, pts i and ii); one was written at Christ Church (Bodley 708); one perhaps at Worcester (CCCC 190); two in South-West England (Exeter 3501; Bodley 849); and one in Southern England (Bodley 718). It is not clear if Bodley 394 was written in France or England, and Auct F. 3. 6 is of wholly unknown origin. Some books originated on the continent, but had been in England before Leofric acquired them: Bodley 579 is probably from Arras, but was in England from the 920s; and Bodley 849 is from Western France, but was in South-West England by the tenth century. The continental books are earliest in date; Bodley 849 is datable to 818, while Bodley 579 was copied around 900. The English books are mostly recent, copied in the first half of the eleventh century. The example of Leofric shows that books were readily available for permanent acquisition in pre-Conquest England. How he acquired these books – friendly pressure for donations, purchase, or less salubrious methods – is unclear.

Anglo-Saxon patrons were undoubtedly willing to donate books to favoured houses. Wills sometimes include bequests of books.¹³ We know that aristocrats commissioned books from English houses for donation abroad: examples include the gospel-book presented by Ælfgar of Mercia to Saint-Remi, Rheims between 1062 and 1065,¹⁴ and the 'tria plenaria cum uno textu evangelii' commissioned in England in 1065, and presented by Judith, Countess of Flanders to Weingarten in 1094, perhaps after the books had been used in her household.¹⁵ (Some Anglo-Saxon manuscripts had reached Normandy in this way before the Conquest).¹⁶

¹² Of course, some of the manuscripts may have changed hands after their production but before Leofric acquired them. For example, both parts of Auct F. 1. 15 were perhaps at Christ Church s. x/xi.

¹³ For one example, see above 22.

¹⁴ Now Rheims, Bibliothèque Municipale, 9: see Hinkle 1970.

¹⁵ Now Fulda, Hessische Landesbibliothek, Aa. 21; Monte Cassino, Archivio della Badia 437 + 439; New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 708; and New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 709: see McGurk and Rosenthal 1995.

¹⁶ See Alexander 1970, 237-9.

Fortune also played its part. For example, it would seem that an English pilgrim simply left the Vercelli Book in Vercelli during the eleventh century.¹⁷

It is also evident there was a book trade before the Conquest. Abbot Ælfward of Evesham (1014-1044) was able to buy books in London, along with the relics of St Odulf.¹⁸ Both Faricius and William of Malmesbury narrate a miracle in which Aldhelm was hoping to purchase books from a group of Gaulish merchants, whose wares included a giant pandect (*VA* cap. 11; *GP* v. 224). We can infer that this trade was fuelled by private ownership of books, as well as frequent alienations from institutional collections perpetuated by careless or light-fingered monks and mischievous Vikings, who frequently stole books in which they had very little personal interest. For example, a contemporary inscription records the ‘Codex Aureus’ was stolen by the Vikings during the ninth century and ransomed to Ealdorman Ælfred of Surrey and his wife, Werburg, who returned it to Christ Church, Canterbury.¹⁹ Since the Vikings would have been unable to remove the gold leaf without considerable difficulty, ransoming the book back to Ealdorman Ælfred was the only way to realise the asset. By contrast, Willibald reports that the murderers of St Boniface were singularly disappointed when a chest they seized proved to contain only books.²⁰

The heathenish mob seized with exultation upon the spoils of their victory ... they stole the chests in which the books and relics were preserved and, thinking they had acquired a hoard of gold and silver, carried them off, still locked, to the ships ... [There they] found to their dismay that they held manuscripts instead of silver plate. Disappointed in their hope of gold and silver, they littered the fields with the books they found, throwing some of them into reedy marshes, hiding away others in widely different places.

We can infer that later heathens were more market-aware, and preferred to ransom or sell the books they stole rather than litter the countryside with them.

¹⁷ Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare, CXVII: Sisam 1953a, 113-6; Halsall 1969; Sisam 1976, 44-50.

¹⁸ Sayers and Watkiss 2003, 153.

¹⁹ Stockholm, Kungliga Bibliotek, A. 135, fol. 11r: for commentary, see Gameson 2001, 75-77.

²⁰ Talbot 1954, 57-8.

Beside these means of acquiring books secondhand, there is evidence that exemplars circulated through various networks for the manufacture of new copies. One example concerns the homilies of Caesarius of Arles on the Apocalypse, which are attributed to Augustine in the manuscripts discussed here. According to their most recent editor, the copy produced for Dunstan when he was abbot of Glastonbury (940-956),²¹ was copied from a manuscript produced in Northern France during the second half of the ninth century.²² The late medieval provenance of the exemplar was St Augustine's, Canterbury,²³ but it is not clear if Dunstan imported it himself or borrowed it from another English house. Likewise we do not know where the manuscript was produced for him. Sometimes a particular textual tradition could have a more lasting impact. A St Augustine's manuscript of the second half of the tenth century is thought to lie behind the insular transmission of the *Cosmographia* of 'Æthicus Ister' [CPL 2348].²⁴ It was the direct exemplar of a Worcester manuscript from the turn of the tenth century,²⁵ and perhaps a contemporary Christ Church copy, now lost, which was the exemplar of the twelfth-century manuscript, Dublin, Trinity College, 371 (D. 1. 26).²⁶ Newly-produced texts could also be disseminated programmatically from particular centres.²⁷

This subsection cannot pretend to be a full study of the movement of manuscripts before 1066, but it should have given examples of the most significant types of movement. Collation shows that multiple Anglo-Saxon copies of a particular text sometimes descend

²¹ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 30, fol. 73v: 'DVNSTAN . ABBAS | HVNC LIBELLVM | SCRIBERE IVSSIT'. Its late medieval provenance was Worcester: Atkins and Ker 1944, 80.

²² London, British Library, Egerton 874. For their relationship, see Morin 1942, 249n21.

²³ 'Augustinus super apocalypsin . Liber sancti augustini cantuariensis' (fol. 1r); 'Di III Gr III | augustinus super apocalypsin cum J liber sancti augustini cantuariensis' (fol. 2r): James 1903, no. 345 (p. 222).

²⁴ Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Scaliger 69: Bishop 1966, xvii. The initial on fol. 1r was added s. xii^{med}.

²⁵ London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian B. x, fols. 31-124.

²⁶ 'D iii Gr. xiiii^o' (p. 1): James 1903, no. 137 (p. 31). This description, and the early-thirteenth-century table of contents on p. 1, shows that the manuscript used to contain papal letters, which are now part of London, British Library, Cotton Domitian v, fols. 2-14.

²⁷ The most famous example is Alfred's translation of Gregory's *Cura Pastoralis*: see Sisam 1953b.

from an individual imported manuscript. Some of these manuscripts are copied in localisable hands, which strongly suggests that it was the exemplars which circulated between houses. Leofric's acquisition of books for Exeter presupposes the existence of a flourishing trade in secondhand manuscripts, the most popular products of which were recent insular manuscripts and tenth-century continental books. Leofric's habit was to inscribe such books with an *ex libris* and anathema, suggesting that this trade was not always entirely licit. There is thus a strong possibility that some of the books available from this trade were acquired by theft, since the Vikings (and other miscreants) would have needed an outlet for any manuscripts they seized.

THE LOAN OF EXEMPLARS AFTER 1066

Although the post-Conquest transmission of certain texts can be shown to depend on one or two manuscripts imported after the Conquest, insular books and continental manuscripts which had been imported before the Conquest were also used as exemplars.²⁸ This is largely in accordance with pre-Conquest practice. The best-attested example of the use of a newly-imported exemplar is Lanfranc's decretal collection,²⁹ but the transmission of Augustine's *De nuptiis* [CPL 350] and *Contra Julianum* [CPL 351], which derives from a ninth-century French manuscript, may be taken as typical.³⁰ This exemplar was first copied during the second half of the eleventh century at an unknown centre by two scribes, one Norman, the other English, and it is likely it was imported to this unknown house for the purpose.³¹ It was subsequently corrected by another Norman-trained scribe who had access to a different manuscript of the *Contra Julianum*. There is then a gap in our knowledge of the

²⁸ The Augustinian canons of Beckford in Gloucestershire, a dependency of Saint-Barbe-en-Auge, founded between 1128 and 1135, sent manuscripts copied from English exemplars back to their mother house: Bouquet 1738-1904, xiv. 502. Some of the exemplars may have been pre-Conquest.

²⁹ Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 16. 44 (405), p. 405 ('hunc librum ... ego LANFRANCUS archiepiscopus de beccensi cenobio in | anglicam terram deferri feci'): Ker 1960, pl. 5; Gullick 2001.

³⁰ London, British Library, Additional 23944. For this, and what follows, see Ker 1960, 12-13, 54-57.

³¹ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 145.

transmission.³² Two copies (from Rochester and Hereford) derive from the corrected manuscript via an intermediary.³³ A mid-twelfth-century Bury copy derives from the Rochester manuscript,³⁴ and two Salisbury copies derive independently from the ninth-century continental exemplar.³⁵ The ninth-century continental manuscript was itself rubricated and corrected during the twelfth century,³⁶ and had passed to Burton Abbey by around 1175, when a list of the abbey's books was added on an endleaf (fol. 157v).³⁷ The choice of this book as a repository for the list suggests the Burton monks felt it to have a certain venerability. Exemplars imported after the Conquest may also lie behind the English transmission of Bede's commentary on Habbakuk,³⁸ and Augustine's *Confessions*.³⁹

However, some of the exemplars used were not new imports, but had been in England before the Conquest. The English transmission of Cassiodorus's *Institutiones* depends on a ninth-century continental manuscript,⁴⁰ which may have been in England in the mid-eleventh century, as Old English scribbles attest (fols. 30v, 31r, 57r).⁴¹ It was the

³² Ker notes that 'it is tempting to suppose that one of the two copies of *De nuptiis* and *Contra Julianum* recorded in the medieval Christ Church, Canterbury, catalogue ... was the missing manuscript ... and that the other copy was [Bodley 145] itself': Ker 1960, 13n2.

³³ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 134 (s. xii¹, Rochester) and Hereford, Cathedral Library, P. VI. 2 (s. xii¹, Hereford).

³⁴ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Add. C. 181.

³⁵ Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 138 (s. xi^{ex}); Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 65 (s. xii¹).

³⁶ See above 41.

³⁷ Sharpe, Carley et al. 1996, B11.

³⁸ Cambridge, Pembroke College, 81 (S. France, s. ix^{2/3}). The suggestion is made by Thomson 1986, 35n37. Only two copies of Bede's commentary are extant from the period between 1066 and 1130: Cambridge, University Library, Ff. 3. 29, fols. 13-162 (Cant CC, s. xii¹) [incomplete] and London, British Library, Royal 5 B. vii (Rochester, s. xii¹).

³⁹ Webber 1996. She shows that four copies from the South-West of England – London, British Library, Harley 3080 (s. xi^{ex}, West Country?); London, British Library, Royal 5 B. xiv (s. xii¹, ?Gloucester, later prov. Bath); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 815 (s. xi^{ex}, Exeter); and Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 6 (s. xi^{ex}, Salisbury) – derive from an exemplar related to Paris, BNF, lat. 1917A, from Ghent, and copies from Christ Church – Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 3. 25 (104) (s. xi/xii) – and Durham – Durham, Cathedral Library, B. IV. 6, fols. 1-94 (s. xii¹) – derive from an exemplar related to Boulogne, Bibliothèque Municipale, 46, from Saint-Bertin.

⁴⁰ Hereford, Cathedral Library, O. III. 2. For what follows, see Mynors 1937, xv-xvi.

⁴¹ Mynors, Thomson et al. 1993, 18.

exemplar for copies from Salisbury and St Augustine's,⁴² and seems to have moved from house to house to be copied,⁴³ coming to rest at Hereford before the mid-twelfth century.⁴⁴ The exemplar for the insular transmission of Eusebius's *Historia ecclesiastica* may also have been in England before 1066.⁴⁵ Moreover, two Salisbury manuscripts appear to have been copied from pre-Conquest exemplars belonging to Exeter, which the canons must have lent to Salisbury Cathedral.⁴⁶ In both cases, the Exeter exemplar was just one of the exemplars used to produce the Salisbury manuscripts, and the Salisbury copyists ignored material in the Exeter exemplar. Houses also drew on their own holdings of pre-Conquest manuscripts. Symeon of Durham modernised, corrected and supplied text missing from a copy of Bede's commentary on Proverbs, written in eighth-century cursive minuscule,⁴⁷ before it acted as exemplar to a new copy, to which was appended Bede's letter to Egbert, presumably from a different exemplar.⁴⁸ Symeon copied the first six leaves himself, probably to guide the other scribes in copying the unfamiliar script of the exemplar.⁴⁹ Finally, vernacular texts were perforce copied from insular exemplars, some of which survive. A pre-Conquest copy of the Old English Gospels from the first quarter of the eleventh century of unknown origin and

⁴² Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 88 (s. xi^{ex}); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 391 (s. xi^{ex}). For Cassiodorus's importance at Salisbury, see Webber 1992, 34-7.

⁴³ It contains the hands of Webber's Salisbury scribes i and ii: Webber 1992, 150-1.

⁴⁴ Mynors, Thomson et al. 1993, 18.

⁴⁵ Worcester, Cathedral Library, Q. 28 (France, s. ix²). For the suggestion, see Thomson 2001, 135. This manuscript has a major lacuna which is also found in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 184 (s. xii¹, Rochester); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 187 (s. xi/xii, Cant CC); London, British Library, Royal 13 B. v (s. xiiⁱⁿ, St Albans); and London, British Library, Additional 21084 (s. xii²). The supposed exemplar (Worcester Q. 28) seems to have been in England, possibly at Canterbury, before the Conquest.

⁴⁶ Webber 1992, 68-75. The manuscripts concerned are London, Lambeth Palace Library, 149, fols. 1-139 (s. x², prov. SW England s. xiⁱⁿ, prov. Exeter), exemplar to Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 128, fols. 5-116 (s. xi^{ex}, Salisbury); and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 319 (s. x², prob. SW England, prov. Exeter), exemplar to London, British Library, Royal 5 E. xvi (s. xi^{ex}, Salisbury). For the former relationship, see Ker 1976a, 35.

⁴⁷ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 819. Symeon updated punctuation, altered abbreviations, changed spellings, expanded numerals and some ligatures, introduced paraph marks to signal runovers, re-signed quires, used slashes to improve word division and supplied fol. 74 to replace lost leaves.

⁴⁸ London, British Library, Harley 4688 (s. xiiⁱⁿ, Durham). For the relationship with Bodley 819, see Kendrick 1956, II. ii. 32-3. The Letter to Egbert is a very rare text; Laistner and King 1943, 120.

⁴⁹ Gullick 1994, 104.

provenance was used in the second half of the twelfth century as the exemplar for a copy of later Christ Church provenance.⁵⁰

The examples discussed above illustrate the wide variety of manuscripts which were loaned between houses after the Norman Conquest, and the various networks through which they passed. Sometimes the entire English transmission of a particular text can be shown to derive from a single imported continental manuscript. It is probable most of these exemplars arrived in England after 1066, when there was a major influx of continental ecclesiastics, each of whom may have brought manuscripts into England, but it is possible some such exemplars had reached England shortly before 1066, as late Anglo-Saxon prelates learnt of new continental trends. Once in England, these exemplars seem to have moved from place to place to be copied, rather than a copy being sent from place to place and the original remaining *in situ*. Such imports may have been viewed as expendable, since the exemplar could become so worn by the movement between houses that it was eventually fit only for use in bindings, like the influential fourth-century Cyprian fragments used in the binding of a twelfth-century manuscript.⁵¹ The networks which controlled the circulation of these exemplars differ from those behind the movement of manuscripts in England during the period of the Benedictine Reform. We now find persistent connections between Canterbury, Rochester, St Albans, Exeter and Salisbury.⁵² The circulation of pre-Conquest exemplars almost certainly became more frequent as Norman precentors became more

⁵⁰ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 441 (s. xi^{1/4} or xi¹, SE England?), exemplar to London, British Library, Royal 1 A. xiv. For the relationship, see Liuzza 1994, i, p. lxii.

⁵¹ London, British Library, Additional 40165A. 1, exemplar to London, British Library, Royal 6 B. xv (s. xii¹, Salisbury). For its influence, see Bévenot 1961, 9-15, 61-5.

⁵² Note Matthew Paris's comment that Lanfranc supplied Paul of Caen with exemplars (*GASA* 58).

familiar with the pre-Conquest books in their charge, though definitive evidence is as yet lacking.⁵³

THE PERMANENT MOVEMENT OF PRE-CONQUEST MANUSCRIPTS AFTER 1066

Since owners of pre-Conquest manuscripts did not habitually record where or when they acquired such manuscripts, it is very difficult to determine to what extent pre-Conquest manuscripts moved around after 1066. Not unnaturally, when a bishop relocated his see, the members of the community brought their manuscripts with them when they moved. For example, it has been shown that two manuscripts, a copy of the Alfredian translation of the *Cura Pastoralis* and a pontifical,⁵⁴ came from Sherborne to Salisbury when the see was transferred between 1089 and 1091.⁵⁵ It would be possible to study the collections at Lincoln, where the bishop of East Anglia moved his see, and the newly-monasticised Rochester from a similar standpoint.⁵⁶ Post-Conquest foundations also seem to have acquired Anglo-Saxon manuscripts; Battle, Castle Acre, Darley Dale, Dover, Horton, Lewes, Llanthony Secunda, Southwick and Waltham all owned at least one pre-Conquest book. Unfortunately, the evidence that these manuscripts moved during the Anglo-Norman period, and not later, is not always as clear-cut as we might wish. Nonetheless, it is evident that various types of pre-Conquest books changed hands after 1066. Some of these books contained the vernacular. This group of manuscripts shows conclusively that pre-Conquest books were desirable acquisitions after 1066.

⁵³ Contrast Thomson 1986, 34: 'I doubt whether local, pre-Conquest copies were always even used when they existed. The evidence suggests most exemplars came from Norman religious houses, and these can sometimes be identified by collation'.

⁵⁴ Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 5. 22 (717), fols. 72-158 (s. x/xi) and London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius C. i, fols. 43-203 (s. xi¹ or xi^{med}, Germany): Webber 1992, 75-6.

⁵⁵ Permission was granted in 1075: Webber 1992, 1-4.

⁵⁶ At least two pre-Conquest manuscripts have later Lincoln provenance: Lincoln, Cathedral Library, 182 (C. 2. 8) + 184 (C. 1. 13), fol. 1 (Bede, *Homiliae in Evangelia*, s. x/xi, Abingdon); and New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 776 (Psalter, s. viii^{med}, prov. Wessex s. ix). For Rochester's pre-Conquest manuscripts, see Richards 1988, 1-3.

Pre-Conquest liturgical books acquired by houses founded after 1066 include ‘The Red Book of Darley’,⁵⁷ ‘The Southampton Psalter’,⁵⁸ and ‘The Lambeth Psalter’.⁵⁹ The Red Book of Darley is one of the more remarkable liturgical books to have survived from the Anglo-Saxon period. Datable to 1060 or 1061,⁶⁰ and probably written at New Minster, Winchester, this office book contains Old English texts, rubrics and glosses. It was certainly at Darley after the Reformation, since it was titled ‘Rede Book of Darley’ in a Parkerian hand (p. 586) and had earlier belonged to a local woman, Margaret Rollysleye (pp. 130, 131). It was overhauled during the twelfth century, a process which included the addition of a mass for St Helen, and it is this added text that has led to the suggestion that the book was at Darley shortly after the foundation of an Augustinian house dedicated to St Helen in 1146.⁶¹ It would also appear that the ‘Crowland Psalter’ had reached Lewes, a Cluniac house founded in 1077, by 1107 when the obit of Lanzo, its prior, was added to the calendar.⁶² It is tempting to speculate the manuscript was an early gift to the house, the earliest Cluniac foundation in England.

Unfortunately, we cannot be as sure when Dover acquired the Southampton Psalter. The manuscript may even have belonged to the obscure secular foundation at Dover which dated back to the early Anglo-Saxon period, though it is not clear whether there was any continuity between this foundation and the house dependent on Christ Church that was established in the 1130s. The psalter was definitely at Dover by 1389, when the library was catalogued by John Whytefelde.⁶³ Produced in Ireland in the late tenth or early eleventh century, the psalter is glossed in Latin and Old Irish and was consequently described by

⁵⁷ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 422.

⁵⁸ Cambridge, St John’s College, 59 (C. 9).

⁵⁹ London, Lambeth Palace Library, 427.

⁶⁰ Robinson 1988, no. 165.

⁶¹ Hohler [1972], 40; Budny 1997, i. 648.

⁶² Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce 296. For its early history, see Raw 1999, 185-7.

⁶³ Stoneman 1999, BM1. 18.

Whytefelde as ‘ydiomate incognita’. There are some minor alterations to the texts of the psalms (introducing *Romanum* readings) and the canticles (replacing a *vetus latina* reading with the Vulgate reading) in a twelfth-century English hand, but there is no way of knowing where these were effected.⁶⁴ Equally uncertain is the case of the Lambeth Psalter. The linguistic profile of the Old English gloss is South-Western and the script may be dated to the first half of the eleventh century. It has been suggested it was written at Winchester.⁶⁵ The inscription ‘R. Lanthonie’ (preceded by ‘X^{cem}’ and followed by a short erasure) on fol. 209v may suggest that the manuscript was at Lanthony in the fifteenth century, but it cannot be convincingly identified with any manuscript in the Lanthony catalogue of c. 1355-60.⁶⁶ Lanthony Secunda was founded as a dependency of Lanthony Prima in 1136 for canons fleeing the destruction caused by the Welsh rebellion after the death of Henry I, but did not formally become independent until 1205. There is thus a possibility the manuscript was brought from Lanthony Prima, a house founded in 1103. Another pre-Conquest manuscript which perhaps reached Lanthony Secunda during the Anglo-Norman period is a copy of Isidore’s *Sententiae* made at Tours in the first half of the ninth century.⁶⁷ It was in England in the mid-tenth century when three Old English glosses were added (fols. 14r, 18r, 39v),⁶⁸ and appears to have been in the hands of the vicar of Cherington, a priory manor of Lanthony Secunda in east Gloucestershire, during the mid-fourteenth century.⁶⁹ Thus we have good

⁶⁴ ‘On fol. 37r, in the text of the Canticles, the reading, ‘A UESPERE’ (Is 38:13, *Vetus Latina*), was corrected to the corresponding Vulgate, ‘SPERABAM’, by an English protogothic minuscule (twelfth-century) hand. At Ps 52:2 (fol. 39v) SUIIS was added after INIQUITATIBUS and at Ps 65:4 ALTISSIME after TUO, in what may be a twelfth-century hand.’ (Patrick P. O’Neill, personal communication). I am grateful to Professor O’Neill, who is preparing an edition of the Psalter, for sharing some of his findings with me.

⁶⁵ O’Neill 1991.

⁶⁶ Webber and Watson 1998, A16. Webber suggests the manuscript may be A16.45 (‘Psalterium Willelmi de Werdon. Glosatum. in uno volumine mediocri’) but it seems far more likely that this refers to a manuscript with exegetical glosses, perhaps either Lambeth 170 or 197, the alternatives she suggests.

⁶⁷ London, Lambeth Palace Library, 377.

⁶⁸ Merritt 1945, no. 20. There is also an eleventh-century scribble ‘þus scealan preostan’ (fol. 87r).

⁶⁹ Webber and Watson 1998, A16.147 (‘Isidorus de summo bono. mediocris liber’). The identification is not certain since Cherington is not mentioned in the corresponding inscription in the manuscript (fol. 1r). An

reason to think that at least two liturgical books, the Red Book of Darley and the Crowland Psalter, found new homes during the Anglo-Norman period, and that other liturgical manuscripts may have done so.

It also seems likely that several other non-liturgical books found new homes during the Anglo-Norman period: possible examples are a copy of Boethius's *De consolazione philosophiae* at Horton,⁷⁰ a notable illustrated miscellany at Battle,⁷¹ a collection of Ælfric's homilies at Castle Acre,⁷² an Aldhelm at Waltham,⁷³ and a *Cura Pastoralis* and Old English Bede at Southwick.⁷⁴ The most firmly-established instance is the splendid illustrated miscellany somehow acquired by Battle, the monastery founded by the Conqueror in 1067 as penance for the violence of the Norman invasion and staffed with monks from Marmoutier. The house annals added at the beginning of the manuscript show that the miscellany was at Battle by 1119.⁷⁵ Where or how the monks of Battle acquired the book is not known. The movement of the other manuscripts cannot be so securely assigned to the Anglo-Norman period. According to an eleventh-century vernacular inscription at the beginning of the El Escorial Boethius, the manuscript, which was possibly copied at Worcester,⁷⁶ was given to Horton in Dorset by one Ælfgyth.⁷⁷ The palaeographical dating assigned to the hand of the inscription influences how we understand the manuscript to have reached Horton: if the hand is early eleventh century, then the manuscript was probably a gift to the nunnery at

erased inscription, which James read as 'morganus canonicus de kemerden', is at the top of fol. i^v: James and Jenkins 1930, 519. There are some twelfth-century corrections, e. g. fols. 10v/17, 16r/14-5, 56r/12.

⁷⁰ El Escorial, Real Biblioteca, E. II. 1 (s. x/xi, Worcester?). I have not seen this manuscript, but know it through Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Film 4.

⁷¹ London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. v, pt. 1, fols. 2-73 and 77-88 + Cotton Nero D. ii, fols. 238v-41r (s. xi^{2/4}, Cant CC? Winchester?): McGurk, Dumville et al. 1983.

⁷² London, British Library, Harley 2110, fols. 4*, 5* (s. xi¹).

⁷³ London, Lambeth Palace Library, 200, fols. 66-113 (s. x², Cant StA, prov. Barking??).

⁷⁴ Oxford, St John's College, 28 (s. x^{med}, prob. Cant StA, prov. Abingdon).

⁷⁵ McGurk, Dumville et al. 1983, 104.

⁷⁶ Bishop 1971, xxv.

⁷⁷ 'pas boc syllp ælfgyþ into horetune' (fol. 1r).

Horton, as the gender of the donor may suggest;⁷⁸ if it is later, then we may be dealing with the monastery at Horton, founded c. 1050 and refounded as a dependency of Sherborne between 1122 and 1139.⁷⁹ Indeed, a case has been made that the book was given to Horton in the middle of the eleventh century, perhaps by the Ælfgyth who was Abbess of Barking.⁸⁰ The dates of Ælfgyth's abbacy are very obscure, but it seems probable that she was in office until at least 1086. The manuscript may thus be a post-Conquest gift.

Other cases are similarly uncertain. The cartulary of Castle Acre, a Cluniac priory in Norfolk, founded as a dependency of Lewes in 1089, was compiled around 1250 and now contains two leaves (fols. 4*, 5*) from a collection of Ælfric's homilies.⁸¹ These appear to have been used as pastedowns during the sixteenth century. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, we may assume that the Ælfric manuscript from which the leaves came was at Castle Acre in the late middle ages, having presumably been acquired during the Anglo-Norman period when Ælfric's homilies were still being copied at other houses.⁸² A very fine, largely unglossed, copy of Aldhelm's prose *De uirginitate* which had found its way to Waltham by the fourteenth century may have arrived during the Anglo-Norman period,⁸³ when there was considerable interest in his saintliness and possible relationship with the West-Saxon royal line.⁸⁴ According to Waltham's house chronicle, the church owed its foundation to King Cnut, but the bulk of its endowment to Harold Godwineson, who made the church

⁷⁸ So Malcolm Godden (personal communication). It should be noted that female donors did give manuscripts to male houses, as Royal 1 D. iii (below pp. 65-6) makes clear. Professor Godden also draws attention to another inscription on fol. 1r (perhaps c. 1100) 'R (or K?) gratia dei abbatissa', which may suggest the manuscript had by then moved to another nunnery.

⁷⁹ As implied by Ker 1957, no. 115 (pp. 152-3).

⁸⁰ O'Donovan 1988, lxi and n. 26.

⁸¹ Wright 1938.

⁸² No other manuscripts have been identified as survivors of the library; see Sharpe, Carley et al. 1996, 101.

⁸³ Waltham Abbey pressmark 'cxxx almarioli canonicorum' (fol. 66v) and 'Aldelmus de uirginitate dormitorii prioris' (fol. 67r). Leland later saw the manuscript at Waltham: Webber and Watson 1998, A39.5. On its decoration, see Kiff-Cooper 1991, 21-5 and pls. 2-4 (fols. 68v, 69r, 80v).

⁸⁴ Faricius, abbot of Abingdon, wrote a life between 1093 and 1099, and William of Malmesbury incorporated a life as Book Five of his *Gesta Pontificum*, apparently inspired by Queen Mathilda's interest in her supposed ancestor: Winterbottom 2005; Winterbottom and Thomson 2007, i, p. xx.

collegiate in 1060; it became an Augustinian abbey in 1184.⁸⁵ Unless this manuscript was part of Harold's endowment, the manuscript must have been acquired after the Conquest, and, given the dearth of interest in Aldhelm in the later middle ages, probably during the Anglo-Norman period. Our final example, a mid-tenth-century copy of Gregory's *Cura Pastoralis*, is more vexed. The manuscript does not bear the distinctive Southwick *ex libris* but may once have belonged to the house, like other manuscripts given to St John's College, Oxford, by Sir John White in 1533.⁸⁶ Southwick was founded in 1133 within the walls of Porchester, but moved to Southwick between 1145 and 1153. Along with the severely fire-damaged Cotton Otho B. xi, this manuscript may have moved to Southwick soon after its foundation.⁸⁷

The evidence for the permanent movement of Anglo-Saxon books after the Conquest is certain in only a few instances; in other cases, we are forced to rely on educated inference from shreds of evidence. This should not obscure the inevitable conclusion that it was possible to source and acquire pre-Conquest manuscripts during the Anglo-Norman period and that these manuscripts were in demand, especially if they were high-grade, expensive productions. Though the evidence is not as strong as we would like, it seems likely that copies of relatively common texts, recently produced, and books in the vernacular also moved from house to house. Booklists from post-Conquest foundations support these conclusions: Flaxley (a Cistercian house established in 1151) had three English books by the early thirteenth century.⁸⁸ The early date of this list makes it likely the books in question were pre-Conquest.

⁸⁵ A brief account of the library is given by Watkiss and Chibnall 1994, xxix-xxx.

⁸⁶ Ker 1957, no. 361 (p. 435).

⁸⁷ London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi + Otho B. x, fols. 55, 58, 63 + Additional 34652, fol. 2 (s. x^{med}-xi¹, Winchester). Part of a thirteenth-century Southwick inscription remains (fol. 28r), and the manuscript was seen there by Thomas Rudborne (fl. 1460): Ker 1957, no. 180 (pp. 230-4).

⁸⁸ Bell 1992, Z7.69-70, Z7.73. See also Bell 1987.

THE DONATION AND SALE OF PRE-CONQUEST MANUSCRIPTS AFTER 1066

None of the books we have discussed give any indication how they were acquired. Indeed, the mechanics of the acquisition of books after the Conquest is, if anything, even more obscure than the mechanics of the acquisition of books before the Conquest. Donors presented pre-Conquest manuscripts to particular houses after 1066, but this tells us nothing about how the donors had acquired the books. Donations could come from secular patrons or other houses. The evaluation of existing holdings that was occurring in many houses by 1100 may have led to the charitable donation of unwanted copies of particular texts, and, by virtue of age and unfamiliarity, pre-Conquest manuscripts may have been more likely to be unwanted than more recent productions. Houses whose collections had been decimated by fire or military destruction would have been particularly worthy beneficiaries. However, some ‘donations’ are rather more complex than they appear to be. For example, Rochester acquired a rather wretched mid-eleventh-century Gospel Book, and recorded the acquisition in an inscription (fol. 9r), which seems to claim that the book was presented by Goda (Godgifu), a sister of Edward the Confessor (d. c. 1049).⁸⁹ However, this inscription is not contemporary and the thirteenth-century Rochester Register puts the ‘gift’ in a rather different light.⁹⁰ Here we learn that a monk called Radulf removed ‘*textus ewangeliorum argento et lapidibus preciosis ornatos*’ from Goda’s former manor of Lambeth to Rochester along with other ornaments.⁹¹ The Gospels were apparently then stolen, but Prior Helyas (occ. 1214, after 1215) was able to recover them, along with a vessel that had belonged to

⁸⁹ London, British Library, Royal 1 D. iii. The inscription reads ‘*Textus de ecclesia Roffensis per Godemi comitissam .III.*’. The ‘III’ may suggest that Goda gave two or more other gospel books.

⁹⁰ London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian A. xxii, fols. 60-129.

⁹¹ Cotton Vespasian A. xxii, fol. 85r: Thorpe 1769, 119. Radulf (*fl.* s. xii^{med}) was formerly *custos* of the manor of Lambeth: Greatrex 1997, 628 [II Ralph].

Anselm.⁹² Though the syntax of the inscription in the gospel book is unusual, it does seem that the monks regarded the gospel book as a gift from Goda, or at least acquired through her agency. It is interesting that a questionable acquisition from her estate should be presented in this way, and celebrated for its association with her, particularly when the book itself (as opposed to the lost ornamental cover mentioned in the register) is so unimposing. By contrast to this evidence for donation, almost no evidence for acquisition by purchase exists.⁹³

THE THEFT AND PLUNDER OF PRE-CONQUEST MANUSCRIPTS AFTER 1066

Casual alienations were a severe problem for religious houses as a letter from Herbert Losinga to his prior makes clear:⁹⁴

Ecce, ut audio, nihil est tutum in domo vestra [*scil.* Norwich Cathedral Priory] sed intestinis latrociniiis sancta ecclesia coinquinatur. Perditis libros, sciphos, coopertoria, et omnia nisi ea quae vestrorum utilitati furum necessaria non sunt.

Similarly, William of Malmesbury narrates a miracle which ensued when the brother of one of the Worcester monks stole a book (*VW* iii. 26). Specific historical circumstances could exacerbate the risk of theft. The brutality of the Norman invasion and the uncertainty it created prompted some monks and secular canons to flee with their own house's possessions, out of piety as much as greed. The *Liber Eliensis* claims that Archbishop Stigand appointed an Ecgrith as abbot of St Albans, who subsequently decamped to Ely with most of the house's treasures (*thesauris ecclesiae illius*, *LE* ii. 103), a bounty which may have included some books. Sæwold, who appears to have become abbot of Bath around 1065, and resigned

⁹² Cotton Vespasian A. xxii, fol. 89r: Thorpe 1769, 121.

⁹³ Though it should be noted that the inscription on TCC B. 16. 44, p. 405 (above p. 55) implies Lanfranc bought the book ('hunc librum dato precio emptum...'). Thomas of Burton describes Alexander, abbot of Meaux (1197-1210), as 'librorum ... maximus perquisitor', which presumably alludes to purchase: Bond 1866-1868, i. 326.

⁹⁴ Anstruther 1846, 90. 'Note – so I hear – nothing is safe in your priory, but the holy church is defiled by internal thieves. You will lose books, vessels, coverings, and everything except things which are useless to your thieves'.

after the arrival of the Normans,⁹⁵ bequeathed thirty-three books to Saint-Vaast in Arras on his death, presumably as an expression of his gratitude for their hospitality during his exile.⁹⁶ Though at least one of the books was produced at Saint-Vaast itself during the second quarter of the eleventh century,⁹⁷ some of the books contain English hands and were presumably produced in England;⁹⁸ others, written in continental Caroline minuscule, may have been brought to Bath by monks from Saint-Bertin, who were given refuge at Bath in 944.⁹⁹ This suggests that Sæwold obtained some of the books he gave to Saint-Vaast in England, and presumably from Bath. Moreover, his short, uncelebrated abbacy suggests these books are unlikely to have formed the ‘personal library of an English ecclesiastic at the time of the Conquest’,¹⁰⁰ but were probably books he alienated from Bath when he fled from England. Other senior ecclesiastics, disgruntled at being deposed of their offices and fearing for the future of their churches, may have behaved similarly when notified of their removal. What happened to collections taken by men like Ecgfrith and Sæwold is a matter of uncertainty, and it is not clear whether they usually passed to another house *en bloc* or were dispersed piecemeal.

It can also be shown that individual manuscripts were alienated in the aftermath of the Conquest, and passed as gifts to continental religious houses. In his biography of the Conqueror, William of Poitiers boasts that:

⁹⁵ Kelly 2007, 42-3. She argues Sæwold resigned in 1066, but both Grierson and Lapidge suggest he fled to Flanders at the same time as Harold Godwineson’s family in 1068/9. Note that the sixteenth-century chronicler Jacobus Meyerus mentions a glossed psalter which Gunhild, Harold’s sister, gave to the church of Bruges: Ker 1957, no. 403 (p. 469). Gneuss has tentatively identified the psalter with the fragments Cambridge, Pembroke College, 312C, nos. 1 and 2 + Haarlem, Stadsbibliotheek, 188 F. 53 + Sonderhausen, Schlossbibliothek, Br 1: Gneuss 2003, 295.

⁹⁶ Grierson 1940, 107-11; Lapidge 1985, no. VIII (pp. 58-62).

⁹⁷ Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale, 732 (684): Schulten 1956, no. 5 (p. 81); Lapidge 1985, VIII. 20.

⁹⁸ Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale, 1029 (812) (s. x^{ex} and xiⁱⁿ); New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 826 (s. viii^{ex}, Northumbria): Lapidge 1985, VIII. 19, 22.

⁹⁹ Grierson 1940, 104.

¹⁰⁰ Lapidge 1985, 126.

Treasures remarkable for their number and kind and workmanship had been amassed [in England], either to be kept for the empty enjoyment of avarice, or to be squandered shamefully in English luxury. Of these [William] liberally gave a part to those who had helped him win the battle and distributed most, and the most valuable, to the needy and the monasteries of various provinces (*GGWP* §31).

House chroniclers also complained of such alienations, and make it clear books were one of type of treasure that was plundered,¹⁰¹ but seldom specified particular books. By assuming that such books would be ‘high status’ and have post-Conquest continental provenance, one scholar was able to draw up a list of fifty books which were ‘exported from England after 1066’, putatively as plunder.¹⁰² As one might expect, the evidence for when these fifty books reached the continent is very uneven. For example, the ‘Eadwig Gospels’ were in Germany by the second quarter of the eleventh century, and it is reasonable to assume they were produced as a gift for a continental house.¹⁰³ By contrast, the Leiden Aethicus is listed in Eastrý’s fifteenth-century catalogue of the library of St Augustine’s, Canterbury, and may only have reached the continent after the dissolution.¹⁰⁴ Some of the books were perhaps never in England, such as the copy of Smaragdus’s commentary on the Benedictine Rule, which was at Fécamp in the eleventh century, and probably written there.¹⁰⁵ Others were probably written in England, but after the Conquest.¹⁰⁶ In most cases, the evidence is simply inadequate to decide with any certainty when a book reached the continent. For example, though the ‘Paris Psalter’ belonged to Jean, duc de Berry (1340-1416), it may never have been in a monastic library, and could have reached the continent at any stage.¹⁰⁷ However,

¹⁰¹ Dodwell 1982, 216-9.

¹⁰² Dumville 1994, 98-9.

¹⁰³ Hannover, Kestner-Museum, W. M. XXIIa, 36: Dumville 1994, no. 8. For its provenance, see Gameson 2002, 214-22.

¹⁰⁴ Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Scaliger 69: Dumville 1994, no. 12. For its provenance, see James 1903, no. 1468 (p. 367); Bishop 1966, xxi.

¹⁰⁵ Paris, BNF, lat. 4210: Dumville 1994, no. 25. For its probable origin, see Branch 1979, 163; Ebersperger 1999, no. 57.

¹⁰⁶ For example, Paris, BNF, lat. 14782: Dumville 1994, no. 34. For its date, see Alexander 1966.

¹⁰⁷ Paris, BNF, lat. 8824: Dumville 1994, no. 28. For suggestions regarding its provenance, see Emms 1999, 182.

some of the manuscripts do stand up to scrutiny: a benedictional, which reached Saint-Évroul by Orderic's time;¹⁰⁸ a gospel book at Cherbourg by the late eleventh century;¹⁰⁹ the 'Sherborne Pontifical' at a continental house dedicated to the BVM by the end of the eleventh century;¹¹⁰ the 'Egbert Pontifical' at Evreux in the eleventh century;¹¹¹ a service book at Avranches by the twelfth century;¹¹² and the 'Lanalet Pontifical' at Jumièges by c. 1100.¹¹³ Of course, it is impossible to say for sure that these books reached the continent as a result of theft. For example, the copy of Lantfred's *Translatio et miracula sancti Swithuni* which was at Jumièges in the early twelfth century may have been sent to Normandy to foster the development of Swithun's cult abroad.¹¹⁴ Nonetheless, the evident importance of a book like the Sherborne Pontifical to the Sherborne monks makes it unlikely they would have surrendered it willingly, so we can infer that many of these books reached the continent illegitimately.

¹⁰⁸ Alençon, Bibliothèque Municipale, 14, fols. 91-113 (s. xi¹, Winchester): Dumville 1994, no. 1. For the presence of Orderic's hand in the manuscript, see Chibnall 1969-80, i. 202; Hartzell 2006, no. 1.

¹⁰⁹ This now survives only as a single leaf containing the end of John's Gospel: London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. xv, fol. 174 (s. x): Dumville 1994, no. 13. The verso bears William the Conqueror's foundation charter for the Chapel of Notre-Dame, Cherbourg (1063x1066) in a late-eleventh-century Norman hand: printed Fauroux 1961, no. 224 (not from this manuscript).

¹¹⁰ Paris, BNF, lat. 943 (s. x/xi-xi¹, Sherborne): Dumville 1994, no. 22. The manuscript contains a list of books headed 'Hic continentur numerus diuinorum librorum sante marie quos custodit dodo' in a hand of the second half of the eleventh century (fol. 154v). Notre-Dame de Paris, Chartres and Lorsch have all been suggested as the home of this list, and thus the manuscript: see respectively De Bruyne 1912; R. H. Rouse *apud* Reynolds 1983, 205; Avril and Stirnemann 1987, no. 16.

¹¹¹ Paris, BNF, lat. 10575 (s. x^{med} or x/xi): Dumville 1994, no. 31. A quire (fols. 179-86) was added at Evreux in the eleventh century: Hartzell 2006, no. 312.

¹¹² Rome, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 946, fols. 72-6 (s. xi¹): Dumville 1994, no. 41. Fol. 75v contains a vernacular decree of King Æthelræd, presumably added on a blank leaf of a deluxe service book; fols. 72-74 contain additions made at Avranches during the twelfth century, printed [Anon] 1879, 27-31.

¹¹³ Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale, A. 27 (368) (s. x^{4/4} or xi^{2/4}?, Winchester NM): Dumville 1994, no. 43. Fols. 53v-54v contain responsories and versicles 'in reconciliatione atrii vel ecclesie' in a twelfth-century Norman hand: Hartzell 2006, no. 318.

¹¹⁴ Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale, U. 107 (1385), fols. 28-85 (s. x^{ex}, Winchester OM): Dumville 1994, no. 45. Liturgical materials were added during the twelfth century (fols. 85v, 94rv): Hesbert 1954, 38-40 and pl. 84 (fol. 94v); Hartzell 2006, no. 320. Note however that Michael Lapidge has recently suggested the book acted as an exemplar at Fleury during the first half of the eleventh century: Lapidge 2003, 247-8.

How far does this re-evaluation of the evidence affect Dumville's conclusions? The first thing to remark is that most of the secure examples are liturgical books.¹¹⁵ To some extent this is a consequence of Dumville's criteria for selection; liturgical books are *a priori* more likely to be 'high status' than non-liturgical books. There is no doubt that non-liturgical books did circulate between England and Normandy after 1066, and pre-Conquest books took part in this circulation, but that is beyond the scope of this discussion. Nonetheless, the lack of evidence that illustrated vernacular manuscripts reached Normandy is striking. Where the books came from is unclear. It is difficult to imagine that the Sherborne Psalter could have been acquired from anywhere but Sherborne, but other manuscripts may have come from 'private chapels and estate churches', as Dumville suggests.¹¹⁶ It is also striking that the books do not seem to have reached Normandy at a uniform time; this suggests that though some manuscripts were the chance acquisitions of a military force intent on acquiring anything that looked valuable (as had been the case with the Vikings), others were acquired only after the leisurely inspection of resources described in Chapter II. This, combined with the evident utility of the books when they reached the continent, refutes Dumville's suggestion that only obsolete books were exported,¹¹⁷ and speaks to the influence of Anglo-Saxon liturgical practices in Normandy after the Conquest. Though house chroniclers complained about the alienations inflicted on them after 1066, the Norman beneficiaries appreciated the spoils, which is more than can be said for the Vikings.

This chapter has shown that pre-Conquest books were desirable acquisitions after 1066, and explored the unknowable networks through which books circulated both before and after 1066. Before the Conquest, as Leofric's ability to acquire books shows, 'books

¹¹⁵ 'C'est d'ailleurs l'époque où furent apportés en Normandie de précieux livres liturgiques anglo-saxons, qui y sont encore conservés aujourd'hui': Porée 1923, 417.

¹¹⁶ Dumville 1994, 85.

¹¹⁷ Dumville 1994, 95.

seem to have travelled with comparative ease between different religious communities, not to mention individuals'.¹¹⁸ We can infer there was a considerable trade in books, fuelled, in part, by light-fingered bretheren and marauding Vikings. Books also circulated freely for copying, and were imported from abroad to act as exemplars. Generous patrons were able to commission manuscripts to donate to favoured houses. The Conquest changed little of this. The Normans certainly appreciated Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, and high-grade liturgical books left England as plunder; post-Conquest ecclesiastics brought new networks for the acquisition and circulation of exemplars; and initially relied more on imported exemplars than insular manuscripts, but these are changes of degree, not kind. We can now begin to examine how post-Conquest readers interacted with Anglo-Saxon manuscripts.

¹¹⁸ Gameson 1996, 148.

CHAPTER IV: UPDATING PRE-CONQUEST MANUSCRIPTS

This chapter examines the different kinds of changes post-Conquest scribes made to prepare Anglo-Saxon manuscripts for use in the twelfth century. It begins with a discussion of two fundamental difficulties of pre-Conquest books for twelfth-century readers: their unfamiliar script and inconsistent orthography. It then examines how the textual recensions which pre-Conquest manuscripts contained could also surprise twelfth-century readers, who were familiar with different redactions, which they assumed to be more worthy. The chapter ends with more practical issues, and explores how post-Conquest scribes were able to harness various types of pre-Conquest manuscripts, particularly liturgical books and chronicles, and adapt or continue them to suit contemporary requirements more closely.

ALTERATIONS TO MAKE PRE-CONQUEST SCRIPT MORE EASILY LEGIBLE

There are tantalising hints that insular scripts were not easily legible after the Conquest. The Ramsey Chronicler justified recopying charters of Edward the Confessor by arguing that post-Conquest readers were unfamiliar with insular graphs.¹ His statement is corroborated by pre-Conquest manuscripts which contain short passages where words or individual graphs have been accurately transliterated. Such passages suggest that most pre-Conquest scripts remained legible after 1066, but reading them required some effort. This is true of the insular minuscule of a mid-ninth-century copy of Philippus Presbyter, *Commentarii in librum Iob* [CPL 643], which belonged to St Augustine's Abbey in the later middle ages.² A short passage was transcribed interlinearly in a small academic hand of the second half of the twelfth century. Where the transcription differs from the original reading, I give the original reading in square brackets:

¹ Macray 1886, 161. For comment, see Rumble 2002, 115.

² Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 426, fols. 1-118: 'Di .iiii. *Gradus* .iiii. | Liber sancti augustini Cantuariensis' (fol. iv^v); 'Expositio philippi presbiteri super iob cum A' (fol. 1r): James 1903, no. 137 (p. 204). It is perhaps datable 838x847: Watson 1984, no. 88.

qui diabolū [diabylum] diei nomine dictum. eundemq^{ue} auctorem [auctore^m] mali(s) [mali] similiter ma|ledicunt. Et resistendo dominationi ei^{us}. [eius.] ut non seruiant uiciis [uitiis] et con|cupiscentiis. tanquam [tamquam] leuiatan [leuiathan] draconem suscitant contra se in pre|liū [pro|elium] hostem acerrimum. Ob tenebrentur stelle [stellae] caligin(e) [caligine] ei^{us} [eius] | peccatores qui in nocte seculi [saeculi] huius. honorib^{us} [honoribus] uel diuitiis. uel sapi|entia mundi huius lucere se putant cecitatis caligine tenebrentur. | et merito suo euangelii lumen [lumen] non uideant (fol. 9r/20-6).

The scribe was evidently committed to making a very accurate transcription and even partly followed the punctuation of the original text, but he did not reproduce its orthography or abbreviations. Similarly, a twelfth-century hand felt obliged to recopy a short portion of Isidore's *Sententiae* which had earlier been supplied in insular minuscule in the margin, and insert the text on a small slip.³ Since two later leaves (fols. 155, 166) in insular hands proved unproblematic, it would seem that it was the combination of the unfamiliar script and the damage to the outer margin of the leaf that prompted the twelfth-century scribe to recopy the supplied text. Moreover, in many pre-Conquest manuscripts, later scribes have transcribed pre-Conquest display script, presumably because the rustic capitals or majuscules were unfamiliar and the display script encoded vital information like the title of a work and its author. In some cases, the transliteration is as early as the first half of the twelfth century. In a Worcester manuscript of the third quarter of the eleventh century, the title page was transcribed at the bottom of the facing verso during the mid-twelfth century, then interlinearly in the famous 'Tremulous Hand', and later, in bastard anglicana, at the foot of the display page.⁴ The existence of three transcriptions of the same display capitals suggests

³ London, Lambeth Palace Library, 377 (s. ix¹ or ix^{2/4}, Tours, prov. England by s. x^{med}), fol. 39v. The text is *Dum rerum preteritarum ... patrata uideantur*. PL 83, col. 585.

⁴ Cambridge, Clare College, 30, fol. 2r: 'INCIPIT. PREFATIO. SUBSE|QUENTIS. LIBRI. DIALOGO|RUM. GREGORII | ([PAPAE]). DE. | VITA. | SANCTORUM. | QUADAM | DIE NIMIIS QUO|RUNDAM SECU|RIUM TUMULTIBUS | DEPRESSUS . QUIBUS | IN SUIS NEGOTIIS PLERUMQUE COGIMUR SOLUERE | ETIAM QUOD NOS CERTUM EST NON DEBERE . SECRETUM | LOCUM PETII AMICUM MERORI. UBI OMNE QUOD DE MEA MIHI | OCCUPATIONE DISPLICEBAT SE PATENTER. OSTENDERET.' The Tremulous Hand and the latest transcriber only copied the first words of the text proper, not the opening rubric. In addition, the Tremulous Hand ignored the last four lines of the display page, which are in rustic capitals, probably because this script was familiar to him.

that the transcriptions were personal, and not intended as an effort to improve the reading experience for other users.

Equally, small modifications to individual graphs could make an uncommon script less likely to confuse an unfamiliar reader. For example, the bead of word-final **t** has been erased throughout a copy of Isidore's *De fide catholica* in tenth-century insular minuscule, presumably to avoid it being mistaken for a punctus.⁵ On other occasions, particular graphs were transcribed. This is the case with the excerpts from Ælfric's *Grammar* and *Glossary* added at the end of a booklet containing the *Synonyma* of pseudo-Cicero (fols. 57rv).⁶ The script of both the Latin lemmata and Old English glosses is insular minuscule,⁷ but a later scribe wrote the second, third and fourth letters of around half of the Latin lemmata above these words in a tiny Caroline minuscule. Graphs common to Caroline and insular minuscules (like **b** and **l**) are among those transcribed, which suggests that the transliterator's main interest was in the morphology of the script. It is possible he was learning to imitate a pre-Conquest hand.

The attempts of individual scribes to understand particular scripts may have led to the formation of short compendia of insular graphs. These could be used by scribes copying exemplars written in an unfamiliar script, or more importantly, by administrators who needed to read the awkward script of early documents. One such compendium may survive at the top of the first leaf of a manuscript of Defensor's *Liber scintillarum*, produced during the first half of the eleventh century.⁸ The insular letters wynn and thorn, the Old English

⁵ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 319, fols. 20r/16 (laborauit), 47r/15-6 (pas|cet) etc. Noticed by Ker 1933a, 230.

⁶ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barlow 35, fols. 56-7.

⁷ Ker dated the hand s. xi^m, which seems convincing, despite Buckalew's attempt to redate it s. xii^m: Ker 1957, no. 298 (pp. 355-6); Buckalew 1978, 154.

⁸ London, British Library, Royal 7 C. iv, fol. 1r. The book was at Christ Church in the thirteenth century ('de clauistro christi cantuarie', fol. 1r). Among other scribbles, an endleaf contains a couplet from the *Poema Morale* (fol. 106v): Hill 2005a.

words *oð* and *þa* and the insular graphs for **r**, **s** and **g** are written in a row just to the left of the fifteenth-century title ‘Liber Scintillarum’. Protogothic forms of **r**, **s** and **g** are clearly visible above the insular forms of these letters, and there were clearly interpretamenta over the other graphs, though they are now illegible. The damage to the script makes it very difficult to date, though the form of the letters **g**, **h** and **s** suggests it may be twelfth- or thirteenth-century. Twelfth-century manuscripts containing English texts sometimes use **th** for **ð** or **þ** and **w** for wynn,⁹ so a reader familiar only with such manuscripts may have struggled with the mid-eleventh-century insular minuscule of the Old English gloss here, and produced a quick list of unfamiliar forms to refresh his eye. Likewise, the difficulty of understanding unusual insular abbreviations could inspire the formation of brief *ad hoc* indices of such abbreviations and their correct interpretations. One such list is found in a tenth-century continental copy of Laidcenn’s *Egloga de moralibus in Job*, which was at St Augustine’s by the end of the tenth century, and subsequently reached Bury.¹⁰ There are many scribbles on the front flyleaf (fol. i^v), some now rubbed and faded, but backwards capital **e** explained as ‘eius’ and the insular sign for *autem* explained as ‘autem’ are easily legible.

Some old manuscripts in unfamiliar scripts may have been used for copying practice as part of the training of post-Conquest scribes, and it may be that the transliterations discussed above are the residue of the use of the manuscripts to teach the copying of difficult scripts. Sisam has suggested that the phrase ‘writ þus’, which occurs as a pentrial in several manuscripts, reflects a command for a pupil to copy the text.¹¹ Similarly, the

⁹ See Ker 1957, xxv-xxxiii.

¹⁰ Cambridge, Pembroke College, 88: Bury ex libris and pressmark (fol. 1r). For its sojourn at St Augustine’s, see Bishop 1971, xii, xxv.

¹¹ For example, London, British Library, Harley 55, fol. 4v; London, Lambeth Palace Library 237, fol. 162v; and Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare, CXVII, fol. 63v.

inscription ‘Willimot writ þus oððe bet’ suggests ‘Willimot, whose name reflects the new French fashion, was doing a copying exercise at Worcester’.¹² A further inscription, ‘writ þus oððe þine hyde forlet’ suggests the penalties for completing such copying exercises inaccurately could be severe.¹³ The use of English is suggestive.¹⁴ An ability to read difficult pre-Conquest insular scripts was a necessity after 1066 because it made charters and legal documents accessible. The acquisition of this ability also rendered many Anglo-Saxon manuscripts in unfamiliar scripts legible, which enabled post-Conquest readers to access the whole range of Anglo-Saxon literary culture, and sympathetically update the script of manuscripts that would not have been legible to a normal reader. It is difficult to know how long it would take a reader to learn to read such scripts, and how many readers had this ability, and whether the script of pre-Conquest manuscripts made them seem rebarbatively difficult to most readers. However, small modifications to script, compendia of insular graphs and abbreviations, and the transliterations of specimen passages could all aid a reader unfamiliar with insular script, and make its unfamiliarity an inconvenience rather than a barrier.

ALTERATIONS TO SPELLING

The orthography of many pre-Conquest Latin manuscripts was also an inconvenience to readers more familiar with Norman manuscripts. Since the Norman vernacular was a Romance language, certain developments in Latin orthography seem to have become entrenched in Normandy, as perhaps elsewhere on the Continent. Post-Conquest scribes routinely adjusted the spelling of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts to this preferred orthography. This phenomenon is best illustrated through a detailed discussion of one manuscript.

¹² Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 20, fol. 53v: Sisam 1953a, 111.

¹³ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 20, fol. 55r.

¹⁴ For the use of English in the post-Conquest classroom, see below Chapter V.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner 3, is an early-eleventh-century copy of Gregory's *Dialogi* [CPL 1713].¹⁵ There are many interventions in the text, and these are the work of a wide variety of hands and range in date from the early eleventh to the mid-twelfth century and beyond.¹⁶ Gregory's *Dialogi*, which narrates miracles wrought by early Italian religious and provides a *vita* of St Benedict himself, was a canonical text for Benedictine monks, who considered it particularly suitable for reading at collation.¹⁷ This may explain why such a variety of hands have intervened in Tanner 3, and why it has proven impossible to form a stemma for the diffusion of the text.¹⁸ The text was well-known in Anglo-Saxon England (and famously translated into Old English by Wærferth at King Alfred's request),¹⁹ and survives in two other full copies and six fragments.²⁰ By contrast, only one insular copy survives which was produced between 1066 and 1130,²¹ though the text was being copied in

¹⁵ Edited de Vogüé 1978-80.

¹⁶ It is very difficult to establish the portfolios of different correctors, and to date particular interventions, because most corrections consist of only a few letters. Nonetheless, one can see that the original scribe of Tanner 3 corrected small slips *calamo currente*, and that a corrector who used greyish ink and square minuscule **a** worked over the manuscript shortly afterward. Further interventions seem to be the work of a large number of scribes, and I have assumed that these interventions accumulated steadily after the Conquest, and that it is fair to speak of a 'collective mentality' when analysing them.

¹⁷ The Use of Sarum recommended Gregory's *Pastoral Care* and *Dialogues* 'de miraculis sanctorum patrum' for reading at collation: Frere 1898-1901, i. 215. John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter (1327-1369) added a note to Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 230 (Gregory, *Dialogi*, s. xii¹) that the *Dialogues* used to be (and still was) read at collation during Lent at Salisbury (fol. iv^v). Tanner 3, fols. 37v-39r (ii. Pro and ii. 1, here presented as a unit) are divided into eight lections, which shows that it was used for communal reading.

¹⁸ Jean Mallet, who collated fifty manuscripts for a projected edition in the CCSL, concluded: 'plus encores que la Vulgate hiéronymienne, les Dialogues, sont un texte «surveillé», continuellement révisé et corrigé, de sorte que les familles de manuscrites, s'il y en eut, ont mêlé leurs caractéristiques dans une sorte de texte reçu et ne peuvent être reconstituées': de Vogüé 1978-80, i. 164.

¹⁹ Yerkes 1986.

²⁰ Cambridge, Clare College, 30, part i (Worcester, s. xi² or s. xi^{3/4}); Canterbury, Cathedral Library and Archives, Add. 32 [f] (s. xi^m); London, Lambeth Palace Library, 204 (Canterbury CC?, s. xi¹, prov. Ely); Münster in Westfalen, Universitätsbibliothek, Fragmenten-kapsel 1 no. 2 [f] (s. viii²); Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale, A. 337 (506) [part] (Canterbury CC?, s. x^{ex}); Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 96 [f] (Continent or England, s. x, prov. Salisbury); Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, Theol. et Philos. Qu 628 [f] (s. vii/viii, Northumbria or Continent); and Wrocław (Breslau), Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, Akc. 1955/2 and 1969/430 [f] (Northumbria, s. viii¹ or viii^{med}).

²¹ Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 2. 36 (79), fols. 122-245 (Canterbury CC, s. xii¹).

Normandy at this time.²² This suggests that the *Dialogi* is one text which the first generation of Norman churchman would have been pleased to find in ample supply in England.

Some of the corrections to Tanner 3 resolve genuine ambiguities of orthography, others standardise the spelling of particular sequences of letters, and others inconsistently apply imaginary standards in a quibbling and pedantic manner. It should be emphasised that many late Anglo-Saxon scribes occasionally used ‘Norman’ spellings, and even sometimes corrected earlier manuscripts to reflect these spellings.²³ This shows convincingly that the Norman Conquest did not introduce into England the types of spellings discussed below; I argue rather that it caused certain newer spellings to become entrenched as standard, and by prompting a reappraisal of pre-existing books allowed many older spellings to be corrected.

Some of the post-Conquest alterations to spellings disambiguate between homonyms, but the majority of the alterations merely standardise obsolete forms. Alterations to the use of the letter [h], one of the principal orthographical differences between Classical Latin and Medieval Latin, illustrate this point.²⁴ In Tanner 3, we find *ortus* written for *hortus* (fol. 46r/23) and *habundanter* (fol. 59r/22) and *habundantia* (fol. 59v/3-4) written alongside *abundantia* (fol. 39r/5) and *abundant* (fol. 43r/7). The first variation might lead a reader to confuse the noun *hortus* (‘garden’) and the past participle *ortus* (‘risen’), but in the second case, where there is no noun **habundantia* with a meaning distinct from *abundantia*, we simply have a case of harmless orthographical variation. Later correctors made

²² Avranches, Bibliothèque Municipale, 101 was written at Mont St Michel c. 1030-1045. See Alexander 1970, 221 and pl. 11g. The fragmentary Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale, A. 357 (507) is from Saint-Évroul and copies are attested in early library catalogues from Fécamp and Bec: Nortier 1966, [211].

²³ e. g. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 399: *co(n)\l/lationis* (fol. 1v/17); *mic\h/i* (fols. 6v/13, 8v/9); *co(n)\m/pre|bendi* (fol. 8v/5-6). These occur adjacent to more extensive corrections which are probably pre-Conquest.

²⁴ The letter *h*: (a) is added to *c*, *t*, or *p*. (e. g. *charitas* = *caritas* ‘love’) or removed from *ch*, *th*, or *ph* (e. g. *sphaera* = ‘sphere’). (b) has *c* added to it (e. g. *michi* = *mibi* ‘to me’). (c) is omitted or inserted: (i) at the beginning of words, e. g. *ac* = CL *hac* ‘this’ (abl. s. f), *hortus* = *ortus* ‘having arisen’ (p. p. of *orior*); (ii) in the middle of words, e. g. *aduc* = *adhuc* ‘up to now’, *perbennis* = *perennis* ‘everlasting’: Sidwell 1995, 374.

several disambiguating interventions in Tanner 3. We find *\h/oram* (fol. 52v/24) (to prevent confusion with *oram*, ‘border, region’); *\h/ominibus* (fol. 57r/3) (to prevent a hasty eye mistaking it for *omnibus*, ‘all’); and *ex(h)ortae* (fol. 61v/6) (to prevent confusion with *ex *borte*).

In the first and third case, context indicates the correct reading, regardless of orthography:

Quo responso percepto. | ad \h/oram conuiator conticuit (fol. 52v/23-4)
 Du(a)e quaedam | sanch[(.)]moniales f\ a/eminae, nobiliori genere ex | (h)ort\ a/e (fol. 61v/6)

In the first case, *conticesco* cannot be transitive, so a sensitive reader would be obliged to read *horam*; in the second case, *hortus* is a second declension masculine noun, and cannot have an oblique form (except the vocative singular) in *-(a)e*, so (regardless of other difficulties) the reader is forced to take *ex(h)ort\ a/e* as a form of ‘orior’. Clearly there was no danger of any reader moderately confident of his own Latinity being stumped for too long in any of these cases. That correctors felt the urge to intervene in these cases may suggest they had a poor opinion of the Latinity of their compatriots, just as authors of school editions of Latin texts normalise the spelling to an artificial standard.

Whether the first syllable of *abundanter* should be aspirated, and whether this aspiration should be represented orthographically was a rather different issue, a question of convention about which post-Conquest readers felt more strongly than had Anglo-Saxons.²⁵ In Tanner 3, we find eccentric corrections like *abac\h/uc* (i. e. Habbakuk) (fol. 61r/8) and *corusc\h/ationis* (fol. 69r/22). Spellings such as these may have been intended to guide pronunciation: on three occasions in Book II, the *spiritus asper* was added to indicate aspiration.²⁶ However, other examples suggest orthographical concerns were the guiding principle. In Book II, the scribe wrote *mibi* six times, *nihil* twice (fols. 62r/1, 67v/3) and *nichil* twice (fols. 64v/15, 65r/3). One of the *nihil* spellings (fol. 62r/1) was corrected to *nichil*. My

²⁵ Post-conquest writers diverge. Orderic wrote *abundantiam*, *abundanter* and *arietinis* (< *arieto*, ‘charge (like a ram)’); Eadmer, *abundanter*; but William of Malmesbury preferred *habundanter*. On the criteria for selecting these examples, see n. 48 below.

²⁶ *abundantia* (fol. 39r/5); *exortatione* (fol. 58r/12); *exortandis* (fol. 58r/14). For this mark, see Bischoff 1990, 87.

overwhelming impression is that *nichil* and *michi* were ‘Norman’ spellings; *nihil* was uncomfortable to one post-Conquest reader, who corrected it.²⁷ The same is perhaps true of *abacuc* and *coruscationis*. Thus, though in some cases later interventions in Tanner 3 resolve genuine ambiguities, in others where the ambiguity is illusory, intervention suggests an anxiety about the linguistic competence of one’s fellow readers and the desire for orthographical conformity. However, to change a spelling required the certainty that one spelling was more correct than another spelling. This raises the question of where post-Conquest readers derived this certainty that particular forms in pre-Conquest manuscripts were aberrant and needed emendation.

Late Latin was a living language in which orthography might change to reflect developments in pronunciation, but Medieval Latin was a *Traditionssprache* whose orthography, modelled on the inconsistent practice of ancient texts but swayed by the variations of Late Latin, controlled its pronunciation.²⁸ In France, Spain and Italy, the vernaculars were Romance languages, derived from Late Latin, and, despite their Scandinavian origins, we can assume the Normans also spoke a Romance vernacular. These vernaculars exerted a strong force on the learning, writing and pronunciation of Medieval Latin even in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. By contrast, the Germanic vernacular of England had nothing in common with Medieval Latin, which would have been learnt as a foreign language. The Norman Conquest, which brought to England men whose vernacular was a Romance language, inevitably challenged fossilised Latin spellings.

²⁷ William of Malmesbury seems to have used both *nihil* and *nichil*; Eadmer always (or almost always) *nichil*. Their practice with *mi(c)hi* is difficult to ascertain from printed editions, since editors do not always indicate when they are expanding an abbreviation. When Orderic spelt it in full, he always wrote *michi*: Chibnall 1969-80, i. 124.

²⁸ See, in general, Löfstedt 1959. There is no thorough treatment of the orthography of Medieval Latin. Brief discussions of some deviations from Classical orthography will be found in Blaise 1954, 30-1; Sidwell 1995, 373-5; Rigg 1996.

Shortly after their conversion, the Anglo-Saxons had felt the need for orthographical rules to help deal with the variety of forms they encountered in imported manuscripts. Antique grammars contained occasional prescriptions about correct orthography, but these prescriptions were too infrequent, too miscellaneous and too contradictory to be of much use. The tracts by Caper and Agroecius on orthography consisted mainly of *differentiae*, and the misspellings they aimed to correct were those that troubled late Classical writers, not medieval copyists.²⁹ Cassiodorus's *De orthographia* [CPL 907] was seemingly known only in late Anglo-Saxon England, and seems to have been a rare text throughout the medieval period.³⁰ Book I, chapter 27 of Isidore's *Etymologiae* likewise concerned orthography, but was too brief to be useful. Accordingly, Bede composed what he described as a 'librum de Orthographia, alphabeti ordine distinctum' (*HE* v. 24).³¹ Bede's work is a curious mixture of orthographical legislation, stylistic advice in the form of verbal *differentiae* and *idiomata*, and linguistic lore, all alphabetised by the first letter of the lemma. It is neither a readable manual of style, nor particularly helpful as a reference work. Nonetheless, Bede was Alcuin's main source for his *De orthographia*, a more purposeful text omitting much of Bede's lore, which survives in two recensions.³² The treatises of Bede and Alcuin circulated in tandem in late Anglo-Saxon England, and consequently their prescriptions can perhaps be taken as evidence of the ideal spelling standard for which late Anglo-Saxon scribes were striving.³³

²⁹ Keil 1857-80, vii. 92-107, 113-25. A copy of Caper is recorded at Glastonbury: Sharpe, Carley et al. 1996, B39.325. Both texts are found in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 221 (see n. 33 below).

³⁰ Keil 1857-80, vii. 144-210. There is a copy in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 221 (see n. 33 below). Abbot Saewold gave a copy to St Vaast c. 1070: Lapidge 1985, VIII. 25. Christ Church had two copies in 1331 (the first bound with a 'Musica Augustini libri IV'), one of which was seen by the compilers of the *Registrum*, who also saw a copy at Salisbury: James 1903, 18, 53; Rouse and Rouse 1991, R14.10.

³¹ Jones and Kendall 1975, 7-57. See also Dionisotti 1982.

³² Bruni 1997, edits the a-version. The b-version has not been edited according to modern standards. See also Wright 1981; Jullien and Perelman 1999, ALC 32 (pp. 142-5).

³³ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 221, fols. 1-24 contains Alcuin and Bede (perh. Canterbury StA (or Brittany?), s. x¹ or x^{med} or x²); see Bishop 1955, 187-9; Budny 1997, no. 15 (i. 205-9) and pls. 160-1 (fols. 1r, 14v). Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 221, fols. 25-64 contains Cassiodorus, Caper and Agroecius (England, s. x or Continent, s. ix, prov. England by s. x or xi?). London, British Library, Harley 3826 (prob. Abingdon, s.

The company the treatises keep in Harley 3826 suggests that Latin orthography was part of the Anglo-Saxon school curriculum. However, it is doubtful whether Bede and Alcuin would have been of much use in the late tenth century. They rarely give general rules, preferring to disambiguate only in the particular. Alcuin, for example, following Cassiodorus, tells us to write *ara* without aspiration when we mean ‘altar’, but *haru* with aspiration when we mean a shelter for pigs.³⁴ Such guidance might have helped prevent an embarrassing misunderstanding, but it scarcely helped a scribe to decide between *abundanter* and *habundanter* where there was no danger of confusion.

It is therefore unclear what texts the post-Conquest readers drew on for guidelines regarding orthography. No orthographical treatises appear to have been copied in England between 1066 and 1130. Library catalogues from the later medieval period record copies of Bede and Alcuin at Glastonbury,³⁵ Alcuin at Ramsey,³⁶ and Alcuin (misascribed to Bede), enjoyed a brief renaissance in certain Cistercian houses.³⁷ However, it seems likely the Ramsey and Glastonbury copies were pre-Conquest and the Cistercian copies reflect a specific initiative. Moreover, neither Priscian nor Donatus, the staples of post-Conquest grammatical education, concern themselves greatly with spelling.³⁸ Nonetheless, there is evidence that some Anglo-Normans were interested in orthographical norms. William of Malmesbury copied or compiled a collection of orthographical texts, very similar to CCCC

xi/xi) contains Alcuin, Bede, Book III of Abbo of St Germain’s *Bella Parisiacae urbis* with glosses, Book IV of Martianus Capella’s *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* and glossaries. See Gneuss 1994, 60-2. Columbia, University of Missouri, Ellis Library, Fragmenta Manuscripta F. M. 2 (prob. Wales, s. ix, prov. Winchester by s. x^m) is a single leaf containing part of Bede (lls. 37-154) and other grammatical excerpts.

³⁴ ‘Ara cum altare significat sine aspiratione, cum vero cubile porcorum cum aspiratione’ (Alcuin, *De orthographia* §29).

³⁵ There were two copies of Alcuin, one with Bede, the other with Alcuin’s own *De dialecta*: Sharpe, Carley et al. 1996, B39.258 = B44.43 = B45.52.

³⁶ In a volume with the mysterious ‘Beda de Phisica’: Sharpe, Carley et al. 1996, B68.247a.

³⁷ The compilers of the *Registrum* saw copies at Newminster (f. 1138 or 1139), Combe (f. 1150) and Merevale (f. 1148). Rouse and Rouse 1991, R7.27.

³⁸ The first book of Priscian’s *Institutiones Grammatici* concerns the *littera*, but is not really concerned with spelling; this is also the case with Donatus.

221, which now survives only in a later copy.³⁹ The autograph manuscripts of post-Conquest authors evince a concern for consistent orthography, and may offer evidence of their underlying training.⁴⁰ To avoid instances where a foreign exemplar may have affected the scribe's usual orthographical profile, I have drawn examples from Eadmer's personal manuscript of most of his works,⁴¹ William of Malmesbury's autograph of the *Gesta pontificum*,⁴² and, from the other side of the Channel, the surviving portions of Orderic's autograph of his *Historia ecclesiastica*.⁴³ It is clear that the Anglo-Normans, like the Anglo-Saxons before them, learnt Latin spelling in the schools, but how the standards underlying their orthography developed is almost entirely obscure.⁴⁴

This is nonetheless the context in which we should see the post-Conquest orthographical corrections in Tanner 3. Unassimilated spellings were altered to assimilated forms. Book II of the *Dialogi* contains fourteen spellings of the *ads-* / *ass-* type:

assensum (fol. 41v/24): 'adsensus', assent, approval.
a(d)seruit (fol. 40r/10); *asserit* (fol. 56r/24); *asseris* (fol. 60r/2); *asseris* (fol. 68v/10): 'adsero', protect, defend.
assidue (fol. 63r/21): 'adsidue', continually, incessantly.
adsistere (fol. 51r/21); *adsis|tere* (fol. 63v/15); *adsistere* (fol. 63v/15); *adsistens* (fol. 73r/15): 'adsisto', stand by, defend.
adstaret (fol. 58v/12); *adstare* (fol. 67r/17): 'adsto', stand by, assist.
adstringens (fol. 66v/23): 'adstringo', draw close, tighten.
a(d)sueta (fol. 42r/9): 'adsuetus', accustomed, customary.

³⁹ London, British Library, Harley 3969: Thomson 2003, 61.

⁴⁰ Parkes 1994.

⁴¹ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 371. The full contents are listed by Southern 1963, 367-8. For a plate, see Robinson 1988, pl. 40 (p. 23). I have drawn my examples of Eadmer's practice from his life of St Wilfred: Muir and Turner 1998. The editors print **oe**, **e**-caudata and **e** as simply [e]. On Eadmer's spelling in general, see Southern 1962, xxxiv.

⁴² Oxford, Magdalen College, lat. 172: Hamilton 1870. Hamilton appears to have reproduced the orthography of the manuscript, either expanding **e**-caudata as [æ] or leaving it as [e-cedilla], reproducing consonantal **i** as [j] and expanding the abbreviation **p'** as either [pre-] or [prae-]. For a plate, see Watson 1984, pl. 46 (fol. 99r). See also Winterbottom 2003.

⁴³ Paris, BNF, lat. 5506, parts i and ii, and lat. 10913: see Chibnall 1969-80, i. 123-4. Chibnall preserves Orderic's spelling, reproducing **e**-caudata as [æ], though she standardises to Orderic's favoured spelling when expanding abbreviations. For plates, see [Anon] 1959-, ii. pl. XV (5506, pt. i, fol. 126v), iii. pl. XXIX (10913, p. 271).

⁴⁴ Professor Vincent Gillespie (personal communication) has suggested that the orthography of papal correspondence may have been the controlling influence on post-Conquest orthographical preferences.

The original scribe thus spelt *ads-* nine times, and *ass-* five times, but it is notable that he always spelt *adsisto* and *adsto* with *ads-*. This reminds us that, on psychological grounds, the spelling of the preposition was more likely to be retained in words where its prepositional force was still felt.⁴⁵ However, the variation in the spelling of *adsero* suggests that the scribe had no preconceived rules for spelling compounds in *ads-*. On two occasions, one of the later correctors felt warranted to expunge the **d**, either by underdotting (fol. 40r/10) or erasure (fol. 42r/9), and produced an assimilated spelling. Both Bede and Alcuin recommended assimilation here,⁴⁶ and Alcuin even recommended *ass-* spellings in words like *asspiro* and *asspicio*.⁴⁷ William of Malmesbury also favoured assimilation, writing *assecutus*, *asseritur*, *assumpsit* and *assurgere*, but also *astantem* and *astitit* from *adsto*, presumably by analogy with verbs like *aspicio* and *aspiro* where *adsp-* was usually assimilated to *asp-*.⁴⁸ The corrections thus bring the spelling of the manuscript closer in line with the practice of William of Malmesbury (who permitted *as-* spellings) and, to a lesser extent, with the universal assimilation prescribed by Bede and Alcuin. We can tentatively see them as a ‘Normanisation’ of the spelling of Tanner 3.

Similarly, the digraphs **ae** and **oe**, **a** and **e**, and **e**-caudata were often confused before the Conquest, and post-Conquest correctors frequently altered ambiguous forms. The original scribe of Tanner 3 used the spelling [ae] interchangeably with *e*-caudata:⁴⁹

ae- for CL *e-*: *aegressa* (fol. 37r/23); *aecclesiae* (fol. 38v/20); *aedito* (fol. 40v/12); etc.

⁴⁵ Buck 1899, 157.

⁴⁶ ‘Assuere et assumentum panni per s, non per d scribendum; similiter assumere per s’ (Bede, *De orthographia* 93-4); ‘Saepe ad, euphoniae causa, in sequenter, mutabitur consonantem, ut ... assumo’ (Alcuin, *De orthographia*, §3).

⁴⁷ ‘Asspiro, asspicio sine d scribenda sunt per duplicem s, licet cum ad praepositione composita sint, quia perit ibi d’ (Alcuin, *De orthographia*, §16). The scribe produced two spellings of this sort in Book II, alongside six *asp-* spellings. Both Alcuinian spellings were later corrected: *a(s)spexit* (fol. 65v/2) and *a(s)spicimus* (fol. 70r/3).

⁴⁸ In the absence of concordances, examples to illustrate the spelling of Orderic, Eadmer and William have been collected by reading through Hamilton 1870, §§84-90 (=pp. 184-96); Chibnall 1969-80, XII. 24-6 (=vi. 282-306); Muir and Turner 1998, prol., cap. i-xi (=pp. 8-28). No instances of *ads-* or *a(s)s-* were found in the section from Orderic; Eadmer used *associatur* once.

⁴⁹ On *e*-caudata, see Beneš 1999-2000.

e- for CL *ae-*: *emulari* (fol. 47v/18); etc.

-ae- for CL *-e-*: *depraebensa* (fol. 36v/24); *taenebris* (fol. 48r/5); *laenare* (fol. 50v/17); *caellerime* (fol. 51v/6); *faemin(a)e* (fol. 61v/5); etc.

-e- for CL *-ae-*: *pene* (fol. 40v/20); *ceteris* (fol. 53v/22-3); *adherere* (fol. 53v/23); etc.

-ae for CL *-e-*: *blandae* (fol. 38v/10); *lenaræ* (fol. 51r/1); *tæ* (fol. 57r/6); etc.

-e for CL *-ae-*: *bone* (fol. 44v/10); *aque* (fol. 46r/3); etc.

These examples could easily be multiplied, but are sufficient to demonstrate extreme confusion. Most offputting to the reader is the confusion of [æ] and [e] in inflections: *inter alia*, we find adverbs in *-æ* and first declension nouns with oblique forms in *-e*. Orderic Vitalis, Eadmer, and William of Malmesbury are careful to distinguish between [e] and [æ] (usually written as *e-caudata*) in inflections or inflectional positions but are less consistent in other positions. The Tanner 3 correctors likewise took care to add a disambiguating cedilla to final **e** (fols. 53v/18, 54v/18, 58v/4, 61v/7, 61v/24 etc). However, in other positions, post-Conquest writers were less sure of the correct spelling. Sometimes, however, the spelling of a particular word appears to have been standardised. Orderic, for example, always wrote *aecclesia*. Eadmer used different forms of *e-caudata* depending on whether it indicated [æ] or [e],⁵⁰ but did not always know when a digraph was etymologically correct (for example, *ceca* for *caeca*) and produced analogical spellings like *faecunditate*.⁵¹ Additionally, some corrections to Tanner 3 reflect the obsolescence of the **ae** digraph. In Book II of the *Dialogi*, I have counted 242 instances of the erasure of **a** from **ae** combinations. In Latin bookhands, *e-caudata* was being replaced with plain **e** by 1160.⁵²

The spelling of individual words was also standardised in Tanner 3. The spelling *doleum* for *dolium*, ‘a large vessel’ was corrected four times in chapter 29 (fols. 65r/21, 65r/22,

⁵⁰ Webber 1995, 152.

⁵¹ Unfortunately, editors do not reproduce the testimony of the manuscripts regarding the use of *e*, *e-caudata* and digraph spellings. The two examples are drawn from CCCC 371 (Eadmer’s autograph manuscript), p. 23 (lls. 14, 8). He also uses a number of etymologically correct spellings such as *baec* (npn) (29, 31, 32).

⁵² ‘In two collections of twelfth-century charters the latest dates at which tailed **e** is found seems to be c. 1160 ... These charters are in bookhand. In charter-hand tailed **e** had been abandoned at a much earlier date in the twelfth century’: Ker 1960, 37n8.

65r/24, 65v/13), in accordance with the prescription of Bede.⁵³ The word for ‘nun’, *sanctimonialis*, was altered at least seven times, seemingly because it was the scribe’s normal practice to decline both parts of the compound separately. The adjective *incolumis*, meaning ‘safe, unharmed’, originally spelt *incolomis* by the scribe, was changed to the more familiar form on four occasions (fols. 52r/1, 53r/14, 65r/11, 68v/7). A [u] was inserted into the spelling *spiritalis* twice (fols. 61r/14, 69v/23). Likewise, there are a number of corrections of confusions regarding the use of geminate consonants,⁵⁴ the vowels [i] and [e],⁵⁵ and final [t].⁵⁶ None of these alterations clarify ambiguous forms; all correct perceived aberrant spellings to a norm.

This impulse also affected conventions of abbreviation in Tanner 3. On 123 occasions in Book III of the *Dialogues*, the **e** and second minim of the **u** of enclitic *–que* were erased to approximate to **q**; in abbreviation for *–que*. The replacement of unabbreviated *–que* with an abbreviation is a frequent sight in pre-Conquest manuscripts, and may be connected to concerns about the placement of stress when reading aloud.⁵⁷ These erasures seem to have been made before the mid-twelfth century since a hand of this date occasionally resupplied the second minim of **u** and the **e** over the partial erasure.⁵⁸

Many spellings in Tanner 3 have been altered. In a few cases, these alterations resolve genuine ambiguities, but in most cases the ambiguities are more imagined than real. Additionally, a few alterations to spellings may have resulted from preparing the manuscript

⁵³ ‘Dolium per .i. scribendum, non doleum per .e.’ (Bede, *De orthographia* l. 327).

⁵⁴ *cor(r)uscis* (fol. 54v/22); *ue\l/lim* (fol. 61r/16); *inca\s/sum* (fol. 61r/24); *to(l)leraret* (fol. 61v/17); *co\r/reptus* (fol. 72v/23).

⁵⁵ Originally with [i] for [e]: *despectis* (fol. 37v/23); *excederet* (fol. 42v/15); *collegit* (fol. 43v/4); *despectum* (fol. 49v/14); *intellegi* (fol. 50v/21) etc. Originally with [e] for [i]: *intelligo* (fol. 42v/11); *dilacterum* (fol. 51v/16); *dicitis* (fol. 60v/13).

⁵⁶ *sed* (fol. 45v/3); *apud* (fol. 63r/14).

⁵⁷ ‘To write *neque* in full was an error likely to mislead a reader into stressing the second syllable: the correction to *neq*; is usually made’: Ker 1960, 51.

⁵⁸ See fol. 71r in particular. The broad bowl and short descender of **q**, and tendency for the mark of abbreviation to collide with the **q** all point to a date of s. xii^{med}.

for reading aloud, just as annotators were wont to expand Roman numerals and add accents. But alterations of this type are in the minority. The majority of alterations bring the manuscript's spelling into line with a perceived standard. This standard is not that enunciated by Bede, Alcuin, or their predecessors (if any of them can indeed be said to be enunciating a standard), but is a standard that can be detected in the personal spelling of Anglo-Norman authors like Orderic Vitalis, Eadmer and William of Malmesbury, and, though the investigation of the chronological and geographical variation in Latin spelling is not very far advanced, it does seem to be a Norman standard, brought across the Channel with the Conqueror's churchmen. Generally, the application of this standard resulted in a levelling of forms, but the correctors also intervened where post-Conquest writers were themselves confused (the etymological distinction between [a] and [ae] in non-inflectional positions, for example), suggesting they held the flawed conviction that their notions of spelling were *ipso facto* more correct than those found in pre-Conquest manuscripts. Unassimilated spellings, variation in the use of [h], enclitic *-que* spelt in full and other obsolete features of habitual Anglo-Saxon orthography seem to have grated with post-Conquest readers, who itched to eliminate such inconsistencies.

ALTERATIONS TO TEXTUAL REDACTIONS

Furthermore, many pre-Conquest manuscripts contained redactions of particular texts which were unfamiliar to Norman readers. Post-Conquest scribes responded to this unfamiliarity by eclectically correcting these manuscripts against their favoured redaction, which often had the effect of creating new hybrid texts. In a limited way, this had occurred before the Conquest. For example, a prayer added at the end of 'The Regius Psalter' at the turn of the

tenth century⁵⁹ has around 175 eleventh-century corrections which agree ‘for the most part’ with the text in London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. iii (fols. 46-50v).⁶⁰ Most of the corrections seem to be in the hand of the scribe who added a short account of fasting days (fol. 196v),⁶¹ whose script Ker dates to the first half of the eleventh century.⁶² However, since the Conquest ensured a major influx of Continental manuscripts, and the close scrutiny of pre-Conquest manuscripts, it created a set of circumstances in which Anglo-Saxon manuscripts were particularly liable to undergo textual alteration.

This was particularly the case with Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica gentis anglorum*, which was increasingly influential after 1066. Shortly after the Conquest, Bede’s history inspired Aldwin, prior of Winchcombe, to travel north with Reinfrid and Ælfric, monks of Evesham, to attempt to restore monasticism in the North.⁶³ At the same time, it was coming to be viewed as more than a work of ecclesiastical history. The copy which William of St Carilef donated to Durham is referred to as a ‘Hystoria Anglorum’,⁶⁴ and the same words are found as a twelfth-century running title, added to a copy of later Gloucester provenance.⁶⁵ A late-twelfth-century reader of a pre-Conquest copy of Aldhelm’s *Epistola ad Heahfridum* added a request on the blank first leaf: ‘mitte nobis historia bede de gestis anglorum’.⁶⁶ Bede’s text had become a history of the English. The text was also copied with increasing frequency during the twelfth century,⁶⁷ and Bede’s reputation was on the rise. A twelfth-century scribe added an ‘epitaphium egregii Doctoris Bede’ at the end of one pre-Conquest copy of the *Historia*

⁵⁹ London, British Library, Royal 2 B. v, fols. 192v-196v. It was at Christ Church in the twelfth century (title and pressmark, fol. 8r), and may have been there earlier: O’Neill 1986.

⁶⁰ Pulsiano and McGowan 1994, 192. The prayer is edited 212-6.

⁶¹ This text is also found in Cotton Tiberius A. iii (fol. 44r).

⁶² Ker 1957, 320.

⁶³ Baker 1970; Dawtry 1982.

⁶⁴ Browne 1988, 155.

⁶⁵ London, British Library, Royal 13 C. v, fols. 128v-129r (‘YSTORIA ANGLORUM’).

⁶⁶ London, British Library, Cotton Domitian ix, fols. 2-7 (fol. 2r).

⁶⁷ Davis 1989, 105.

ecclesiastica.⁶⁸ However, the most significant consequence of the Conquest was for the type of text which circulated.

Two redactions of Bede's *Historia* are attested in early manuscripts, which editors call *m* (after the Moore manuscript, Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 5. 16) and *c* (after London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius C. ii).⁶⁹ These redactions are distinguished by six main features:

- (1) the prayer *Praeterea omnes ... inueniam* is found after the preface in *m*, but after the list of Bede's works at the end of Book V in *c*.
- (2) *m* has an extra miracle of St Oswald (iv. 14).
- (3) an erroneous cross-reference in *m* 'cuius supra meminimus' (iv. 18) is not found in *c*.
- (4) at the end of iv. 30 *c* has 'unum quod' as if only one miracle of St Cuthbert followed, while *m* has 'quaedam quae'. Two miracles follow in both texts. In its table of contents, *c* has the headings of these miracles in reverse order.
- (5) in the chronological summary (v. 24) the *c*-text ends annal 731 with 'archiepiscopus' and supplies annals for 733 and 734, which are not in *m*.
- (6) the *c*-text omits Bede's *Capitula* on the Prophets from the list of his works (v. 24).

Early manuscripts of the *m*-text soon migrated to the Continent,⁷⁰ while early manuscripts of the *c*-text remained in England, or were sent to Germany with Anglo-Saxon missionaries.⁷¹

Thereafter, the transmission becomes increasingly complicated, as new redactions were produced by various revisers, and these new redactions were compared with each other, resulting in hybrid texts whose filiations can be very difficult to distinguish. Mynors distinguishes a *c*2-redaction 'which represents the form of the *History* current throughout the Middle Ages in these islands', and a sub-redaction, which I will call the English *textus receptus*, 'the common text of southern England in the later middle ages'.⁷² Manuscripts of the English *textus receptus* themselves fall into two groups, the 'Digby Group', and what I will call,

⁶⁸ Winchester, Cathedral Library, 1 + London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius D. iv, vol. 2, fols. 158-66 (Tiberius D. iv, vol. 2, fol. 166v). The text of the epitaph has suffered severe fire damage.

⁶⁹ Colgrave and Mynors 1969, xxxix-lxxi.

⁷⁰ Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 5. 16 ('The Moore Bede'), probably datable soon after 737; St Petersburg, Russian National Library, Q. v. I. 18 ('The Leningrad Bede'), probably datable 731x746. The Moore Bede was probably at Charlemagne's court school in the eighth century: Bischoff 1994, 67-8.

⁷¹ Kassel, Gesamthochschulbibliothek, 4^o Ms. theol. 2 (prov. Fulda by s. viii²); London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius C. ii.

⁷² Colgrave and Mynors 1969, xliii, lv.

for convenience, the ‘Harley Group’.⁷³ The English *textus receptus* appears to be the product of the comparison of a *c*-text with an *m*-text and a *terminus ante quem* for its creation is established by the early-twelfth-century date of its earliest manuscripts. It is generally believed that the *m*-text was largely unavailable in England after 800,⁷⁴ and though this has recently been challenged,⁷⁵ it seems likely that the creation of the English *textus receptus* depended on the acquisition of a *m*-text manuscript from the continent, something which may have occurred as a result of the Norman Conquest, even though the Normans seem to have known a *c*-text themselves.⁷⁶ Partially conflate manuscripts may even have been circulating in England before the Conquest.⁷⁷ At any rate, frequent alterations to the text of pre-Conquest manuscripts by twelfth-century hands suggest strongly that the Norman Conquest precipitated a particularly intense encounter between *m*- and *c*-type texts.

The miracle of St Oswald missing from the *c*-text was added to two pre-Conquest manuscripts after 1066. Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 7. 5 (743) is an early-eleventh-century copy of the *Historia*, which was probably in the North of England a century later. The text was supplemented and altered during the early twelfth century, apparently in two phases. In the first phase, lists of *capitula* to Book I, II and III (fols. 4-5, 46, 82) and the Oswald miracle (fols. 151-2) were supplied; letter sequences were used to instruct the binder where these

⁷³ The twelfth-century members of the ‘Digby Group’ are Hereford, Cathedral Library, P. V. I, fols. 29-152 + Oxford, Bodleian Library, e Mus. 93 (s. xii¹, Battle); Oxford, Magdalen College, lat. 105 (s. xii^{med}); and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 211 (s. xii², Waltham). The twelfth-century members of the ‘Harley Group’ are London, British Library, Harley 3680 (s. xii¹, Rochester); Oxford, Bodleian Library, e Museo 115 (s. xii²); and Dublin, Trinity College, 492 (E. 2. 23) (s. xii¹, Bury).

⁷⁴ Colgrave and Mynors 1969, xlvi-vii. The only copy that seems to have remained in England is London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. xiv (s. viii^{med}, Wearmouth-Jarrow).

⁷⁵ Westgard 2006.

⁷⁶ Two Norman manuscripts are known to me: Rouen, Bibliothèque Publique, 1177, fols. 173-275v (s. xiiiⁱⁿ, Jumièges) and Rouen, Bibliothèque Publique, 1343, fols. 34-121 (s. xii^m, Saint-Évroul), copied by Orderic. Mynors identifies both these as *c*-texts, though notes that Orderic’s manuscript has *Praeterea ... inueniam* at the end of the preface: Colgrave and Mynors 1969, lxi. The filiation of these manuscripts needs to be re-examined.

⁷⁷ Westgard deduces the existence of a predominantly *m*-text manuscript, which he calls HE(*Y), and which was written in tenth-century Northumbria, and ‘stood somewhere between the two recensions [*scil.* *m*- and *c*-texts]’: Westgard 2006, 315.

leaves should be inserted.⁷⁸ Though Books IV and V have original tables of contents (fols. 129v-131r, 187r-188r), there is nothing to indicate Books II and III did, and the division of the text is generally rather haphazard.⁷⁹ The supply of part of v. 21 (fols. 235-7)⁸⁰ and the end of the text (fols. 246-249r)⁸¹ may belong to a second phase, since these leaves are in a different hand and the letter sequences were not used.⁸² Subsequently, an account of the wanderings of St Cuthbert's community (fol. 249rv),⁸³ and a catalogue of the prognostics received by various English bishops at their consecrations, probably composed shortly after 1123, were added at the end of the book (fols. 250v-251r).⁸⁴ The manuscript has also been very carefully corrected throughout.

The second example is Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 163, another early-eleventh-century copy of the *Historia*. There is plentiful evidence that the manuscript was at Peterborough in the later middle ages,⁸⁵ and it has been suggested that it contains an initial by the artist responsible for initials in the 'Peterborough Chronicle' (fol. 1r).⁸⁶ The original, early-eleventh-century part contains Bede's *Historia* (fols. 2-209r), Æthelwulf's *De abbatibus* (fols. 209v-226v), and excerpts from Jerome and Orosius concerning Babylon (fols. 226v-227r). A brief Latin account of the reigns of Ethelred and Edmund Ironside was added directly below the end of Bede's *Historia*, pretending to be part of the text proper (fol.

⁷⁸ 'c' (fol. 45v), 'd' (fol. 46r); 'e' (fol. 81v), 'f' (fol. 82r), 'g' (fol. 150v), 'h' (fol. 151r).

⁷⁹ The first leaf of Q1, which may once have contained a table of contents to Book I, is missing.

⁸⁰ '[in]ueniri qui mensis ... seruitutis intonsis in': Colgrave and Mynors 1969, 542/8-546/29.

⁸¹ From 'sexcentesimo quadagesimo eadbalus' to end: Colgrave and Mynors 1969, 564/5-570/23.

⁸² Fols. 246-9r probably replaced a lost final quire; fols. 246-51 may have replaced three damaged leaves.

⁸³ The text on the wanderings of the Community of St Cuthbert also accompanies Bede's *Historia* in a fifteenth-century manuscript, Cambridge, St John's College, 254 (S. 6).

⁸⁴ Printed and discussed Henderson 1990.

⁸⁵ 'Anno domini m ccc lix obiit frater S[...] de burgo sancti petri' (fol. 250v); 'Humfridus Natures' (s. xvi^m, fol. 249v). A similar inscription is found in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Gough liturg. 17, from Peterborough.

⁸⁶ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud misc. 636. The resemblance was first noted by E. W. B. Nicholson (*apud SC* 1003), and is repeated by Whitelock 1954, 14; Colgrave and Mynors 1969, li.

209r).⁸⁷ The text of the *Historia* was substantially modified during the twelfth century. Fols. ii, 1, 6, 7 (the outer two bifolia of the first quire) and fols. 136, 137 (a bifolium after Q17) were supplied. Given their position, the first four supply leaves probably replaced damaged leaves, but the other two supplied the Oswaldian miracle missing from the *c*-text.⁸⁸ These two examples show that post-Conquest readers wanted to ensure they had as much of Bede's text as possible. However, the twelfth century also saw more extensive attempts to correct pre-Conquest manuscripts against different recensions.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 43 is an early-eleventh-century copy of the *Historia*.⁸⁹ The original text of Hatton 43 was originally very close to that of the oldest complete manuscript of the *c*-text,⁹⁰ but it contains numerous twelfth-century interventions. These include alterations to the spelling of personal names,⁹¹ place names⁹² and Latin words;⁹³ changes to abbreviations,⁹⁴ script⁹⁵ and word division,⁹⁶ punctuation,⁹⁷ and the

⁸⁷ This is a skilful and drastic abridgement of Henry of Huntingdon: HH v. 28 [p. 326] (*Adelred ... predixit*), vi. 11 [pp. 355-6] (*Adelred ... aduenisset*), vi. 12 [p. 356] (*Post ... negociis*), vi. 14 [p. 360] (*Edmundus ... Oxenforde*), vi. 14 [p. 362] (*Sic periit ... Glastingbiri*).

⁸⁸ Davis thought the missing chapter was supplied when the manuscript was copied, which led him dramatically astray: 'whoever did the transcribing at Peterborough took care to reinstate from a *m* version the text of Book IV chapter 14 which was missing in *c*. This chapter concerned a miracle of St Oswald and would have been important for Peterborough after it had acquired its arm of St Oswald from Durham. How did the transcriber know about the missing chapter at a time when all the *m* texts, which alone contained it were apparently on the continent? One can only suppose that the information came from Fleury-sur-Loire where there was an *m* text of the early ninth century (Bern, Burgerbibliothek, 49) because Fleury was the place *par excellence* where the English monastic reformers of the tenth century received their training': Davis 1989, 112-3. In Davis's defence, the script of fols. 136-7 is consciously imitative, but the proportions, the punctuation and the initials evince its true date.

⁸⁹ Plummer's argument that the manuscript is from Glastonbury is unconvincing: Plummer 1896, i. cxiii.

⁹⁰ London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius C. ii: Colgrave and Mynors 1969, xliii.

⁹¹ \u/ugheard\us/ (324/4 = fol. 103r/1); col\e/ma\n/n\us/ (324/14 = fol. 103r/9); saxuulf\us/ (324/18 = fol. 103r/13) etc. All references to the text of the *Historia* are to the edition of Colgrave and Mynors 1969.

It should be noted that William of Malmesbury refers to English names as 'barbarous' (GR ii. 115, *W*i. 16. 5).
⁹² bri(t)ta\n/niam (324/6 = fol. 103r/3); bercingens\i/ (324/20 = fol. 103r/15); nordanhumborum (324/32 = fol. 103v/1) etc.

⁹³ provinci\ae (324/12 = fol. 103r/7); immune *altered from* innume (326/26 = fol. 104r/1); re(p)ertum (326/26 = fol. 104r/2) etc.

⁹⁴ quoq(ue)\ue/ (324/9 = fol. 103r/5); insular abbreviation for *autem* explained interlinearly (384/3 = fol. 119r/23); p\er/(er) biduum (394/20 = fol. 122v/11); &iam \etiam/ (428/22 = fol. 133r/9).

⁹⁵ In ostendit (346/1 = fol. 109r/24) the ligature between *s* and *t* has been erased.

⁹⁶ e. g. bis\^i_\n\|/anno (352/3 = fol. 111r/20); praedi(x)\x/erit (392/29 = fol. 122r/9-10).

treatment of numerals;⁹⁸ but, most interestingly, corrections which bring it closer into line with the *m*-text. Plummer argued these corrections fathered the ‘Harley Group’,⁹⁹ though Mynors took the view that they were made to bring Hatton 43 into conformity with a pre-existing recension.¹⁰⁰ My examination of the text of Book IV only emphasises the complexity of the situation. Hatton 43 did originally contain a very pure *c*2-text. Book IV agreed with the *c*-text against the *m*-text 108 times; and on 24 occasions, it agreed specifically with the *c*2-text.¹⁰¹ It disagreed with the *c*-text on only four occasions:

pia ... *prouisione* against *c*-text *pia* (360/10 = fol. 113v/18-9)
aduenerant against *c*-text *uenerant* (366/23 = fol. 116r/1)
ordo against *c*-text *et ordo* (416/19 = fol. 129r/22)
renitens against *c*-text *paenitens* (436/35 = fol. 135v/23)

Most of the textual corrections to Book IV emend obvious errors, such as the omission of *quae ibidem erant facultates cum agris et hominibus donauit, omnes* by haplography (374/32-3 = fol. 118r/26), but thirty-nine correct a *c*-reading to an *m*-reading, and eight correct a *c*2-reading to an *m*-reading. The correctors thus corrected about one-third of the *c*-readings, and one-third of the *c*2-readings. There is no apparent reason why they corrected the text in some cases, but not in others.

Twenty-seven of the remaining corrections alter a reading common to the *c*- and *m*-texts, and replaced it with a reading found in the English *textus receptus*.¹⁰² On eleven

⁹⁷ e. g. *Vt defuncto deusdedit \u/uigheard\us/ ad suscipiendum episcopatum | romam sit misus \./ sed illo ibidem defuncto theodorus archi\-/ | episcopus ordinatus \./ et cum hadriano abbate sit bri(t)ta\n/niam missus.* (324/4-7 = fol. 103r/1-3).

⁹⁸ e. g. *.dclxviii. \sescentesimo sexagesimo octauo/ sub die .vii.\mo/* (330/17 = fol. 105r/7).

⁹⁹ Plummer 1896, i. xcv-vi, cxxvii-iii.

¹⁰⁰ Colgrave and Mynors 1969, lvii.

¹⁰¹ These figures have been obtained by comparing the text of Hatton 43 with the variants recorded in the *apparatus criticus* of the edition of Colgrave and Mynors; I have not attempted to check *c*-text or *m*-text readings for myself.

¹⁰² My ‘Digby Group’ readings are based on Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 211 (Plummer’s O₆) and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 101 (Plummer’s O₁₁), while my ‘Harley Group’ readings are based on Oxford, Bodleian Library, e Mus. 115 (Plummer’s O₇) and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Holkham misc. 7 (which Plummer did not know, and I have christened O₂₂).

occasions, the correctors introduced a reading only found in the ‘Digby Group’. There is only one instance where the corrections introduced a reading unique to the ‘Harley Group’:

\cui/ *magis* for ‘cuius magis’ (328/26 = fol. 104v/12) [O₇O₂₂ cui; O₆O₁₁ cuius].

There are five occasions where the correctors offered a reading not found in the English *textus receptus*:

(*ac*) *stragica* for ‘ac stragica’ (382/3-4 = fol. 118v/16) [O₆O₁₁O₂₂ ac stragica; O₇ ac tragica].
 (*ac*) *defunctus est corpusque* for ‘ac defunctus est corpusque’ (390/15 = fol. 121r/18) [O₆O₇O₁₁O₂₂ ac defunctus est corpusque].
perductus iussus est rearranged to *iussus perductus est* for ‘perductus iussus est’ (416/26 = fol. 129v/3) [O₆O₇O₁₁O₂₂ perductus iussus est].
 (*autem*) for ‘autem’ (438/31 = fol. 136v/3) [O₆O₇O₁₁O₂₂ autem].
 \cuthbertus/ *repetiit* for ‘repetiit’ (438/31 = fol. 136v/3) [O₆O₇O₁₁O₂₂ repetiit].

Most of these changes are stylistic rather than substantive, and it is probable little weight should be attached to them.

This collation shows us that Hatton 43 was not the ultimate exemplar for manuscripts of the ‘Harley Group’. Rather, the corrections are related to the ‘Digby Group’. However, (in its present form) Hatton 43 was not the ultimate exemplar for Digby 211 either.¹⁰³ Moreover, though none of the corrections preclude Hatton 43 having been corrected against a manuscript like Digby 211, this book must have more conflate than Digby 211, containing the *m*-text of annal 731 and including Bede’s capitula on the Prophets in his bibliography (v. 24). It is therefore possible that the correctors of Hatton 43 had access to more than one exemplar. At any rate, Hatton 43 was not the first *c*-text to be compared to an *m*-text, and was not the cradle in which the English *textus receptus* was nurtured. Moreover, it is not clear where the correctors acquired their exemplar(s) to correct Hatton 43, but such conflate manuscripts may have come from the Continent, where both *c*- and *m*-type manuscripts were available.

¹⁰³ For example, Digby 211 has ‘Praeterea omnes’ (fol. 108r) only at the end of the work, though it was added to the end of the Preface in Hatton 43 (fol. 2v) and allowed to stand after Bede’s bibliography (fol. 177v).

It will require a great deal of work to trace the diffusion of Bede's *Historia* during the Anglo-Saxon period, and how the transmission subsequently developed. A thorough edition based on the full collation of all surviving manuscripts is a *desideratum*. The survival of early manuscripts of both redactions of the text means we already have a fairly good idea of what Bede actually wrote, so the proper work of a critical edition would be to establish how, when and why the text changed during its circulation. At any rate, it is certain that post-Conquest readers were busily comparing different manuscripts of the *Historia ecclesiastica*, and expanding and correcting pre-Conquest manuscripts on the basis of these comparisons. Such processes no doubt also underlie many of the twelfth-century corrections in pre-Conquest manuscripts of other texts. They reflect the overwhelming academic desire to have a 'correct' text, even if many of the corrections drew readers away from Bede's *ipsissima verba*. Similar corrections are found in many liturgical books, though these changes usually had a practical implication for the performance of the *opus dei*.

ALTERATIONS TO REFLECT DIFFERENT LITURGICAL NEEDS

One of the most surprising aspects of the post-Conquest use of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts is the frequency with which pre-Conquest liturgical books were not discarded, but overhauled to comply with new liturgical practices. Immediately after the Conquest, Anglo-Saxon liturgical books must have found use because of the overwhelming importance of maintaining the performance of the *opus dei*. However, the ongoing use and adaptation of pre-Conquest liturgical books attest that these books were not just pragmatically useful but considered significant in themselves. The frequent adaption of a pre-Conquest liturgical book – in some ways a more difficult project than producing a new book – attests the desire of Anglo-Norman churchmen to assert the continuity of post-Conquest liturgical practice with what had occurred before 1066.

Anglo-Saxons often refurbished their own liturgical books because they had great significance to the community, and it was desirable to keep them in ongoing liturgical use. The ‘Vespasian Psalter’, an eighth-century copy of the *Psalterium Romanum* mentioned by Thomas Elmham in the fifteenth century as one of the *libri Augustini*, was supplemented in the early eleventh century with an extra quire in the hand of Eadwig Basan.¹⁰⁴ This quire contains the *Te Deum* and Athanasian Creed and seven prayers. The *Te Deum* and Athanasian Creed frequently follow the Canticles in Carolingian and post-Carolingian psalters, which suggests the quire was added to bring the book into line with current liturgical requirements.

Pre-Conquest psalters were more extensively altered and adapted during the Anglo-Norman period. A late-tenth-century psalter, which later may have belonged to Thomas Becket, received a few small but significant additions after the Conquest.¹⁰⁵ An early-twelfth-century scribe corrected a short omission in the ‘Canticum Moysi’ (fol. 130r), corresponding to Deut XXXII.24, while another contemporary hand added various setting of *Benedicamus domino* and *Ita missa est* at the front of the manuscript (fols. ii^v-iii^v),¹⁰⁶ and a quire of six (fols. 141-6) was inserted at the end. The first two leaves of this quire contain lections for the vigil and feast of the nativity (Matt I.18-21; John I.1-14, Mark XVI.1-7), the assumption of the virgin (Luke X.38-42) and the passion of St Elphege (John X.11-16, John XV.1-7); the rest are blank. According to a library note by Michael Gullick, these additions are in the hand of a Christ Church scribe who was active between 1100 and 1130, and added the *ordo* for the reception of the pallium to the ‘Pontifical of St Anselm’.¹⁰⁷ London, British Library, Harley 863, produced at Exeter during the episcopate of Leofric, was also supplemented after the

¹⁰⁴ London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian A. i, fols. 155-160: Wright and Campbell 1967. For Eadwig, see Pfaff 1992a; Dumville 1993, 111-40; Rushforth 2001. For the *libri Augustini*, see below 186-7.

¹⁰⁵ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 411. For its origin, see Wormald 1965, 45; Lapidge 1991, 65-6. For Becket’s ownership, see below 188.

¹⁰⁶ Hartzell 2006, no. 43 (p. 66).

¹⁰⁷ Dublin, Trinity College, 98 (B. 3. 6), fols. 69v-72r. For the scribe, see Gullick and Pfaff 2001, 286.

Conquest. A quire containing a calendar was added at the beginning of the manuscript (fols. 1*, 1-6), perhaps between 1173 and 1220.¹⁰⁸ Somewhat earlier, a scribe read through the psalter and added one or two variant readings from different textual traditions,¹⁰⁹ as well as abbreviated references to commentators (Cassiodorus, Jerome, Augustine and, on one occasion, Remigius) by particular words, presumably indicating whose commentary he found particularly apt for each verse. Saints Anna and Catherine of Alexandria were added to the litany.¹¹⁰ Neither occurs in any original pre-Conquest litany.¹¹¹

Similarly, the 'Eadui Psalter' was overhauled during the first half of the twelfth century.¹¹² The text of the Psalter was corrected from the *Romanum* to the *Gallicanum*, and the canticles were substantially altered. An unknown number of leaves was excised after fol. 136, and thirty-four new leaves were added in their place (fols. 137-144, 147-70). These contain the text of the remaining canticles and numerous prayers. Alterations to the calendar show that the psalter remained in liturgical use, which suggests these very extensive alterations were intended to ensure its compliance with contemporary liturgical standards. Additions to the calendar range from the twelfth to the fifteenth century.¹¹³ The eleventh-, twelfth- and thirteenth-century additions identify the Egyptian Days for the whole year (e. g. 1 January, 25 January). They record new feasts, such as the *dies natalis* of St Amphibalus (25 June), whose

¹⁰⁸ Watson 1979, no. 638 and pl. 102 (fol. 1r).

¹⁰⁹ e. g. 'dominus dixit ad me filius meus es tu \hebraica ueritas/ ego hodie genui te' (fol. 8v/10 = Ps II.7); 'quique terrigene et filii hominum \simul/ in unum diues | et pauper' (fol. 35r/11-12 = Ps XLVIII.3). I have not been able to establish whether these are typical Hebraic readings.

¹¹⁰ Fol. 110v/b7-8: Dewick and Frere 1914-1921, i, pl. XVII.

¹¹¹ Both occur in the rewritten litanies of the 'Portiforium of St Wulfstan' and the 'Lambeth Psalter'. Catherine also occurs in the rewritten litanies of the 'Eadwi Psalter' and the 'Salisbury Psalter', and as an original entry in the litany of the post-Conquest Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale, A. 44 (231): Lapidge 1991, VI. 104, XXVII.101 (Anna), VI. 133, XIII. 120, XXVII. 121, XLIII. 139 (Catherine).

¹¹² London, British Library, Arundel 155. The same scribe is thought to have overhauled the two-volume bible London, British Library, Royal 1 E. vii + viii, and to have written Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 1. 17 (16), a copy of Jerome, *In Mattheum*, and Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 3. 9 (88), a copy of Ambrose, *Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam* during the early-twelfth century. For discussion, see Dumville 1991, 47; Marsden 1994, 114; Marsden 1995, 333-4; Webber 1995, 155-6.

¹¹³ Fols. 2-7: Wormald 1934, 170-81.

relics were discovered in 1178, and established feasts, like that of St Fursey (16 January). Such feasts were presumably being celebrated at Christ Church for the first time. These additions are quite eclectic, and clearly not comprehensive, since the feast of St Anselm (21 April) was not added until the fifteenth century. They also record celebrations customary at Christ Church, such as the ‘officium in conuentum *pro patribus et matribus*’ (14 March), and the obits of men of local and international significance, like Richard, bishop of Amiens (22 May).¹¹⁴ Additions to calendars were generally accretive; old feasts were seldom erased.¹¹⁵ They provide firm evidence that post-Conquest churchmen wanted to appear to accept Anglo-Saxon liturgical observances and to build their own practice on the habits of the past.¹¹⁶

Many other types of liturgical books were overhauled after the Conquest, including pontificals,¹¹⁷ handbooks,¹¹⁸ hymnals,¹¹⁹ and legendaries.¹²⁰ Such books would provide ample evidence for a liturgiologist studying the consequences of 1066 on the conduct of the *opus dei*. For the purposes of this thesis, it suffices to note that the changes reflect the post-Conquest enthusiasm for textual comparison and alteration, but also a willingness to keep pre-Conquest books in ongoing liturgical use, even if the complex process of overhauling them was more demanding than the production of a new book.

¹¹⁴ Presumably Richard de Gerberoy (1205-1210), though his obit was celebrated locally on May 14: Desportes and Millet 1996, 50-1.

¹¹⁵ However, on fol. 5v, the names of two saints have been erased, and the names of other saints entered *in rasura*: ‘*Sanch̃ Bartholomei apostoli*’ (24 August); ‘*Sanch̃ audoeni archiepiscopi*’ (25 August).

¹¹⁶ Of the nineteen calendars printed by Wormald, only one has no additions.

¹¹⁷ e. g. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 146 (s. xiⁱⁿ, Winchester OM (or Cant CC??), prov. Worcester s. xi²); London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius C. i, fols. 43-203 (s. xi¹ or xi^{med}, Germany, prov. Sherborne s. xi², then Salisbury). For the latter manuscript, see Ker 1959.

¹¹⁸ e. g. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 391 (s. xi^{3/4}, Worcester); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 422, pp. 27-570 (s. xi^{med}, prob. Winchester, prov. prob. Darley Dale). For the former manuscript, see Hughes 1958-60.

¹¹⁹ e. g. London, British Library, Cotton Julius A. vi (s. xiⁱⁿ-xi¹, prob. Cant CC, prov. Durham); London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D. xii (s. xi^{med}, Cant CC).

¹²⁰ e. g. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 9 + London, British Library, Cotton Nero E. i, vol. 2, fols. 166-80 and its companion volume London, British Library, Cotton Nero E. i, vol. 2 + vol. 2, fols. 1-155 (both s. xi^{3/4}, Worcester)

TEXTUAL CONTINUATION

Modernisation also involved the addition of new material, which expanded the original book. Some types of manuscript naturally encouraged continuation. For example, chronicles invited the addition of further annals reporting events which had occurred since the original act of compilation, while cartularies encouraged the addition of records of business recently transacted. Anglo-Saxons had long continued their own chronicles, but the disjunction of 1066 reconfigured the ways in which these manuscripts could be continued, and the significance of these continuations.

The \bar{A} -, B- and C-versions of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle were all continued after 1066.¹²¹ New copies were produced: the E-version was originally copied in 1121, and F was also compiled during the early twelfth century, while the D-version may have been compiled and copied as late as 1079.¹²² However, the version containing the most spectacular continuations and alterations is undoubtedly \bar{A} – the ‘Parker Chronicle’.¹²³ This manuscript was systematically adapted during the early twelfth century by three scribes to demonstrate the primacy of the see of Canterbury over York and the pre-eminence of the monastic chapter of Christ Church over St Augustine’s Abbey. These scribes simultaneously maintained the ‘Caligula annals’.¹²⁴ The scribe who entered the obit of Lanfranc (1089) in Caligula also inserted annals 1005-1066 to the Parker Chronicle. The scribe who wrote annals 1110-1115 in Caligula added the *Acta Lanfranci* and several shorter texts to the Parker Chronicle, and the scribe who entered annal 1121 compiled and wrote the F-version of the

¹²¹ Sometime during the twelfth century, a bifolium was added at the end of *ASC* C (London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i, fols. 164-5), containing the conclusion of annal 1066, which broke off in the middle of an account of the Battle of Stamford Bridge: Dickens 1940; O’Brien O’Keeffe 1998, 141-7 and pl. 13 (fol. 164r).

¹²² Guimon 2006, 141-5.

¹²³ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 173, fols. 1-56: Flower and Smith 1941. I follow Bately’s division of scribal stints: Bately 1986, xxi-xliv. My discussion here summarises Faulkner 2005.

¹²⁴ Part of the ‘Canterbury Computus’: London, British Library, Egerton 3314, fols. 9-72 + Cotton Caligula A. xv, fols. 120-53. See Willetts 1966. Printed Baker 2000, 129-34. For plates, Garmonsway 1953, xxiv-v (plate of fols. 132v-133r); Ker 1960, pl. 8a (fols. 135v-136r); Swanton 1996, pl. 1 (fols. 134v-135r).

Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, and subsequently interpolated a spurious charter of Cnut into annal 1031 of the Parker Chronicle, as well as correcting the whole manuscript.

Annal 1031 summarises a charter of Cnut purporting to grant the port of Sandwich to Christ Church in 1023 (S959).¹²⁵ Sandwich was ‘the port within easiest access of Canterbury and the most flourishing on the Kentish coast’,¹²⁶ and the estate had been hotly contested between Christ Church and St Augustine’s from the 1030s. Odo of Bayeux seized Sandwich after the Conquest, but returned the estate to Christ Church by 1086.¹²⁷ However, litigation continued well into the twelfth century, and Elmham reports a dispute between 1116 and 1118,¹²⁸ while a further plea was made concerning the toll and customs (*theolonia et consuetudine*) of Sandwich in 1127.¹²⁹ At the *placitum*, the basis of the archbishop’s case was the charter of Cnut. The insertion of the Cnut charter as annal 1023 may be seen as an attempt to reinforce the validity of Christ Church’s story about their acquisition of Sandwich.¹³⁰

Annal 1031 was inserted by ‘the Sandwich interpolator’,¹³¹ who was also responsible for the second part of annal 1070:

Da ða Landfranc crafede fæstnunge his gehersumnesse mid aðswerunge, þa forsoc he 7 sæde þæt he \hit/ nahte to donne.

Since his stint begins immediately after the first half of a ‘ða ða’ clause, the Sandwich interpolator was probably collaborating with scribe 7.¹³² The annal glories in Lanfranc’s humiliation of Thomas of Bayeux: Lanfranc speaks with lucid argument (*openum gesceade*) and

¹²⁵ Graham 2003, 182.

¹²⁶ Tatton-Brown 1984, 19.

¹²⁷ Bates 1998, no. 71. The scribe of this document, probably a member of Lanfranc’s *familia*, also wrote the charter London, British Library, Cotton Augustus ii. 36 and the anathema added to Lanfranc’s collection of decretals in Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 16. 44 (405) (Ker 1960, 25-26 and pl. 5).

¹²⁸ Hardwick 1858, 353-4; Caenegem 1990, no. 212.

¹²⁹ Stenton 1965, 116-23; Caenegem 1990, no. 254; O’Brien 1995.

¹³⁰ This was not the only legal document added to the manuscript. It seems likely a contemporary scribe added the Conqueror’s confirmation of Christ Church’s lands and privileges (c. 1070) at the beginning of the Chronicle, though the leaf has now been lost: see Ker 1957, 57; Bates 1998, no. 66 (Version I).

¹³¹ Bately’s scribe 10: Bately 1986, xxxix-xliii.

¹³² Aside from administrative modifications to the annal numbers, and the entry of the first half of annal 1070, this scribe added details from Dunstan’s biography (*924, *942, 955, 959, 961, 988).

persuasive words (*strangan cnydan*), convincing the Pope and forcing Thomas to submit humbly (*eadmedlice*). The Sandwich interpolator also seems to have been the scribe of the ‘Domitian Bilingual’ (*ASC F*),¹³³ and numerous additions to the Parker Chronicle, though the identification is not certain.¹³⁴ The majority of his interventions in the Parker Chronicle as far as 616 bring the text into line with the DE-recension. Many of the inserted DE-readings record the accessions and obits of individual rulers and popes,¹³⁵ but others reflect more than a desire to accumulate further historical data from another set of annals. They suggest that the F-scribe viewed the Parker Chronicle as textually inferior to a DE-type text.¹³⁶

Another scribe added the *Acta Lanfranci* to Parker in the early decades of the twelfth century. It offers a narrative of Lanfranc’s archiepiscopate that emphasises his status as primate of Britain, ‘compellente rege Willelmo et iubente papa Alexandro’, deposing and ordaining bishops and abbots and suppressing rebellion at St Augustine’s.¹³⁷ This scribe also extended the list of popes (fol. 53r), and complemented the pre-Conquest lists of Southumbrian ecclesiastics with descriptive accounts of the bishops of Lindisfarne and the archbishops of York, and a note concerning Archbishop Theodore’s sponsorship of the church in Northern England. These notes overlap with documents drawn up to defend Canterbury’s case in the primacy dispute. The York list does not include Thomas II’s

¹³³ London, British Library, Cotton Domitian viii.

¹³⁴ Earle and Plummer 1952, xxvi n. 1: ‘I do not feel sure that they may not be one and the same’. Dumville 1983, 44: ‘there is not a little plausibility to this (*scil.* Plummer’s) claim’. For the most recent discussion, see Baker 2000, xxii.

¹³⁵ There is occasionally a chronological dislocation between these insertions and DE. For instance the martyrdom of St Alban appears s. a. 283 in A, s. a. 286 in DE, while the arrival of the Pelagian heresy appears in A s. a. 381 and in DE s. a. 380.

¹³⁶ e. g. ‘AN. .ccccxxx. Her Paladius \uel Patricius/ se biscep was onsended to Scottum þæt he hiera geleafan trymede from Celestino þam papan.’ (E Patricius); ‘AN. .dxviii. Her Cerdic 7 Cynric \Westse\xe/na/ rice onfengun . . .’ (E Westseaxna); ‘AN. .dlxxi. . . . (Benningtun) Bænesington 7 Egonesham, 7 þy ilcan geare he gefor.’ (E Benesingtun).

DE derive their early annals from the main narrative of *HE*; ABC rely on Bede’s chronological summary (*HE* v. 24). See Earle and Plummer 1952, I. lx-xi.

¹³⁷ Printed Bately 1986, 84-9. A second copy is preserved in London, Lambeth Palace Library, 1213 (fols. 177-8), a fourteenth-century St Augustine’s manuscript.

successor Thurstan, suggesting it was added between 1108 and 1114.¹³⁸ This scribe also entered annals 1110-1115 in the Caligula manuscript.

Another early-twelfth-century scribe active in Christ Church historiographical circles added a list of Popes and the archbishops to whom they sent the pallium to the Parker Chronicle (fol. 54v). The original list was completed between 1093 and 1109. Its accuracy is very suspect,¹³⁹ and the scribe's admiration for Lanfranc is evident, since he capitalises his name along with those of Pope Gregory I and St Elphege. The same scribe added a similar list to the B-version of the Chronicle (fol. 35v).¹⁴⁰ He also added a note on the invention of the true cross, as well as a similar list of Roman emperors on a blank leaf at the beginning of a glossed copy of the *Regularis Concordia*,¹⁴¹ suggesting that Æthelwold's customary was being studied as historical evidence of reformed monasticism.

These three scribes were engaged in two longstanding disputes which occupied Christ Church during the priorate of Conrad (1107-1126):¹⁴² one traditional and local (the ancient hostility with their elder neighbour, the Benedictine abbey of SS Peter and Paul, and later of St Augustine), the other recent and national (Canterbury's primacy over Britain as a whole and York in particular). Writing retrospectively, they recorded Lanfranc's achievements in the 1070s as representative of the *de facto* pre-Conquest dominance of Christ Church, adding the *Acta Lanfranci* as if it were a continuation of the Chronicle, and making numerous small alterations to the text of the manuscript. Some of these alterations brought *Ā* into line with a DE-type text, which the monks believed to be a superior text. They recall the textual changes made to Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica* in Hatton 43. Other alterations

¹³⁸ Hayward 2004, 152.

¹³⁹ Brooks 1984, 369n11.

¹⁴⁰ London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi, fol. 35v: Taylor 1983, 58.

¹⁴¹ London, British Library, Cotton Faustina B. iii, fols. 158-198 + Cotton Tiberius A. iii, fols. 174-7 (Faustina B. iii, fol. 158rv): Ker 1957, no. 155 (p. 197). The list has never been printed, but see Kornexl 1993, cxiv-xv.

¹⁴² For more extensive comments on the historical context of these interventions, see Faulkner 2005, 22-30.

modified the Chronicle so it included material salient to the community's contemporary needs, just as new prayers or lections were added to pre-Conquest psalters. These uses of the Parker Chronicle are compelling testimony to the power of old books to claim to instantiate historical practices, a phenomenon we will be exploring in more detail in subsequent chapters.

The only surviving pre-Conquest cartulary was also continued after 1066. To judge from surviving evidence, 'no more than half a dozen cartularies [are] earlier than 1150, and fewer than thirty are earlier than 1200'.¹⁴³ Worcester was especially precocious. A cartulary, the *Liber Wigornensis*, was first compiled there under the auspices of Archbishop Wulfstan during the early eleventh century.¹⁴⁴ After the Conquest, inspired by St Wulfstan, Hemming compiled another cartulary, which he completed around 1100.¹⁴⁵ The *Liber Wigornensis* contains a long series of charters arranged by shire and then a shorter series of Gloucestershire charters followed by 76 leases. There is no narrative material, unlike in Hemming's cartulary, which has two prefaces (the *Prefatio istius libelli* and the *Enucleatio libelli*), a long account of the alienation of Worcester properties and short biographies of Bishops Ealdred and Wulfstan, as well as the expected sequences of charters and bounds. The surviving fragments suggest that the *Liber Wigornensis* was the exemplar of the cartulary produced to be bound up with the 'Offa Bible'.¹⁴⁶ By contrast, the documents in Hemming's cartulary are independent of the copies in the *Liber Wigornensis* and were presumably copied

¹⁴³ Clanchy 1993, 102. See also Davis 1958, xi-xii; Ker 1960, 20-1.

¹⁴⁴ London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. xiii, fols. 1-118; Hearne 1723, i. 1-247. The full contents are tabulated by Baxter 2004, 191-205. The name was devised by Finberg 1961, 15-18.

¹⁴⁵ London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. xiii, fols. 119-200; Hearne 1723, i. 248ff, ii. For both cartularies, see Ker 1948.

¹⁴⁶ See below p. 156

from the original singlesheet charters. Whether Hemming knew the *Liber Wigornensis* must remain an open question.¹⁴⁷

Our concern here is with the continuation of the *Liber Wigornensis*, which remained in use as ‘a live book into the blank spaces of which were copied a large number of eleventh-century documents’.¹⁴⁸ The cartulary’s status as a ‘live book’ was established shortly after its completion by the near-contemporary addition of further documents as they were discovered in the archive, such as the grant of thirty hides at Ripple by King Oshere (S52, fols. 20v-21). By contrast, the post-Conquest additions include both recent documents and charters recording ancient transactions which had been recently forged. Since some of the additions post-date the compilation of Hemming’s Cartulary, it is a nice question why a scribe would prefer to add a document to the *Liber Wigornensis* rather than its younger sibling (and, vice-versa, why additions made to Hemming’s Cartulary were not made to the *Liber Wigornensis*).¹⁴⁹ I list below the post-Conquest additions to the *Liber Wigornensis*.¹⁵⁰

32. Fol. 21v: Extract from Domesday Book concerning the payment of church dues (*Hemingi*, pp. 49-50) [Ker (A iii), s. xi^{ex}].

55. Fol. 33v: First entry in the bishop of Worcester’s fee in Worcester Domesday (*Hemingi*, p. 72) [Ker (C iii), s. xi/xii].

56. Fol. 34v-35v: Royal Diploma of King Offa (*Hemingi*, pp. 73-5) [S142, Ker (C iv), s. xi/xii, in second main hand of Hemming’s Cartulary].

57. Fols. 35v-36r: ‘Conventio’ between Wulfstan II and Walter, abbot of Evesham c. 1086 (*Hemingi*, pp. 75-6) [Ker (C v), s. xi/xii].

58. Fols. 36r-37r: Three documents relating to a dispute between Worcester and Evesham (*Hemingi*, pp. 77-9) [Ker (C vi), s. xi/xii, same hand as art. 59].

59. Fol. 37r: Writ of William II demanding payment from the honour of Worcester on the death of Wulfstan II (1095) (*Hemingi*, pp. 79-80) [Ker (C vii), s. xi/xii, same hand as art. 58].

60. Fol. 37v-38v: ‘Commemoratio placiti’ in the Evesham dispute (*Hemingi*, pp. 80-83) [Ker (C viii), s. xi/xii].

60.5: Fol. 39r, top margin: Note on the number of hides pertaining to Bibury, Withrington, Bishops Cleeve and Westbury (*Hemingi*, pp. 83-4) [Ker (D iii), s. xi^{ex}].

69. Fols. 44v-45v: Royal Diploma of King Offa (*Hemingi*, pp. 95-8) [S118, Ker (D i), s. xi^{3/4}].

¹⁴⁷ Ker 1948, 68.

¹⁴⁸ Galbraith 1967, 94.

¹⁴⁹ Near-contemporary additions to Hemming’s cartulary include lists of lands, royal writs and regnal and episcopal lists: see Ker 1948, 58-62.

¹⁵⁰ The article number refers to the tabulation of the contents of the *Liber Wigornensis* by Baxter 2004, 192-205. For pre-Conquest documents, I give the Sawyer number; for other documents, I refer to Hearne’s edition of the cartulary and Ker’s *addenda*.

70. Fols. 45v-46v: Note on the annual rent in kind due to the cellarer of Worcester (*Hemingi*, pp. 98-100) [Ker (D ii), s. xi/xii].

181. Fol. 117r: Bounds of Pensax (*Hemingi*, p. 246) [Ker (G v), s. xii].

Some of these additions are difficult to date, but they certainly extend beyond the likely date of the production of Hemming's cartulary. The additions fall into several groups: extracts from the Domesday Book and house records (arts. 32, 55, 70, mostly s. xi^{ex} or xi/xii), recent Worcester documents, particularly documents pertaining to the dispute with Evesham (arts. 57-60; art. 59 is datable after 1095), bounds and notes on the descent of particular estates (arts. 181, 185) and suspect pre-Conquest royal diplomas (arts. 56, 69). The most plausible explanation for the very late addition of these documents is that they had only recently been forged. The second of these (S118), a grant by King Offa to the see of Worcester of lands at Cropthorn, Worcestershire, dated 22 September 780, may well have been forged during the dispute with Evesham over Bengeworth and Hampton.¹⁵¹ Inserting it into Hemming's cartulary gave it the appearance of having existed during the early eleventh century. Any continuation of a cartulary accrued a similar benefit.

This chapter has examined the range of ways in which pre-Conquest books were 'updated' after 1066. Some of these updates were very necessary; insular scripts and abbreviations were alien to Norman eyes, and passing time may have made them unfamiliar even to English eyes. Modernisation unlocked older books for reading and copying. Other updates were rather more pedantic. Pernickety readers wanted certain words spelt certain ways, and had the time to effect such changes. Arguably, they also wanted particular texts in familiar forms; Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica* had to have the extra miracle of St Oswald. Such comparisons led to a progressive deviation from Bede's *ipsisima verba*. Collations bred of unfamiliarity and suspicion even seem to underlie alterations to pre-Conquest psalters, and

¹⁵¹ Stenton 1918, 444-5; Galbraith 1967, 101; Williams 1997, 390, 395; Barrow 2005, 121n76.

to the Parker Chronicle. But there was an upside to this presumption of textual superiority, in that it led readers to a closer appreciation of Anglo-Saxon literature, and to embrace liturgical books, chronicles and cartularies as tangible evidence of cultural continuity. Just as the eclecticism of post-Conquest corrections created hybrid texts, the insertions and continuations of post-Conquest scribes forged a hybrid culture. We now turn to an examination of how this hybridity played out in the classroom.

CHAPTER V: GLOSSING AND ANNOTATING

This chapter looks at the different kinds of annotations post-Conquest readers made in pre-Conquest books. It begins by describing the ways in which readers, presumably schoolmasters, expanded manuscripts of Ælfric's *Grammar* and *Glossary* for use in a trilingual environment. This trilinguality is also reflected in attitudes to pre-Conquest glossed manuscripts containing school texts, to which readers added further glosses in Latin, French and English. I then turn to the different kinds of glosses and annotations added to Anglo-Saxon vernacular books after 1066, providing a rich new context in which to see the activities of better-known annotators like Coleman and the Tremulous Hand.

ÆLFRIC'S GRAMMAR AND GLOSSARY AFTER 1066

The Old English text which seems to have proved most useful to post-Conquest readers is Ælfric's *Grammar* and *Glossary*.¹ The *Grammar* survives in twelve pre-Conquest manuscripts or fragments,² five of which also contain the *Glossary*.³ This suggests the text enjoyed a rapid and wide diffusion. In addition, there is one post-Conquest copy of a revised version of the *Grammar*,⁴ and a Cornish redaction of the *Glossary*, copied around 1100.⁵ Ælfric seems to have intended the *Grammar* as a textbook for students learning Latin, to bridge the gap

¹ Edited by Zupitza 1966.

² Cambridge, University Library, Hh. 1. 10 (s. xi^{3/4}, Exeter); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 449, fols. 42-96 [f] (s. xi¹); Durham, Cathedral Library, B. III. 32 [with the Dialogue on declinations] (s. xi¹ or xi^{med}, probably Canterbury); London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. x, fols. 3-101 [with the Dialogue on declinations] (s. xi² or xi^{3/4}, ??Worcester); London, British Library, Cotton Julius A. ii, fols. 10-135 [with a treatise on Latin verbs] (s. xi^{med}); London, British Library, Harley 107 [with the Dialogue on declinations and supplemental glossary] (s. xi^{med}); London, British Library, Harley 3271 [part of miscellany] (s. xi¹); London, British Library, Harley 5915, fols. 8 and 9 + Bloomington, Indiana University, Lilly Library, Add. 1000 [f] (s. xi¹); London, British Library, Royal 12 G. xii, fols. 2-9 + Oxford, All Souls College, 38, fols. I-VI and i-vi [f] (s. xi^{med}); London, British Library, Royal 15 B. xxii (s. xi^{3/4} or xi²); Oxford, St John's College, 154 [with colloquies and *Bella Parisiacae urbis*, bk iii] (s. xiⁱⁿ, prov. Durham); Paris, BNF, anglais 67 [f] (s. xi¹).

³ CUL Hh. 1. 10; Cotton Faustina A. x, fols. 3-101; Cotton Julius A. ii, fols. 10-135; Harley 107; and St John's College 154.

⁴ Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 9. 17 (819), fols. 1-48 (s. xi/xii). In addition, excerpts from both *Grammar* and *Glossary* were added to Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barlow 35, fol. 57rv (s. xiⁱⁿ): see above 74.

⁵ The 'Vocabularium Cornicum' (London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian A. xiv, fols. 7-10r), in which the Old English glosses which explain the Latin lemmata have been replaced by Old Cornish glosses.

between Donatus's *Ars minor* and Priscian's *Institutiones grammaticae*.⁶ Consequently, he concentrates on inflectional morphology, but concludes with a short exposition of the thirty divisions of *ars grammaticae* (Zup. 289/7-296/11). The complementary *Glossary* helped the reader learn some 1250 nouns and adjectives under seven headings: *membrorum* (which encompassed parts of the body, terms of kinship and occupations), birds, fish, animals, plants, trees and *domorum* (which includes all things domestic and much more besides).⁷ Both *Grammar* and *Glossary* proved very interesting to readers after the Conquest.⁸

A variety of late-eleventh- and twelfth-century hands added glosses to the copy which had been produced at Exeter under the auspices of Bishop Leofric.⁹ The glosses are the result of the careful study of Ælfric's text by readers interested in expanding their Latin, Old English and French vocabularies, and in finding models for analysing the morphology of the French verb. For instance, the readers often added a gloss above a form cited by Ælfric which explained what it was exemplifying: *Eadgarus* is glossed 'proprium nomen' (fol. 3v/11; Zup. 8/10); and *scola* is glossed 'primitiua' (fol. 4v/13; Zup. 11/13) when Ælfric cites it and *scolasticus* as examples of primitive and derivative nouns. When Ælfric quotes and defines ten Greek-derived nouns as further examples of third-declension nouns which end in short *a* (such as *poema*), the glossators took the opportunity to explain these rare words in other languages, presumably so they could add the words to their vocabulary:¹⁰

Eall swa gað | þas naman. hoc cauma. \¶urens ardor .i. halhlea/ spolað. thema. \¶materia/
antimber. | scema. \¶figura/ hiw. Onoma. \¶nomen/ nama. malagma. \¶supersanatio/ cliða.
agalma. \¶imago/ | anlicnyss. enigma. \¶obscura/ rædels. plasma. \¶creatura/. gesceaft. |

⁶ Gneuss 1990, 13-16.

⁷ See Buckalew 1978, 150.

⁸ Some of the manuscripts analysed below are discussed by Menzer 2004.

⁹ Cambridge, University Library, Hh. 1. 10.

¹⁰ *Cauma*, *onoma*, *malagma*, *agalma*, *enigma*, *plasma*, and *dogma* are all included in the DML, and seem to have been frequently used in works written in the 'hermeneutic' style. *Thema*, *scema*, and *scisma*, for which the relevant fascicles of the dictionary have not yet been published, all appear in Lewis & Short. *Halhlea* should probably be read as *bat hlea*, 'hot fire'. The curious spelling *dogetrina* may indicate that the Anglo-Norman *doctrine* (with variant spellings *doutrine*, *droitrine*) was intended, rather than Latin *doctrina*.

baptisma. fulluht. dogma. \¶dogetrina/ lar. scisma. \¶discordia/ geflit. & his | similia. 7
 þisum gelice (fol. 12v/7-12; Zup. 33/12-16)

Similarly, the glossators sometimes intervened to give nouns which derived from verbs which Ælfric cites, again presumably to help the reader expand his vocabulary.¹¹ Some glosses, moreover, suggest that readers used the *Grammar* to learn *synonyma* in Latin, English and French. *Hoc trux* (fol. 24v/3; Zup. 72/8), ‘this wild [one]’, is glossed ‘atrox *uel* ferox’. ‘Hoc monile’ (fol. 12v/18; Zup. 34/5-6), ‘this necklace’, which Ælfric explains here as *þes myne*, but in the *Glossary* as *myne oððe swurbeah* (Zup. 303/15), is glossed ‘nuschia .i. munimentum sobrietatis in pectore’, ‘a protection for temperance, [worn] on the chest’. *It geomrige* which explains *gemo* (fol. 55r/10; Zup. 167/19) is glossed ‘sicige’, ‘sigh, yearn for’; and *ic bifige* which explains *tremo* (fol. 55r/11; Zup. 168/2) is glossed *cwacige*, ‘tremble’. The glossators also sometimes offered extra examples of the phenomenon which Ælfric was explaining, hence the interlineation of ‘merges *mergetis*. scef’, ‘sheaf’, after ‘watul’ (fol. 18v/9; Zup. 52/13), as another example of a third-declension feminine noun ending in short *-es*. Similar expansions underlie the version of the *Grammar* copied in the post-Conquest manuscript, Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 9. 17 (819), fols. 3-45r, in which the Old English explanations of the Latin words which Ælfric cites are interlined above their Latin equivalents, along with extra explanations in Latin, French and English.¹² CUL Hh. 1. 10 was also adapted to provide a model for analysing the morphology of the French verb. One glossator interlined the appropriate forms of the French verb *aimer* over Ælfric’s treatment of the Latin verb *amo*

¹¹ Above *texo* (fol. 55r/13; Zup. 168/3-4), ‘weave’, is ‘unde *textrinum opus*’; above *pecto* (fol. 55r/16; Zup. 168/6), ‘comb’, is ‘unde *pecten*’; above *messui* (fol. 55r/17; Zup. 168/6), ‘I reaped’, is ‘unde *messor*’.

¹² See, for example, fol. 12v/3 (Zup. 59/8-9): ‘nemus. [bois *uel* wudea *uel* holt *interlined above*] fenus. *uel* feneris. [fenoris *interlined above*] pignus. [filz *interlined above*] pignoris. [tudder *interlined above*] pignus. [wedd *interlined above*] pigneris. [wedd *interlined above*] et cetera’. Other French glosses printed Hunt 1991, i. 26.

(fols. 41v-46r; Zup. 129/14-141/12).¹³ However, unlike the glossator of Cotton Faustina A. x, he did not translate the names of the verb forms.

This copy of the *Grammar* and *Glossary* was very similarly used.¹⁴ The manuscript appears to have been corrected against another copy of the *Grammar* and *Glossary* towards the end of the eleventh century. For example, the words ‘þes 7 þeos welega . ægþer byð welig ge wer . ge wif. *hic et haec* heres’ (Zup. 18/11-13) were interlined at fol. 7v/28 to correct a haplography caused by the scribe’s eye skipping from ‘þes 7 þeos’ (Zup. 18/11) to ‘þes 7 þeos’ (Zup. 18/13). During the twelfth century, many further changes were made. The *ordinatio* of the manuscript was improved by the introduction of running titles across the top of many openings (e. g. ‘De VIII | *partibus orationis*’ (fols. 4v-5r), ‘De Nomine’ (fols. 5v-6r)) and of a foliation in the lower margin of each recto, just below the right-hand edge of the text area (visible on fols. 4-8, 12-36, 41, 51 and running one behind the present foliation). Latin words and phrases were copied from the text into the outer margin to act as running notes to the *Grammar*. For example, an annotator wrote ‘nomen’, ‘pronomen’, ‘verbum’, ‘adverbium’, ‘participium’, ‘coniunctio’, ‘prepositio’ and ‘interiectio’ in the margins of fols. 4r-5r to enable the reader to find exactly where Ælfric discussed each of these eight parts of speech (Zup. 8/5-11/5). Unfortunately, this annotator and other annotators also copied into the margins Latin words which Ælfric uses in the course of his exposition, and some of the examples he offers (e. g. ‘Eurus’, fol. 4v/15; Zup. 8/2), giving the pages a rather crowded appearance.

In addition to augmenting the *ordinatio* of the book, the annotators offered additional examples of the grammatical principles Ælfric expounds (e. g. ‘Vath getacnað bi|hrerunge | pro dolor. Walla’, fol. 5r/15-6, opposite Zup. 10/20-11/5), and copied short grammatical

¹³ Printed Hunt 1991, i. 111-113.

¹⁴ London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. x, fols. 3-101 (s. xi² or xi^{3/4})

texts into the margins (e. g. fol. 30v by Zup. 92/4-11; fol. 40v, by Zup. 120/5-10). They also glossed many hundreds of Old English and Latin words interlinearly in Latin, French and, very occasionally, English.¹⁵ The French glosses are particularly heavy during Ælfric's discussion of the morphology of the verb (fols. 44r-73v; Zup. 130/8-222/12), and give the French equivalent of almost every Latin verb form cited by Ælfric, and the French name of each part of the verb's conjugation. In the *Glossary*, the same annotators interlined French equivalents for the Latin lemmata given by Ælfric,¹⁶ copied many Latin lemmata into the margins with the appropriate form of *hic* to indicate gender (a piece of information Ælfric usually omitted), and added a list of further Latin-Latin word pairs in the margin of fol. 92v. A thorough, holistic study of the twelfth-century annotations in Cotton Faustina A. x, which treats the Latin, French and English additions, corrections and glosses equally, is a major desideratum.

Two other mid-eleventh-century manuscripts of the *Grammar* and *Glossary* have significant signs of post-Conquest use. In one manuscript, which is of unknown origin and provenance,¹⁷ a scribe of the first half of the twelfth century made some alterations to a passage concerning third-declension nouns:¹⁸

no|minatiuo. Hoc poema. þes leoþcræft. Uocat(er)\ino/ | o poema . eala þu leoþcræft.
Genit(er)\ino/ huius | poematis. þisses leoþcræftes. Datiuo . huic | poemati. þisum
leoþcræfte. Accusat(er)\ino/ hoc | poema . þisne leoþcræft. Ablater ab hoc poe|mate. fram
þisum leoðcræfte. et pluraliter. Nomi|nat(er)\ino/. hec poemata . þas leoðcræftas.
Geni|t(er)\ino/ . horum poematum. þisra leoðcræfta . | Dater . his poematibus. þisum
leoðcræftum. accu|sater . hec poemata. þas leoðcræftas. Uocater | o poemata. eala
geleoðcræftas. Ablat(er)\ino/ ab | his poematibus. fram þisum leoðcræftum. (fol. 21v/8-20)

¹⁵ French glosses printed Hunt 1991, i. 101-111.

¹⁶ Printed Hunt 1991, i. 24-6.

¹⁷ London, British Library, Cotton Julius A. ii, fols. 10-133 (s. xi^{med}). There is a late-twelfth-century scribble on fol. 135v which reads 'karissimo domino suo et amico thorn of hamton'.

¹⁸ I have expanded original barred **t** as *-ter*, though it may have stood for *-tino* in the scribe's exemplar.

The original scribe seems to have described the case of each noun cited using an adverb-like form (e. g. *accusater*, *geniter*), as he occasionally did elsewhere (e. g. fols. 39r, 40v).¹⁹ He compounded the confusion by his erratic use of Caroline and Insular **r** in these words. The strange adverb-like adjectives and variation in letter forms evidently perplexed the twelfth-century reader, who altered most of them to more familiar forms (e. g. *ablatiuo*). The manuscript also contains two rough plummet titles – ‘*capitulum* iij’ by ‘DE GENERIBUS’ (fol. 15v; Zup. 18/5) and ‘*capitulum* [..]’ by ‘HIS QUINQUE DECLINATIONIBUS HIC OSTENDITUR’ (fol. 16r; Zup. 21/2-3) – which are perhaps the remains of a wider attempt to subdivide Ælfric’s text.

In another manuscript, it was not Ælfric’s *Grammar* that attracted the interest of a post-Conquest reader, but an accompanying grammatical text. London, British Library, Harley 107 is a mid-eleventh-century copy of Ælfric’s *Grammar* and *Glossary*, followed by a short dialogue concerning the declension of nouns (fols. 71v/5-72v/3) which survives alongside the *Grammar* and *Glossary* in two other manuscripts.²⁰ A mid-twelfth-century scribe wrote ‘[h]ec Pix. picis | [h]ec Nix. niuis’ in the margin by Ælfric’s treatment of third declension nouns ending in long *-ix* (fol. 18v/2-3; Zup. 70/14), even though Ælfric had just treated these nouns under short *-ix* (Zup. 70/7-10). A somewhat earlier scribe, perhaps late-eleventh-century, made several additions to the dialogue on the declensions. Unfortunately these additions were badly cropped during a subsequent rebinding, and it is very difficult to understand their significance.

The evidence of these manuscripts shows that Ælfric’s *Grammar and Glossary* was a text which post-Conquest readers found very useful. These readers – putatively teachers of

¹⁹ No form of this sort is recorded in the *DML*. It is possible these forms resulted from the incorrect expansion of a common mark of abbreviation over the **t** of *accusatūo*, *genitūo*.

²⁰ London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. x, fol. 101rv; Durham, Cathedral Library, B. III. 32, fols. 121v-22.

the *ars grammatica* – realised that Ælfric's *Grammar* could be adapted to provide a structure to explain the morphology of the French verb and its relationship to Latin and English forms. They also found that both *Grammar* and *Glossary* could be harnessed to offer the student opportunities to expand his vocabulary, in Latin, French and also English. The expansion of Ælfric's text with English examples (along with French and Latin) is key to understanding that his *Grammar* was used because it was in the vernacular, and not despite its vernacularity.

LATIN SCHOOL TEXTS AFTER 1066

The Anglo-Saxons seem to have felt a special affinity for the glossed manuscript,²¹ and many pre-Conquest copies of school texts incorporate glosses copied from their exemplars, which were supplemented by generations of readers *calamo tenente*.²² These glosses interpret the text and give guidance on prosody, lexis, morphology, syntax and context.²³ However, fewer glossed manuscripts were copied in England in the immediate aftermath of the Conquest, and the form only became widespread again in the middle of the twelfth century with the production of glossed copies of individual books of the bible.²⁴ However, post-Conquest readers made good use of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts containing school texts and often added further glosses in Latin and, less frequently, in French or English. This was feasible because the curriculum followed in Anglo-Saxon schools on the eve of the Conquest derived directly from the curriculum which had developed on the continent during the ninth and tenth

²¹ See Irvine 1994, 371-93; Wieland 1998, esp. 59n1 for further bibliography; Lendinara 2002; Stanton 2002, 9-54.

²² The course of the curriculum followed in Anglo-Saxon schools must be inferred from booklists, surviving manuscripts and the sources used by Anglo-Saxon authors: see Lapidge 1982b, 102; Lapidge 1986, 7-8; Irvine 1994, 355-8; Porter 1994; Orme 2006, 40-46. It would have included elementary texts like the *Disticha Catonis*; Prosper, *Epigrammata*; Bede, *De die iudicii*; Christian-Latin poetry like Juvenius, *Evangelia*; Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale*; Arator, *De actibus apostolorum*; Prudentius, *Psychomachia*; and Boethius, *De consolazione philosophiae*; riddles by Symphosius, Aldhelm, Boniface, Tatwine and Eusebius; as well as Aldhelm's *De virginitate*; and the works of classical authors like Virgil, Juvenal and Persius.

²³ Wieland employs this classification in his edition of Arator and Prudentius glosses from Cambridge, University Library, Gg. 5. 35; see Wieland 1983.

²⁴ de Hamel 1984; Gibson 1989. The Bury St Edmunds' monks began acquiring a set in the 1140s: Webber 1998, 189.

centuries. Consequently, the Normans were also used to teaching *grammatica* through the study of authors like Prudentius, Sedulius, Prosper and Boethius, so the arrival of continental teachers after the Conquest had little impact on the curriculum.²⁵

Anglo-Saxon religious houses were well supplied with manuscripts of such staple authors, and post-Conquest readers seem to have made do with what they found, rather than expend valuable resources on the production of new copies. For example, various texts in the famous ‘Cambridge Songs’ manuscript show signs of having been read during the early twelfth century.²⁶ Many of the texts in this manuscript were copied with heavy interlinear and marginal glossing, which seems to have dissuaded later readers from adding any further *interpretamenta*. However, post-Conquest readers did make textual corrections; to Aldhelm’s *Carmen de uirginitate* (fols. 280r-327r),²⁷ to Book III of Abbo of St Germain, *Bella Parisiaca urbis* (fols. 363v-365v),²⁸ and to other texts. These corrections are approximately contemporary with the addition of a compendium of medical excerpts on blank leaves at the end of the manuscript (fols. 425v-431, 444v-446).²⁹ Several texts in the ‘Cambridge Songs’ manuscript, such as Juvenecus, *Libri quattuor euangeliorum*, and Aldhelm, *Enigmata*, had been copied with glosses in Old English, as well as Latin. These vernacular glosses would have reminded the post-Conquest reader of the *translatio linguae* that followed 1066, whether he ignored the interpretations offered by the glosses or not.

²⁵ See Orme 2006, 46-50.

²⁶ Cambridge, University Library, Gg. 5. 35 (s. xi^{med}, Cant StA): Wieland and Rigg 1975.

²⁷ ‘Dum calles gemina dispari \sub/ tramite tendunt’ (763), ‘Nunc igitur casto ueneror (rumore) \sermone/ mariam’ (1673), ‘tempus adest sacras metris uulgare (putrescunt) \choreas/’ (1660), ‘sed moderata (gestat) \parat/ de terra patientia contra’ (2631). For lls. 795-797, the manuscript originally read ‘castus consortia regni | Nec non eximi uirtutum gratia fretus | Percepturus in excelso naua gaudia uictor’. The corrector rectified the erroneous sequence of the lines by copying ‘percepturus in excelso gaudia rector (*sic*)’ by ‘regni’, and marked ‘gratia’ for deletion, and replaced it with ‘munere’.

²⁸ ‘Abbas quo fuerit sit hirudo frequens comitata disparet ac ualidos interea pedo citatim’ (54-55). For this text in Anglo-Saxon England, see Lendinara 1987.

²⁹ The excerpts derive from a variety of sources including Pseudo-Soranus and ‘Petrocellus’: see Cameron 1983, 154-5.

The most powerful testimony to the ongoing use of pre-Conquest manuscripts containing school texts after 1066 is a copy of Boethius's *De consolazione philosophiae* produced around the turn of the tenth century, probably at Abingdon.³⁰ The work was copied with many long marginal glosses, derived from the Remigian tradition, as well as shorter interlinear Latin glosses, which provided basic lexical, morphological and syntactical information.³¹ Many different pre-Conquest hands subsequently entered further interlinear glosses in the book, which also includes a series of scratched Old English glosses.³² After the Conquest, a number of twelfth-century hands added extensive interlinear and marginal glosses. The book was still in active use as late as the mid-fifteenth century, when a scribe added running titles at the top of each opening, and entered a series of rather florid notes summarising the content of each metre and prose in the lower margins of a number of leaves.³³

The twelfth-century glosses are generally more interested in the last three books of the *De consolazione* than the first two, and in the proses than the verses. I print here a small section of Book V, prose 3 (fols. 88r-91r), with its pre- and post-Conquest glosses, to illustrate the interests of the twelfth-century glossators. In this prose, Boethius raises the problem of the apparent incompatibility of human free will and complete divine foreknowledge of events, which Lady Philosophy eventually resolves by arguing that 'everything which is known is grasped not according to its own power but rather according

³⁰ Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 3. 21. The words 'byrstan beoffan sunu ælfnod ælrices sunu æt hrocanlea' appear on an endleaf (fol. 103v). Ker identified Rockley as an appurtenance of Bessels Leigh (Oxon.), an estate about four miles SW of Oxford, which belonged to Abingdon: Ker 1957, no. 24 (pp. 37-8). Other pre-Conquest additions include a poem on the Assumption of the Virgin and a list of *nomina ventorum*: Clayton 1986; Pulsiano 1994.

³¹ For the original glosses, see Bolton 1977, 40, 55.

³² Printed Merritt 1961, 443-5.

³³ For example, the first metre is summarised thus: 'In isto *prosimetro* planget *boetius* suum statum subito mutatus de *prosperitate* in *aduersitate* . a quo accipitur *metra* plangendi statum mutatus de bono in malum de *uirtute* in *uicium* de *castitate* in *luxuria* de *abstinentia* in *gulam* et sic de *consimilibus*'. These summary notes are only found as far as Book III, prose ix.

to the capability of those who know it' (Book V, prose 5). At the beginning of the section which I print, Boethius is addressing the consequences of believing man's free will can influence the foreknown course of future events:³⁴

Nam si aliorum quam prouisae sunt detorqueri ualent . non iam erit futuri firma praescientia . sed opinio potius incerta . quod de deo credere nefas iudicio ; (fol. 88v/2-5)³⁵
 aliorum] *aliam partem* . aliter; prouisae] *praescite*; detorqueri] *uoluntates deflecti*; ualent] *et facta*; praescientia] *s. dei*; sed] *s. est*; opinio] *in RH margin, via signe de renvoi* Ex persona ueritatis quod in deo non cadit incerta opinio; quod] **.i. incertam opinionem**; nefas iudicio] uidelicet ut in ipso sit incerta opinio | s. esse.

In LH margin **Vere si deus prospicit cuncta non possunt aliter euenire. quia si aliter possint euenire non est uera praescientia . a pari in conuersione**³⁶

Neque enim illam probo rationem qua se quidam credunt hunc questionis nodum posses dissoluere . (fol. 88v/5-8)³⁷
 probo] *adprobo* id *est* laudo; hunc questionis] *de praescientia et libero arbitrio*; nodum] *difficultatem*

In LH margin **Ego Boethius ita probo . si deus prouidet omnia . ' cuncta sunt necessaria . si cuncta sunt necessaria . ' non est libertas arbitrii et in hac dubitatione adhuc maneo . ' quia non sufficit mihi solutio quorundam . causa est . et hoc est neque enim et cetera . Et apponit sententiam eorum quam postea destruit**³⁸

Aiunt enim ; non ideo quid esse euenturum quoniam id prouidentia futurum esse prospexerit . ' sed e contrario potius quoniam quid futurum est id diuinam prouidentiam latere non posse . (fol. 88v/5-9)³⁹

Aiunt enim] **uere habent rationem quia istam a parte rationis**; Non] *in LH margin via signe-de-renvoi* **ac si dicerent prouidentiam non esse causam necessitatis rerum hoc ibi dicit . non ideo et cetera . sed res esse causam necessitatis prouidentie hoc ibi dicit quoniam quid futurum et cetera**⁴⁰ quid] *aliquid* | *in LH margin via signe-de-renvoi* Nos uero neutrum negabimus . illi enim dicebant futuras esse res . propter quam causam esset prouidentia . propter prouidentiam autem non res esse futuras ; nos autem dicimus ueraciter et cuncta que futura sunt a deo prouideri et cuncta que prouisa sunt a deo sine dubio futura fieri;⁴¹ prouidentia] *dei*; prospexerit] *quia uerum uidetur*; potius] *s. aiunt*

³⁴ I print all pre-Conquest glosses, original or not, in plain type, and all twelfth-century glosses in bold type.

³⁵ 'For if they [*sic* events] can be turned aside into a different way from that foreseen, then there will no longer be firm foreknowledge of the future, but rather uncertain opinion, which I judge impious to believe of God'.

³⁶ 'If God truly foresees all things, they cannot happen otherwise, because if it could happen otherwise, it is not true foreknowledge. [An argument] from equals, in reversal'.

³⁷ 'For neither do I agree with that argument according to which some believe that they can solve this knotty question'.

³⁸ 'I, Boethius, demonstrate [that] if God foresees everything, all these things are necessary; [and] if all these things are necessary, [there] is no freedom of will. And I still remain locked in this uncertainty because the solution of certain men does not satisfy me and it is a cause and this is not therefore etc. And he takes up their argument which he afterwards destroys'.

³⁹ 'For they say that a thing is not going to happen because providence has foreseen that it will, but rather to the contrary, that since something is going to be, it cannot be hidden from divine providence ...'

⁴⁰ 'But they shall say providence is not a necessary cause of things (the text says here '[a thing is] not [going to happen] because [providence has foreseen that it will])' but the thing is the necessary cause of providence (the text says here 'since something is going to be, [it cannot be hidden from divine providence])'.

⁴¹ 'Truly we may deny neither [proposition]. For they were saying [that] things are about to happen on account of a cause, which is providence; but things are not about to happen on account of providence; but we say truly both [that] everything which is about to happen is foreseen by God and [that] everything which is foreseen by God without doubt will happen in the future'.

eoque modo necessarium hoc in contrarium relabi partem ; (fol. 88v/9-11)⁴²
 eoque modo] ineuitabile istud | tali modo; hoc in contrariam relabi] .i. ut non sit necessitas
 euenire quia deus prouidet | in RH margin via signe de renvoi Superiori sententie [sic] quia
 indocti asserebant :-; relabi] <ue>I recidere; partem] a rebus in prouidentiam

Neque enim necesse est contingere quae prouidentur . sed necesse esse quae futura sunt
 prouideri ; (fol. 88v/11-13)⁴³

Neque enim] Vere in contrariam partem nam hoc modo a parte; necesse est] s. dicunt
 illi. uel loquuntur; contingere] esse; quae] ea; prouidentur] a prouidentia; necesse] est; esse]
 futura; quae] .i. quae futura sunt; prouideri] uidere

In LH margin Neque enim . sententia soluentium . aiunt enim non necesse est esse id
 est non necessario res eueniunt que id est quia prouidentur contingere id est esse
 futura . ac si dei prouidentia non est causa necessitatis rerum sed necesse est
 prouideri esse futura que id est quia futura sunt id est res sunt causa necessitatis
 prouidentiae⁴⁴

quasi uero quae cuius rei causa sit . praescientia ne futurorum necessitatas. an futurorum
 necessitas/(te) prouidentiae laboretur ; (fol. 88v/13-15)⁴⁵

quasi uero] ita locuntur | quasi quereretur a nobis; causa sit] que alterius ratio causa sit | in RH
 margin s. causa alterius; praescientia] s. a; ne] utrum; necessitas] s. sit; futurorum] euentus;
 prouidentiae] sit; laboretur] cum labore | inquiratur a nobis | aliter laberetur

In LH margin via signe de renvoi ipsi ita soluunt sicuti queratur ante quid sit causa
 alterius siue prouidentiam rerum siue res prouidentie est necessitas . sed causam
 non curo . quia solum necesse euenire sufficit ad perimendum arbitri libertatem⁴⁶

Ac non illud demonstrare nitamur . quo quomodo se se habeat ordo causarum . necessarium
 esse euentum praescitarum rerum . etiam si praescientia futuris rebus eueniendi necessitatem
 non uideatur inferre ; (fols. 88v/15-89r/2)⁴⁷

Ac] s. ita; non illud] quod locuntur illi; quo quomodo] .i. qualiter cumque; habeat] .i. utrumque
 ideo futurum quidem quia prouidentia praescit . an deo prouidentia praescit quia futurum
 aliquid est; necessarium esse euentum] ut eueniant que praesciuntur; praescitarum rerum] hoc
 nitimur demonstrare necessarium esse euentum rerum praescitarum; necessitatem] s.
 quod utique non facit

In RH margin. Vere res future necessario eueniunt et prouidentia est necessaria.
 quocumque modo sit id est siue res sint causa prouidentie . siue prouidentia rerum
 quia ita est in hoc exemplo . a simili . 7 hoc est et non si quis et cetera⁴⁸

⁴² ‘... and in this way the necessity slips on to the other side ...’.

⁴³ ‘For, they say, it is not necessary that those things happen which are foreseen, but it is necessary that those things that will happen are foreseen ...’.

⁴⁴ ‘Neque enim, the argument of those solving [the problem]: they say it is not necessary [for things] to be, i. e. things do not happen by necessity, because they are foreseen to happen, i. e. to be about to happen, but if the providence of God is not the necessary cause of things, then it is necessary [that] things about to happen are foreseen, because they are about to happen, i. e. things are the necessary cause of providence’.

⁴⁵ ‘...as if indeed our work were to discover which is the cause of which, foreknowledge of future things’ necessity, or future things’ necessity of providence ...’.

⁴⁶ ‘In this manner, they solve [it], as if they were seeking before what the necessary cause of the other is, either providence of things, or things of providence. But I do not seek the cause because [the fact that it is] necessary [for them] to happen suffices in itself to destroy the freedom of the will’.

⁴⁷ ‘...and as if we were not striving to show this, that whatever the state of the ordering of causes, the outcome of things foreknown is necessary, even if that foreknowledge were not to seem to confer on future things the necessity of occurring.’

⁴⁸ ‘In truth, future things happen by necessity and providence is necessary in whatever way it is; i. e. either things are the cause of providence, or providence of things, because it is thus in this example drawn from similar [things], and this is, and if not, what etc’.

Here, Boethius acknowledges the argument that things do not happen because divine providence has foreseen them, but that, because they are going to occur, divine providence must foresee them. He then dismisses this argument as irrelevant to his concerns because things foreknown must happen, even if foreknowledge does not cause those things to happen, and the necessity of foreknown things occurring prevents human free will influencing the course of events. He demonstrates this by means of a comparison: a man does not sit because someone has truly said that he is sitting, but the statement that he is sitting is true because he happened to be sitting first.

The pre-Conquest interlinear glosses to this passage facilitate a literal reading of the text, and are sometimes very basic. For example, the glosses to the statement ‘neque enim necesse est contingere quae prouidentur’, are predominantly syntactical, but the gloss to *necesse est* also transmits a synonym for *dicunt*. The marginal glosses, which are derived from the Remigian tradition, provided some help for those trying to follow the logic of Boethius’s argument, but they are eclipsed by the added twelfth-century glosses. These added glosses effectively deploy a formal vocabulary of logic: Boethius’s initial statement, that if things do not happen exactly as God foreknew them, then he did not foreknow them, is described as an argument *a pari in conuersione*. They couch the proposition that because events are going to occur, divine providence must foresee them, in terms of necessary causes, and explain that this proposition does not help overturn the proposition that future things happen by necessity. The long gloss beginning ‘Ego Boethius probo’ gives a detailed summary of the context and tenor of Boethius’s argument. An interest in Boethius’s logic is thus the sustaining force behind these glosses. It is therefore no surprise that one twelfth-century

reader, evidently a student of logic, copied the logical tag, ‘*socrates est asinus. Socrates non est homo*’ on a endleaf (fol. 104v).⁴⁹

These logical glosses co-exist on the page with basic pre-Conquest interpretative glossing, and a marginal apparatus drawn from the Remigian tradition, and remind us that the practice of glossing was always cumulative.⁵⁰ Three manuscripts of the *De consolatione* survive which were produced during the Anglo-Norman period (along with one copy of the Old English translation),⁵¹ and scholia were also copied independently.⁵² Insular readers were also beginning to appreciate Boethius’s treatises on theology and music.⁵³ Post-Conquest readers may have preferred to use this pre-Conquest manuscript over producing a new copy not only because the text was copied very sparsely, with few abbreviations, but also because they valued the information transmitted in the pre-Conquest glosses. A close study of this manuscript would undoubtedly reveal a great deal about the changing reception of the *De consolatione*, and how new fashions in interpretation were modulated through older approaches.

The vitality of the pre-Conquest curriculum and the utility of pre-Conquest manuscripts containing school texts after 1066 is best illustrated by a study of manuscripts of

⁴⁹ He continues ‘*Dahait semium le lumbart*’ (from which it is hard to make sense), and also copied the opening of the list of *nomina ventorum*, which a pre-Conquest scribe had added at the bottom of the leaf, mistaking a wynn for a **p** along the way.

⁵⁰ I have not found any overlap with the twelfth-century glosses of William of Conches, though there are some methodological and stylistic similarities; for William’s glosses, see Nauta 1999.

⁵¹ London, British Library, Harley 4092, fols. 87-158 (s. xii¹⁺); London, British Library, Royal 8 B. iv, fols. 102-12 (s. xiiⁱⁿ, Bury) [f: bks i, ii only]; Maidstone, Kent County Archives, U1121 M2B, pp. 103-6 [f] (s. xiiⁱⁿ, Rochester). The copy of the Old English translation is Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 180 (s. xii¹).

⁵² Cambridge, Pembroke College, 84, fols. 32-39 (s. xii¹, Bury) [scholia on bk iii, metre 9]; Durham, Cathedral Library, C. IV. 10 (s. xii¹, Durham) [commentarium, *beg.* ‘*alii auctores solebant prologu in libris suis prescribere*’].

⁵³ Theological treatises: Cambridge, Jesus College, 64 (Q. G. 16) (s. xii¹, Durham); Cambridge, Pembroke College, 84 (s. xiiⁱⁿ, Bury). *De musica*: Cambridge, University Library, Ii. 3. 12, fols. 62-133 (s. xii¹, Cant CC); Oxford, Magdalen College, lat. 19 (s. xii¹, England or Continent).

Prudentius, *Psychomachia*.⁵⁴ Though a few post-Conquest copies of the poem survive, post-Conquest readers appear to have mostly relied on earlier manuscripts.⁵⁵ For example, many Latin glosses were added by twelfth-century readers to the magnificently illustrated Prudentius, now Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 23, pt. i.⁵⁶ These glosses mostly focus on the *Psychomachia* and are overwhelmingly lexical. The following passage, in which Prudentius describes Generosity slaying Avarice, may be taken as representative:⁵⁷

INVADIT TREPIDAM VIRTUS FORTISSIMA DURIS
 Vlnarum nodis .’ obliſo *et* gutture frangit
 Exſanguem ſiccamque gulam ; compreſſa ligantur
 Vincla lacertorum ſub mentum ; *et* faucibus artis
 Extorquent animam ; nullo quæ uulnere rapta .’
 Palpitat ; atque aditu ſpiraminis intercepto
 Incluſam patitur uenarum carcere mortem ; [fol. 29v, lls. 589-95]

INVADIT] .i. agreditur; TREPIDAM] .i. auaritiā; UIRTUS] .i. operatio **i. lar<gitas>**;
 DURIS] .i. ſtrictis
 Vlnarum] .i. brachiorum; nodis] .i. nexibus **uinculis**; obliſo] .i. strangulato **fracto**
 Exſanguem] ſine ſanguine; ſiccamque] **pallidam**
 lacertorum] ipſius operationis **i. brachiorum**; mentum] s. auaritiæ; artis] colligatis ſtrictis
arcatis
 Extorquent] .i. auferunt **ui .s. uincula**; quæ] **sine**
 Palpitat] **moritur**; aditu] **foramine** uia; ſpiraminis] anhelitu; intercepto] .i. intercluſo.
 ſtragulato . **retento**
 patitur] **s. auaritia**

I have printed the original glosses in a plain typeface and the added glosses in bold. Most of the added glosses are lexical, such as *pallidam* explaining *siccam*, which explains a word which already had a gloss. A few help the reader maintain his bearings by identifying the subject or object of verbs. However, there is a strong possibility that this glossator was drawing on

⁵⁴ Glosses from the Weitz tradition are edited by O’Sullivan 2004. I have not found any evidence these glosses were copied in post-Conquest England.

⁵⁵ *Psychomachia*: London, British Library, Cotton Titus D. xvi, fols. 1-36 (s. xii¹, St Albans); London, British Library, Harley 4092, fols. 1-38 (s. xii^{1-2/4}) [f: begins at l. 801]. There is a *Explanatio super Psychomachia Prudentii* (beg. ‘Prudentius tria habuisse nomina dicitur’) in Durham, Cathedral Library, C. IV. 10 (Durham, s. xii¹), and an extract from the *Psychomachia* in Durham, Cathedral Library, B. II. 11 (Durham, s. xi^{ex}).

⁵⁶ The manuscript seems to have been presented to Malmesbury before a hand of the first half of the eleventh century added the verses on fol. ii^v, though it seems unlikely it was produced at the abbey.

⁵⁷ Budny 1997, pl. 269. ‘As she stands thus in consternation the brave virtue [Generosity] sets upon her [Avarice] with the iron grip of her arms and strangles her, crushing the blood out of her throat till it is dry. Her arms pressed tight like bands beneath the chin, squeeze the gorge and wrest the life away; no wound ravishes it in the agony of death; the breath-passage stopped, it suffers its end shut up in the prison of the body’. All translations of the *Psychomachia* are taken from Thomson 1949-1953.

another glossed manuscript of the *Psychomachia* here, because many of his glosses can be paralleled in other copies of the poem. For example, in the ‘Cambridge Songs’ manuscript (fol. 158v), *arctis* also glosses *artis* (592), *ui auferunt ipsa uincula* glosses *extorquent* (593), *moritur* glosses *palpitat*, and *foramine* glosses *aditu* (both 594). By incorporating glosses from other manuscripts, the glossators seem to have been aiming to maximise the assistance available to the reader of this illustrated Prudentius. The manuscript also contains 23 early-twelfth-century glosses in Anglo-Norman French.⁵⁸

Glosses were also added to other pre-Conquest manuscripts of the *Psychomachia* after 1066. I can only print a few examples from London, British Library, Cotton Cleopatra C. viii:⁵⁹

TRANSFIGIT GLADIO ; CALIDOS VOMIT ILLA VAPORES
Sanguine concretos caenoso .’ *spiritus* inde
Sordidus exhalans uicinas polluit auras (fol. 8v, lls. 50-52)

TRANSFIGIT] transfodit s. pudicitia; CALIDOS] **tepidos**; VOMIT] emitat; ILLA] **meretrix uulnerata**; VAPORES] multitudinem sanguinis
Sanguine] cruore; concretos] **coalites**; caenoso] lucoso
Sordidus] **immundus**; exiens] exhalans; polluit] *fetore suo* .i. mala fama **sordidauit**

The different phases of glossing are very difficult to distinguish, so I have only printed in bold glosses which I am certain date from after the Conquest. ‘Vulnerata’ is squeezed in above the original gloss to ‘VAPORES’ (i. e. ‘multitudinem sanguinis’) and ‘meretrix’ is compressed below it. ‘Sordidauit’ is written just above ‘polluit’ (and indeed ‘sordida’ and ‘uit’ are separated by the ascenders of the geminate **I**) to avoid overlapping with the original gloss.

These added glosses are generally lexical in character. However, interpretative glosses do occur, and these sometimes engage with original glosses. For example:⁶⁰

⁵⁸ Discussed below 126-7.

⁵⁹ Ohlgren 1992, pl. 15.9. ‘Then with a sword-thrust she [Chastity] pierces the disarmed harlot’s throat and she spews out hot fumes with clots of foul blood, and the unclean breath defiles the air near by’.

DIXIT ET AURATIS PRAESTRINGENS AERA PENNIS

In *caelum* se uirgo rapit ; mirantur euntem

Virtutes . tolluntque animos in uota uiolentes

Ire simul. ni bella duces terrena retardent (fol. 18r, lls. 305-8)

DIXIT] spes haec; PRAESTRINGENS] secans. dividens

rapit] .s. humilitas superatis mundi pompis .’ *caelos penetrauit sed sancta spes cum | caeteris uirtutibus in hac uita laborans adh<uc> [?] gemit. et ad ipsam peruenire per multas tri|bulationes appetit*

Virtutes] s. aliae; tolluntque] eleuant; in uota] in desideria

duces] uirtutes; retardent] **pro retardarent**

The addition to the gloss to ‘rapit’ (306) is squeezed into the right hand margin of fol. 18r, and separated from the text proper by a paraph mark. The glossator’s point, expressed rather verbosely, seems to be that Spes has not ascended to heaven but remains on the battlefield to assist the other virtues. Since it is Spes who made the speech to which *dixit* refers (as is made clear in l. 284), an unwary reader might have expected that Spes would also be the subject of *rapit* and thus be the virtue ascending to heaven. It is notable that the Latin and Old English captions to the picture of a virtue ascending to heaven on fol. 17v are explicit that the virtue is Humilitas (Eaðmodnes). The post-Conquest expansion of this gloss thus reinforces a point made in the pre-Conquest captions.

In another pre-Conquest *Psychomachia*, the added glosses are restricted to the first three leaves.⁶¹ The rubrication of the manuscript had been left unfinished by its original scribe, who had supplied red initials for each line of the poem, but not the section captions for which he had left room. There are also no contemporary glosses. After the Conquest, a scribe supplied some of the section captions (as far as fol. 9v; l. 279), and a late-eleventh-century hand glossed the first three folios of the manuscript. These Latin glosses have some features in common with pre-Conquest glosses to copies of the *Psychomachia*, but the

⁶⁰ Ohlgren 1992, pl. 15.25. ‘With these words, striking the air with her gilded wings, the maid [Humility] flies off to heaven. The virtues marvel at her as she goes and lift their hearts in longing, desiring to go with her, did not earthly warfare detain them in command’.

⁶¹ Cambridge, Trinity College, O. 2. 51 (1155), pt. i (s. x²).

inclusion of several long marginal glosses suggest they may be drawn from a continuous commentary. I print part of the text of the Preface, with the added glosses:⁶²

Sex [*sic*] fidelis prima credendi uia
 Abram . beati seminis serus pater;
 Adiecta cuius nomen. ' auxit sillaba.
 Abram parenti dictus. abraham deo;
 Senile pignus qui dicauit uictimae.
Docens ad aram cum litare quis uelit
 Quod dulce cordi. quod pium. quod unicum.
 Deo libenter offerendum credito;
 Pugnare nosmet cum *profanis* gentibus
 Suasit . suumque suasor exemplum dedit;
 Nec ante prolem coniugalem gignere
 Deo placentem matre uirtute editam .'
 Quam strage multa bellicosus spiritus
 Portenta cordis saeuientis uicerit; (fol. 1r/1-18; Pref. lls. 1-18)

fidelis] s. est
 Abram] **excelsus pater**; seminis] **i. xpi uel isaac**; serus] .i. tardus; pater] **quia in senectute eum genuit**
 parenti] .i. a parente; abraham] .i. **pater multorum gentium**; deo] s. a
 Senile] **quia senectute genitus est**; pignus] **filium suum isaac**; dicauit] **instituit precepto dei sacrificio**
 litare] .i. sacrificare; *in RH margin* **Exemplo suo ducit cum quis hominum uelit deo | sacrificium libare. sicut ipse filium suum libauit | quem multum dilexerat c[.] ita pocius quam sibi | carius est deo sacrificare.**
 dulce] s. est
 libenter] s. esse
 profanis] .i. uicus; gentibus] .i. **regibus. quia contra .v. reges pugnauit. | Quinque reges .v. sensus corporis signant. visus auditus gustatus | oderatus . tactus. per quos anima ad detrimentum reducitur . quos | abraham allegorice uirtutibus in unit[.] dr[.]**
 Suasit] s. abraham
 prolem] **aliquid boni facere**; gignere] **posse**
 matre uirtute] operante uirtute
 spiritus] .i. sanctus spiritus

All the glosses appear to be in the same hand, but differences in the ink suggest that they were added in two phases. I have accordingly printed the glosses in brown ink in plain type, and those in black ink in bold type. Most of the added material supplies the kind of lexical, syntactical and contextual help that users of pre-Conquest *Psychomachia* manuscripts were

⁶² 'The faithful patriarch who first showed the way of believing, Abram, late in life the father of a blessed progeny, whose name he lengthened by a syllable (for he was called Abram by his father, and Abraham by God), he who offered in sacrifice the child of his old age, teaching us thereby that when a man would make an acceptable offering at the altar he must willingly and with faith in God offer to Him that which is dear to his heart and object of his love, that of which he has but one, has counselled us to war against ungodly tribes, himself giving us an example of his own counsel, and shown that we beget no child of wedlock pleasing to God, and whose mother is virtue, till the spirit, battling valorously, has overcome with great slaughter the monsters in the enslaved heart'.

accustomed to find. However, the content of the longer glosses, which propose tropological readings for particular references in the preface, are rather more unusual. For example, the gloss to ‘gentibus’ (9) explains that the tribes against which Abraham counsels us to fight are literally the five kings against whom he fought (Gen XIV.15) and tropologically the five senses which threaten to destroy the soul.⁶³

Glosses were even added to manuscripts of Aldhelm’s *Prosa de uirginitate*, not a text one would imagine to have appealed to post-Conquest readers.⁶⁴ London, British Library, Royal 6 A. vi, from the first half of the eleventh century, is a tall copy of the Prose *De uirginitate* with contemporary glosses in Latin and Old English. There are a few twelfth-century interlinear glosses in plummet on fols. 28r-29r and 30v.⁶⁵

28r/16 archimandrita: pastor

⁶³ The rubbing which the script has endured obscures the significance of the final point made by the glossator.

⁶⁴ The following Aldhelm manuscripts survive from pre-Conquest England: Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, 1650 (1520) (s. xiⁱⁿ, Abingdon) [*Pdv*]; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 285, fols. 75-131 (s. xiⁱⁿ) [*Cdv*]; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 326 (s. x/xi, Cant CC) [*Pdv*]; Cambridge, University Library, Gg. 5. 35 (s. xi^{med}, Cant StA) [*Cdv*, *Enigmata*]; London, British Library, Cotton Domitian ix, fols. 2-7 (s. xiⁱⁿ or x¹, Cant CC) [*Epistola ad Heahfridum*]; London, British Library, Royal 5 E. xi (s. x/xi, Cant CC) [*Pdv*]; London, British Library, Royal 5 F. iii (s. ix^{ex} or ix/x, Mercia) [*Pdv*]; London, British Library, Royal 6 A. vi (s. x^{ex}, Cant CC) [*Epistola ad Heahfridum*, *Pdv*]; London, British Library, Royal 7 D. xxiv, fols. 82-168 (s. x¹, S England) [*PdV*, *Epistola ad Heahfridum*]; London, British Library, Royal 12 C. xxiii (s. x² or x/xi, Cant CC) [*Enigmata*]; London, British Library, Royal 15 A. xvi (s. ix^{4/4} or ix/x, N France or England, prov. Cant StA by s. x²) [*Enigmata*]; London, Lambeth Palace Library, 200, fols. 66-113 (s. x², Cant StA, prov. Barking??, prov. Waltham Abbey, Essex) [*Pdv*]; Miskolc, Lévy József Library, s. n. (s. viii, S England) [*Enigmata* (f), *Epistola ad Acircium* (f)]; New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, 401 + 401A + Cambridge, University Library, Add. 3330 + London, British Library, Additional 50483K + 71687 + Oslo and London, Schøyen Collection, 197 + Oxford, Bodleian Library, Arch A. f. 131 (ptd. bk.) + lat. th. d. 24, fols. 1 and 2 + Philadelphia, Free Library, John Frederick Lewis Collection, ET 121 (s. ixⁱⁿ) [*Pdv*]; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 49 (s. x^{med}, prov. Winchester OM) [*Cdv*]; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 97 (s. xiⁱⁿ, prov. Cant CC) [*Pdv*]; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 577 (s. x/xi, Cant CC) [*CdV*]; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 146 (s. x^{ex}, Abingdon) [*Pdv*, *Epistola ad Heahfridum*]; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson C. 697 (s. ix^{3/4}, NE France, prov. England by s. x^{med}); Paris, Bibliothèque Saint-Geneviève, 2410 + Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, 903, fols. 1-52 (s. x^{ex}-xi¹, Cant CC (or StA?)) [*Epistola ad Acircium* (excerpt)]; Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 38 (s. x^{ex}, Cant (CC or StA?)) [*Epistola ad Heahfridum*, *Pdv*]. I have seen all the manuscripts in UK libraries (except Salisbury 38) and Beinecke 401 etc. The two manuscripts discussed above are the only two with any significant post-Conquest signs of use. The only surviving copy that was produced between 1066 and 1130 is London, British Library, Royal 6 B. vii (s. xi^{ex}, prov. Exeter) [*PdV*], an extremely fine book measuring c. 300x200mm (220x140mm). The capitula are preceded by a half-length title-page rubric in mixed majuscules (fol. 1r); the preface is written in alternate lines of red and green rustic capitals (fol. 3v); and the text proper begins with a fine historiated I (fol. 4r). It is no surprise that in the late eleventh century, the Exeter canons chose the book as a repository for their relic list (fols. 54v-55r). There are also many drypoint glosses to the outer margins of the text of the *Prosa de uirginitate*.

⁶⁵ Gwara printed these glosses in his apparatus criticus, but does not distinguish them from the original glosses; e. g. Gwara 2001, 157/27.

28v/1 elimaut: dep[...]
 28v/8 arbitantes: iudicantes
 28v/13 con|taminata: incorrupta
 29r/8 anti|dota: contra medicinam
 30v/13 obriza: rotundies
 30v/14 stagnique metella: [.]mixas auri et argenti

The addition of paraphs to mark runovers in the table of contents (fols. 9v-12v), drypoint and plummet crosses in the margins, and a poem lamenting the death of Henry of Blois, bishop of Winchester (d. 1171) on the final verso (fol. 109v),⁶⁶ all attest that the manuscript was read and valued in the twelfth century. The added glosses supply basic lexical equivalents for lemmata which the contemporary glossators had ignored.

There are also added glosses in an early-eleventh-century copy of the prose *De uirginitate*.⁶⁷ This manuscript was at Christ Church, Canterbury in the later middle ages, before moving to Augustine's Abbey.⁶⁸ Each leaf of the manuscript contains about ten glosses in the text hand. These are mainly in Latin, but some glosses are in Old English. The four added glosses are clustered on one opening (fols. 4v-5r), interlined in brownish ink by a hand of the first half of the twelfth century. The glosses are 'pelices' to *olimpiaci* (fol. 4v/14); 'strænge' to *neruo* (fol. 5r/1); 'stænienden' to *anbelantium* (fol. 5r/3); and 'pedibus' to *plantis* (fol. 5r/3). The last gloss 'pedibus' is found in four other pre-Conquest manuscripts,⁶⁹ while the first gloss, 'pelices', occurs in three,⁷⁰ and the second gloss 'strænge' occurs in one other manuscript.⁷¹ 'Stænienden' is not found as a gloss to *anbelantium* in any other surviving manuscript,⁷² but the evidence of the three other glosses strongly suggests all four were

⁶⁶ Printed Wright 1846, 180-1.

⁶⁷ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 97.

⁶⁸ Christ Church pressmarks 'SX' (fol. 1r) and 'D. ii. G. v' (fol. ir): see James 1903, no. 48 (p. 21). 'De librario Sancti Augustini | extra Cantuar' (fol. ir).

⁶⁹ Brussels 1650 (1520); Royal 6 B. vii; Royal 7 D. xxiv; Digby 146. For my knowledge of the gloss tradition, I am reliant on Gwara 2001.

⁷⁰ Brussels 1650 (1520); CCCC 326; Royal 6 B. vii.

⁷¹ Brussels 1650 (1520).

⁷² Though in four pre-Conquest manuscripts (Royal 6 A. vi; Royal 6 B. vii; Royal 7 D. xxiv; Digby 146) *anbelantium* is glossed 'currentium'.

copied directly from another glossed manuscript of the prose *De virginitate*. It is significant that the glossator elected to copy three Old English glosses and only one in Latin.

The added glosses discussed so far are overwhelmingly Latin, with a few exceptional English glosses. However, at least two pre-Conquest manuscripts contain added glosses in Anglo-Norman French. Forty years or so after the Conquest, a few French glosses were added to the ‘versus Prosperi ad coniugem suam’ (fols. 31v-33v) and the *Disticha Catonis* (fols. 34r-40v) in a Christ Church manuscript of s. x/xi.⁷³ The glossator used Latin as well as French to supplement the existing Latin and Old English glosses. These glosses from the ‘versus Prosperi’ (lls. 22-46) show how the different layers of glossing interact (fol. 32r):⁷⁴

reges (28): *id est with s’acutent in the margin (though presumably a gloss to incumbunt)*; aut (31): s. si; occasum (33): **(deca[....])**; prona (36): **enclins**; aquis (36): **lur with nunespusedes in the margin, presumably glossing inexhaustis**; suis (38): **\in/ suis**; florea (38): **florea \it/**; rura (38): **p**; locis (38): **(lur)**; corporis hospes ago (40): *above corporis II; above hospes I; interlined between them ego*; *above ago three dots in a line horizontally*; ne qui quam (41): **in uanum . uel frustra**; quibus (42): s. in olis; occidimus (42): i. cadimus; sed uitam (43): s. sumus nata; rebellibus (45): **as rebataillerus**; effera (46): s. superbia.

The post-Conquest glosses, printed in bold type, are lexical (*s’acutent* glossing *incumbunt*), syntactical (the information given on how to construe line 40), and exegetical (explaining that earthly existence is *in uanum uel frustra*). The pre-Conquest glosses, printed in plain type, are very similar, but addressed to different lemmata.

As mentioned above, the magnificent Corpus Prudentius also contains twenty-three glosses in Anglo-Norman French, clustered on four leaves (fols. 32v, 33r, 34r, 39v).⁷⁵ Most

⁷³ Cambridge, Trinity College, O. 2. 31 (1135); the manuscript also contains Prosper, *Epigrammata* (fols. 1r-31v), Bede’s *De die iudicii* (fols. 43, 42, 41) and Prudentius, *Dittochaeton* [f] (fols. 46-49, 45). The leaves are presently misbound. The manuscript may be the surviving portion of the ‘Cato. Prosper. Sedulius. Prudentius. Arator in uno uolumine’ in the Christ Church catalogue: James 1903, x, no. 158. For its origin, see Bishop 1963, 421. Some pre-Conquest Latin glosses from the manuscript have been printed by Lapidge 1982b, 103-6. See also Ruff 1998.

There are a large number of post-Conquest Latin glosses. Other evidence of post-Conquest use includes the erasure and rewriting of several rubrics on fol. 31r, and the supply of some omitted distichs on fols. 39r and 40v.

⁷⁴ The *Versus Prosperi* are edited among the spurious works of Paulinus of Nola by de Hartel 1894, 344-8. The French glosses are printed Hunt 1991, 19-20.

⁷⁵ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 23, pt. 1. The glosses are printed Hunt 1991, i. 20; Wilkins 1993, 15.

of the glosses are in a tiny hand from around 1100. On fol. 33r, the gloss is continuous for a moment:⁷⁶

VENTUM ERAT AD FAUCES PORTÆ CASTRENSIS .’ UBI ARTUM
Liminis introitum bifori dant cardine claustra ; (fol. 33r, lls. 665-666)

VENTUM ERAT] s. ab illis uirtutibus; AD FAUCES PORTÆ] ad introitum .i. perueniunt ad portas; CASTRENSIS] a castro *dicitur* . castrensis **herbergable** .i. ciuitatis; ARTUM] **angustum**
Liminis] **lintel ianuæ**; bifori] gemino **duble** (*in RH margin bifori .i. duo hostia. uel duo po<r>ta*); dant] **trespercoit**; cardine] **cum** introitum **cardunel**; claustra] **cum cloisturis**

I have printed the original glosses in plain type; added glosses in bold; and the glosses in the tiny hand under discussion in bold and underlined. The Anglo-Norman French glosses are squeezed in as close to the lemma as possible, suggesting the glossator wanted them to be inconspicuous. They are straightforwardly lexical. However, it would seem that the last gloss, ‘cum cloisturis’ is attempting to provide some morphological information as well as a synonym for *claustra*, but, if so, it is a misleading gloss, because *claustra* is not an ablative singular adjective agreeing with *cardine*, but the neuter plural noun which is the subject of *dant*. It is uncertain whether these Anglo-Norman French glosses were intended to supplement the Latin glosses, or replace them.

These examples emphatically show that pre-Conquest manuscripts containing school texts remained in use in the schoolroom after 1066. The added glosses usually ignore the pre-existing Latin and Old English glosses which the glossator would have observed in the manuscript. However, the occasional interaction of the added and the original glosses (such as over the question of which virtue ascends to heaven in Cotton Cleopatra C. viii), and the evidence that many of the added glosses were copied from other glossed manuscripts, strongly suggests that post-Conquest readers did appreciate pre-existing gloss traditions.

⁷⁶ Budny 1997, pl. 275. ‘They [the virtues] had reached the pass of the camp gate where a double-doored barrier swings open to afford a narrow way of entrance’.

Latin was dominant, but readers occasionally expressed themselves in English or Anglo-Norman French.

PRE-CONQUEST VERNACULAR MANUSCRIPTS AFTER 1066

Vernacular literature held its own after 1066. However, as manuscripts containing vernacular texts aged, the form of the language which they embedded became more and more distant from the spoken form of the language with which people were familiar. Consequently, readers deployed a wide range of techniques – such as orthographical correction, lexical substitution, stylistic alteration and repunctuation – to ensure the texts remained comprehensible. Such techniques had been used by Anglo-Saxon readers through the course of the eleventh century, but not with the same intensity.⁷⁷

Pre-Conquest vernacular manuscripts sometimes contain pre-Conquest corrections, and, less frequently, vernacular or Latin glosses.⁷⁸ For example, a mid-eleventh-century Rochester scribe overhauled the two-volume homiliary Bodley 340 + 342, which had been produced there during the early eleventh century:⁷⁹

every department of scribal economy has been studied and improved: letter shapes altered, the system of word-division improved if ambiguous, the punctuation corrected, and hyphens and accents added. Marginal crosses and scrawls act as paragraph marks, and other marginal markings appear to indicate passages for omission. Where sense or syntax needed correction, erasures and additions have been made, and linguistic peculiarities have been as a rule normalised to Late West Saxon.

⁷⁷ For arguments similar to those advanced in this section, see Treharne forthcoming. I am grateful to Professor Treharne for sharing her paper with me in advance of its publication.

⁷⁸ London, British Library, Royal 7 C. xii, fols. 4-218, a copy of Ælfric's first series of *Catholic Homilies* produced under the author's auspices, contains a number of glosses in the hand of the main scribe (S2): *fordonan* is glossed 'uel fyrnfullan' (fol. 116v/3; CH 1 368/91); *arleasra* is glossed 'i. impiorum' (fol. 170r/3; CH 1 454/87); *lybbendra* is glossed 'i. uiuentium' (fol. 203v/2; CH 1 507/21); *beofena* is glossed 'i. celorum' (fol. 214r/2; CH 1 524/10); *geleaffulra* is glossed 'i. fidelium' (fol. 215v/23; CH 1 527/94). In addition, the gloss 'uel forhtiað' to *biniað* (fol. 106v/4; CH 1 350/143) is in the hand associated with Ælfric himself.

⁷⁹ Ker 1933b, 81. The changes are discussed 83-207.

The scribe who made these changes also added an account of Paulinus, bishop of Rochester at the end of the first volume (Bodley 342, fol. 202v).⁸⁰ Several other pre-Conquest scribes made similar alterations to particular homilies.

An early-eleventh-century collection of vernacular saints' lives was similarly corrected by several near-contemporary hands, including one that made additions to fifteen of the saints' lives.⁸¹ This pre-Conquest corrector made his additions interlinearly, and marked the appropriate point of insertion with a double point. He frequently introduced the phrase *þæt is on englisc* before a translation of a Latin quotation; often inserted *god* after *almihtig* used substantively; made a number of alterations to the orthography of the manuscript (e. g. *ec\ē/an*; *Ce\ā/dwalla*); frequently corrected the vowel in inflectional syllables (including sporadically altering dative plural *him* to *beom*); sometimes added doxologies at the end of saints' lives; and corrected one or two copying errors. Wulfstan the Homilist, bishop of Worcester and archbishop of York (1002-1023), made similar alterations to a number of manuscripts.⁸² In Hatton 20, Wulfstan altered obsolescent forms, syntax, emphasis and punctuation, in an attempt to ensure that an early-eleventh-century reader would have no problems with Alfred's early West Saxon.⁸³ These pre-Conquest scribes provide a context for

⁸⁰ Printed Sisam 1931, 10-11.

⁸¹ London, British Library, Cotton Julius E. vii: Needham 1958.

⁸² Ker 1971. The identification of the hand was challenged by Hohler 1978, 74 and 225n59; Wormald 1978, 52. It has been vindicated by Cross and Tunberg 1993, 44-7; Wormald 1999, 227-9. Wormald's later article argues the case best: the hand annotates manuscripts from both Worcester and York; is concerned with pastoral care and secular law; and makes authorial changes to texts by Wulfstan.

The hand occurs in Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliothek, Gamle Kongelige Sammling 1595 4° (version of Wulfstan's 'handbook', c. 1002-1023); London, British Library, Additional 38651, fols. 57 and 58 (OE sermon notes, s. xiⁱⁿ); London, British Library, Cotton Claudius A. iii, fols. 31-86, 106-50 (pontifical, benedictional, s. x/xi); London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. xiii, fols. 1-118 (*Liber Wigornensis*, c. 1016); London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian A. xiv, fols. 114-79 (letter-book, 1003x1023); London, British Library, Harley 55, fols. 1-4 (OE laws, s. xi^l); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 20 (OE Pastoral Care, 890x897); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 42 (*Collectio canonum Hibernensis* etc, s. ix^{1/3-med}); and York, Minster Library, Add. 1, fols. 10-161 (Gospels, s. x^{ex-xiⁱⁿ}).

⁸³ See Dance 2004, 37-43.

understanding the many interventions post-Conquest scribes made in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts.

London, British Library, Royal 7 C. xii, fols. 4-218 is a copy of Ælfric's first series of *Catholic Homilies*, thought to have been written under his supervision at Cerne c. 990, and to contain autograph corrections.⁸⁴ Post-Conquest glosses and alterations are mainly in two hands: the first, probably from the turn of the eleventh century, occurs in Ælfric's homily for the first Sunday after Easter (fols. 80v-83v);⁸⁵ and the second, probably late twelfth century, occurs in the homilies for Quinquagesima Sunday (fols. 51v-56v), Quadragesima Sunday (fols. 56v-62r), Palm Sunday (fols. 71r-76r), the first Sunday after Easter (fols. 80v-83v) and the third Sunday after Easter (fols. 91r-96v).⁸⁶ There is surprising similarity between the two phases of glossing. Both glossators usually entered their interventions interlinearly, but occasionally underlined or even erased original readings. The earlier glossator seems to have been primarily concerned to make the text intelligible to a contemporary reader. He suggested reading *beom* for dative plural *him* on six occasions (e. g. fol. 80v/16), presumably to disambiguate from dative singular *him*. (It is notable that the mid-eleventh-century corrector of the Bury copy of Ælfric's *Lives of Saints* made similar alterations).⁸⁷ The earlier glossator also attempted to clarify Ælfric's description of events by adding prepositional phrases, inserting *to beom* after 'eft þa ða thomas com' (fol. 80v/24; *CH* 1 307/12). He expanded brief biblical allusions, for instance by identifying 'þæs mædenes' as *marian* (fol. 81r/21; *CH* 1 308/33) and explaining that 'lazarum' *hæfde gebeon þreo dagas under eorðan* (fol. 82r/25; *CH* 1 310/81). He made small stylistic changes, such as the insertion of *haliga*

⁸⁴ Clemoes and Eliason 1966. For the date, see Watson 1979, no. 877. For discussion of the glosses, see Clemoes and Eliason 1966, 25-6; Treharne 2006c, 341-4.

⁸⁵ Clemoes 1997, no. 16 (pp. 307-12). For their dating, see Ker 1957, no. 257 (pp. 324-30).

⁸⁶ Clemoes 1997, nos. 10, 11, 14, 16, 19 (pp. 258-65, 266-74, 290-8, 307-12, 325-34).

⁸⁷ London, British Library, Cotton Julius E. vii. See Needham 1958, 163.

between ‘se’ and ‘papa’ (fol. 81r/14; *CH* 1 308/27). He provided lexical glosses to various words, presumably because they were becoming obsolete: *on rope* to ‘ogan’ (fol. 80v/15; *CH* 1 307/4; cf. fol. 82r/11);⁸⁸ *wundan* to ‘dolhswaðum’ (fol. 81r/5; *CH* 1 307/18; cf. fol. 81r/2); *twiges* to ‘tua’ (fol. 81v/19; *CH* 1 309/54); and *caseren* to ‘wælræwum’ (fol. 82r/20; *CH* 1 309/78).⁸⁹ The interventions of the late-twelfth-century glossator evince very similar concerns. He interlined many lexical glosses, preferring, for example, *hus* to ‘templ’ (fol. 92v/4; *CH* 1 327/67) and *speche* to ‘gereorde’ (fol. 92v/20; *CH* 1 328/80-1). He made small and not-so-small stylistic changes, for example by marking *7 hy þonne farað | mid gode sulfe. 7 mid | his engle on ece gefean | heofenerices . þer is | merð . 7 mirbð . 7 ece blisse* for insertion after ‘7 beoð ðonne gelice englum’ (fol. 93r/12; *CH* 1 328/94). The redundant collocation *merð. 7 mirbð* here suggests his concern was more with oral effect than theological meaning. However, this glossator also made several other types of changes. He inserted an appropriate noun after adjectives used substantively, adding, for example, *man* after *se welega* (fol. 91v/24; *CH* 1 326/42).⁹⁰ It is very likely that the horizontal slashes dividing words which the original scribe had run together are his, and that marginal crosses marking major divisions in the homilies are also (e. g. fol. 94r/2; *CH* 1 329/127). The stylistic interventions strongly suggest that the glossator was not simply interested in understanding the text, but in revising it for use. His concern with word division arguably suggests that he was preparing to read the text aloud, because a private reader would have had the leisure to puzzle out any ambiguities when words had been misleadingly run together.

⁸⁸ Presumably *rope* is OE *broþ*, ‘cry’ (cf. MED ‘rop’, n3) with an extended meaning not recorded elsewhere.

⁸⁹ In Ælfric’s text, ‘wælræwum’ and ‘reðum’ are adjectives describing ‘cynegum’. The glossator seems to have thought ‘wælræwum’ was a noun denoting a type of ruler, or that ‘reðum cynegum 7 caseren’ was a more attractive phrase than ‘reðum cynegum . 7 wælræwum’.

⁹⁰ Ker’s hand (1) in Bodley 340 + 342 – apparently an eleventh-century scribe – also added the understood noun after an adjective used substantively on a number of occasions: Ker 1933b, 210.

Other homiletic manuscripts contain similarly dramatic post-Conquest interventions. A mid-eleventh-century Christ Church collection of Ælfric's homilies has twelfth-century glosses to eleven homilies,⁹¹ those for *die dominica pasce* (pp. 3-18),⁹² *dominica II post pasca* (pp. 51-79),⁹³ *dominica III post pasca* (pp. 79-90),⁹⁴ *dominica iiii post pasca* (pp. 90-103),⁹⁵ *dominica v post pasca* (pp. 103-18),⁹⁶ *in letania maiore* (pp. 118-35),⁹⁷ *feria iiii de fide catholica* (pp. 157-79),⁹⁸ *sermo ad populum in octauis pentacosten dicendus* (pp. 249-81),⁹⁹ *dominica iii post pentecosten* (pp. 310-19),¹⁰⁰ *dominica iiii post pentecosten* (pp. 319-37),¹⁰¹ and *dominica vi post pentecosten* (pp. 350-63).¹⁰² The manuscript was evidently a high-status production, since it has a fine frontispiece miniature of Christ in a mandorla.¹⁰³ The glosses are in at least three hands, one early-twelfth-century (pp. 118-276) and two others late-twelfth-century (pp. 11-113, 312-61). The glossators habitually used English, though the glosses to *feria iiii de fide catholica* are in Latin, where the glossator interlined the Vulgate text of a biblical quotation which Ælfric had translated into Old English,¹⁰⁴ and – more surprisingly – cited three clauses from the famous trinitarian

⁹¹ Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 15. 34 (369). Pope 1967, vol. ii, frontispiece (p. 358); Keynes 1992, pls. XXIIa, b (pp. 356, 358) show glosses. From the 1940s, J. I. de l'Anson Bromwich was engaged in editing all the Middle English glosses in pre-Conquest manuscripts, but only published the glosses to *Dominica IV post pascha* from this manuscript. These appeared in a privately printed pamphlet, apparently issued in 1950 under the title *An Anglo-Saxon Homily for the 4th Sunday after Easter*. The only copy in the public domain known to me is an incomplete set of galley proofs in Cambridge University Library (shelfmark 5717c/95/I). Pope and Godden print most of the glosses to the homilies they edit. I hope to edit the unpublished glosses from TCC B. 15. 34 in a forthcoming paper.

⁹² Clemoes 1997, 299-307.

⁹³ Clemoes 1997, 313-6 and 535-42.

⁹⁴ Assmann 1889, 73-80.

⁹⁵ Pope 1967, i. 340-50.

⁹⁶ Pope 1967, i. 357-68.

⁹⁷ Clemoes 1997, 317-24.

⁹⁸ Clemoes 1997, 335-44.

⁹⁹ Pope 1967, i. 415-57.

¹⁰⁰ Godden 1979, 213-20.

¹⁰¹ Clemoes 1997, 371-8.

¹⁰² Pope 1967, ii. 515-25.

¹⁰³ Wormald 1952, no. 15; Temple 1976, no. 74; Backhouse, Turner et al. 1984, no. 63.

¹⁰⁴ 'Spiritus domini repleuit orbem terrarum et hoc quod continet omnia scientiam habet uocis' (Wisd 1.7) marked for insertion before 163/10 (Clemoes 337/7-9).

creed ratified at the eleventh council of Toledo in 675,¹⁰⁵ even though Ælfric's discussion draws exclusively on the Athanasian and Nicean creeds (pp. 157, 160). At least one of the glossators appears to have been a secular canon or a priest, and not a monk.¹⁰⁶

For the purpose of this discussion, I have examined the hundred-plus unpublished glosses to *Dominica Secunda Post Pasca*. Some of these glosses modify syntax. For example, it seems that the force of the inflected genitive was no longer felt, because the annotator introduced *of* before many nouns or phrases, both partitive and possessive, in the genitive.¹⁰⁷ The function of some prepositions had also changed,¹⁰⁸ and the glossator disliked the substantive use of adjectives.¹⁰⁹ However, the bulk of the alterations reflect the obsolescence of particular lexical items. For example *eowde* is frequently glossed 'sceap',¹¹⁰ *geneosian* 'sundian',¹¹¹ *wita* 'wisa',¹¹² *arfæst* 'mild',¹¹³ and *scaðþig* 'hermful'.¹¹⁴ These examples generally illustrate the replacement of one Old English word with another Old English-derived synonym, though some of the lexical glosses in other homilies attest words not recorded in the Middle English Dictionary.¹¹⁵ Sometimes the alterations are more stylistic, and make explicit exegetical equations which Ælfric made tacitly, for example the glossing of *sceapum* as 'folce' (55/3; *CH* 1 314/39), and *þæs godcundan geleafan* as 'þæt is on gode bileafan' (75/11; *CH*

¹⁰⁵ The creed is edited Denzinger 1991, nos. 525-41. For its context, see Madoz 1938.

¹⁰⁶ In the *sermo* for the Octave of Pentecost, Ælfric narrates an exemplum to prove the efficacy of prayer as a counter to evil. The glossator altered a reference to monks praying for a *cnibt* who had been attacked by a dragon so that both monks and priests pray (259/1; Pope 423/171). No source has been found for Ælfric's exemplum here.

¹⁰⁷ e. g. 'sumum \of/ his witegan' (58/10; *CH* 1 535/5); 'manega synd \þa/ gedrefednyssa \of/ rihtwisra manna' (66/10; *CH* 1 538/99); 'nanum \of/ his ge|corenum' (68/18; *CH* 1 539/127-8) etc.

¹⁰⁸ e. g. 'hæfð his mede (for) \on/ þysum life' (55/5; *CH* 1 314/40-1); 'lociað (wið) \to/ heora \þinga/' (61/6; *CH* 1 536/38); 'þa lare (wið) \for/ heora bigleofan' (62/9; *CH* 1 536/51) etc.

¹⁰⁹ e. g. 'ða geleafullan \men/' (62/4; *CH* 1 536/49).

¹¹⁰ e. g. 58/17 (*CH* 1 535/9); 58/21 (*CH* 1 535/11); 69/8 (*CH* 1 539/133) etc.

¹¹¹ e. g. 59/20 (*CH* 1 536/22) (x2); 73/16 (*CH* 1 541/185); 74/9 (*CH* 1 541/193) etc.

¹¹² e. g. 72/20 (*CH* 1 540/175) (x2); 72/21 (*CH* 1 540/176) etc.

¹¹³ e. g. 73/10 (*CH* 1 540/182); 73/12 (*CH* 1 540/183); 75/9 (*CH* 1 541/206) (glossing *genibtsunlice*).

¹¹⁴ e. g. 77/5 (*CH* 1 542/227); 77/10 (*CH* 1 542/229); 77/12 (*CH* 1 542/231) etc.

¹¹⁵ For similar alterations made by post-Conquest copyists, see Liuzza 2000, 156. Liuzza only identifies one example of a French word replacing an Old English word: *aisil* which replaces *eced*.

1 541/207). Sometimes, though, the interlinear additions are merely expansive, perhaps adapting the homily to the greater verbosity customary of oral delivery.¹¹⁶ Occasionally, the alterations are simply orthographical: for example, *wo\h/līce* (64/16; *CH* 1 537/78); and *w\ē/oruldlica* (75/13; *CH* 1 541/208).¹¹⁷ The overall effect of the changes is not inconsistent with the homily having been parsed for outdated lexis, morphology and syntax, presumably to ensure it had the desired effect on a new audience.

Another example is Cambridge, University Library, Gg. 3. 28, a large homiliary of Durham provenance, containing both series of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*, some vernacular prayers, his *De temporibus anni* and one of his pastoral letters.¹¹⁸ Six homilies have glosses of the late eleventh century: those for Lent (fols. 53v-6v), for the second (fols. 196r-9v) and third Sundays after Lent (fols. 199v-202v), the 'alia visio' concerning Drihthelm (fols. 202v-4v), and the homilies for the Assumption of the Virgin Mary (fols. 221v-3r), and for the feast day of a Virgin (fols. 248v-51r).¹¹⁹ These are the interventions to *Feria secunda. letania maiore*:

pinc above 'magas' (fol. 196r/12; *CH* 2 180/10); *naht* marked for insertion after 'menn' (fol. 196r/17; *CH* 2 180/16); paraph mark before 'Gehyrað' (fol. 196r/22; *CH* 2 181/25); 7 inserted before 'gif heo ydel bið' (fol. 196v/6; *CH* 2 180/44); *sym\b/le* (fol. 197r/15; *CH* 2 183/100); *hī\y/m* (fol. 197r/15; *CH* 2 183/101); *hī\y/m* (fol. 197r/19; *CH* 2 183/106); *hī\y/m* (fol. 197r/26; *CH* 2 103/115); *swigade* above '(for)suwade' (fol. 197v/3; *CH* 2 184/125); *segon* above '(for)sawon' (fol. 197v/5; *CH* 2 184/126); *sym\b/le* (fol. 197v/5; *CH* 2 184/139); punctus elevatus altered to punctus versus after 'and dreagað me siððan' (fol. 197v/14; *CH* 2 184/139); punctus altered to punctus versus after 'þis sædde drihten' (fol. 197v/14; *CH* 2 184/139); *wraððied* interlined above 'geysiað' (fol. 197v/16; *CH* 2 184/141-2); *were 7 wīfe* above 'twam' (fol. 197v/29; *CH* 2 184/160); *he* inserted before 'lærð hit anrædlice' (fol. 198r/24; *CH* 2 186/194); *mynegode* above 'manode' (fol. 198v/9; *CH* 2 186/215); *\ead/modē\nesse/* (fol. 198v/11; *CH* 2 186/217); *unlustlice* above 'ansyne' (fol. 198v/12; *CH* 2 187/218); *eadmod* above 'anfealdre' (fol. 198v/12; *CH* 2 118/219); *nē\ā/* (fol. 198v/12; *CH* 2 187/219) *eian* over 'ogan' (fol. 198v/13; *CH* 2 118/220); *eadmodnesse* over 'þæslicnysse' (fol. 198v/14; *CH* 2 118/221); *hī\ber/ geearniað* (fol. 198v/16; *CH* 2 118/224); *eac \hine/on edleane* (fol. 199r/17; *CH* 2 188/265); *lareow \paulus/ sæde* (fol. 199v/1; *CH* 2

¹¹⁶ e. g. 'for ðan ðe se wyrhta bið wyrðe his metes \þonne he ðer æfter swincað/' (62/7; *CH* 1 536/50).

¹¹⁷ Ker's corrector (4) in Bodley 340 + 342, who was apparently working in the eleventh century, primarily made orthographical changes like these. He preferred, for example, *ciricean* to *ciran* and *wered* to *werod*.

¹¹⁸ '1^d 8ⁱ P' (fol. 1r), apparently a Durham pressmark, and 'Leo Pylkyngton' (fol. 1r). It was given to Cambridge by his brother, James Pilkington, bishop of Durham, in 1574.

¹¹⁹ Edited by Clemoes 1997, 317-24; Godden 1979, 180-9, 190-8, 199-203, 255-9, 327-34. Godden prints many of the alterations to the text in his apparatus but does not distinguish between contemporary corrections and later interventions.

189/285); and *unrihtdemeres* over 'gytseras' (fol. 199v/3; CH 2 189/286); *ne nane wununge mid him* over 'rice' (fol. 199v/4; CH 2 189/287).

Many of these glosses are stylistic: the suggestion we read *þinc*, 'things' for *magas*, 'men'; the preference for a double negative in 'ne fremað cristenum men \naht/'; the clarification of *twan æwum* as 'were 7 wife'. Others are orthographical, such as the preference for *symble* rather than *symle*, 'always'; for *hym* rather than *him* in both singular and plural; and for *forswigade* and *forsegen* rather than *forswade* and *forsawan* as the preterites of *forswigian* and *forseon*. Some are lexical, for example preferring *wræðian*, 'be angry', to *iersian*, 'rage'; and *myndgian*, 'remember', to *manian*, 'remind'. A few other interventions may have been primarily motivated by lexical concerns, but also involve a stylistic change, for example 'Ne ðeowige ge to ansyne \unlustlice/. ac mid anfealdre \eadmod/ heortan', where the adverb *unlustlice*, 'wearily',¹²⁰ replaces the adverbial phrase *to ansyne*, 'on the surface' and *eadmod* (notably not in the correct oblique form) replaces *anfealdre*. The corrector also seems to have been responsible for small alterations to the punctuation.

London, British Library, Cotton Julius E. vii is an early-eleventh-century collection of vernacular saints' lives, mainly by Ælfric.¹²¹ If the book was not produced at Bury, it is likely it was there shortly afterwards.¹²² An early addition to the manuscript was an Old English translation of the *Vita sancti Mariae Aegyptiacae* (fols. 123r-136r).¹²³ This life does not appear in the near-contemporary table of contents, and was not corrected by any of the early hands which corrected the manuscript proper. However, the text does contain some twenty corrections which appear to be in the hand of the text scribe, *calamo currente*, and, more

¹²⁰ *Unlustlice*, an adverbial form of *unlust*, is unattested in Old English, and the MED only quotes one example of 'unlustili', from c. 1390.

¹²¹ Ker 1957, no. 162 (pp. 206-10); Torkar 1971; Magennis 1996; Rushforth 2002, 159-65 and pls. 20-22 (fols. 3r, 206v, 224r); Magennis 2005; Hill 2006.

¹²² Needham 1958. The thirteenth-century pressmark 'Liber sancti Ædmundi regis 7 martyris' is on fol. 3r.

¹²³ Magennis 2002. See also Scragg 2005. Hereafter references are to Magennis's edition, followed by line number. Magennis does not record all these corrections in his apparatus.

significantly, some thirty corrections in plummet, by a hand that uses rough insular minuscule, putatively twelfth-century. This corrector was very astute. He corrected obvious mistakes like the dittography of *beforan* in ‘(beforan) þa synd beforan’ (fol. 124r/17; Magennis 89). He offered plausible corrections to errors, for example by supplying the verb ‘ongæt’ at the end of the incomplete clause ‘þa þa ic þone weg’ (fol. 130v/6; Magennis 569).¹²⁴ Sometimes his solutions are admirably astute, such as when he suggests reading ‘manfullra’ (wicked) for ‘manðwæra’ (placid, gentle) in Mary’s statement ‘seofontyne wintre ic wan on þam gewilnunga þære manðwæra and ungesceadwisra wildeora lustum’ (fol. 130v/6; Magennis 616-8). The Old English translator may have been rendering a Latin source which had *mansuetis*, ‘gentle’, for *inmansuetis*, ‘wild’, and the corrector was clever enough to fathom this out.¹²⁵ When he was unable to supply a feasible correction, he underlined impossible readings like *nyrcum* for *nyrsum* (fol. 128v/16; Magennis 447). He also sharpened the rather verbose style of the translation by omitting unnecessary conjunctions.¹²⁶ Moreover, it is possible his marginal note ‘ð cwæð’ (fol. 127r/18; Magennis 303) was intended to flag up the major lacuna that follows ‘þa arisan he butu of þære eorþan’. Indeed, this note may anticipate ‘ðus cwæð’ (Magennis 304), which is how the text continues in another witness; if so, then it would seem the corrector had access to another manuscript of the Life of Mary of Egypt. Occasionally, however, he produced nonsense or misunderstood the text – for example, inserting a 7 before *god* as if *hæbbende* were a finite verb in ‘\7/ God to gewitan hæbbende’ (fol. 124r/24; Magennis 97) – but he generally shows himself to be a remarkably able corrector. He also marked a number of passages with marginal crosses:

‘þæt wæs mid þam wyrtum þe on þam westene weoxon’ (fol. 125r; Magennis 160-1)

¹²⁴ Magennis’s two other witnesses read ‘þa þa ic þone weg wiste’.

¹²⁵ See Magennis’s note to lls. 617-8, p. 127.

¹²⁶ e. g. ‘(ac) wuna her mid us’ (fol. 124r/24; Magennis 99). See Magennis’s note to l. 99, p. 122.

‘þæt hi to Hierusalem faran woldon for þære halgan rode wurðunga’ (fol. 127v/26-7; Magennis 391-2)
 ‘þa ongan ic bitterlice wepan’ (fol. 129r/22-3; Magennis 487); ‘Seo wuldor ælmihtigum Gode’ (fol. 130r/16; Magennis 545-6)
 ‘god is se þe gehet him sylfum gelice beon þa þe hi sylfe ær clænsiað’ (fol. 134r/22-3; Magennis 819-20)

The crosses presumably highlight what the corrector considered significant. I have not found this corrector’s hand anywhere else in Cotton Julius E. vii. This raises the question of why he focused exclusively on Mary of Egypt. It may be that he had access to other manuscripts containing Ælfrican saints’ lives, but only here to a life of St Mary of Egypt.

London, British Library, Cotton Julius A. x, fols. 44-175 is a copy of the Old English Martyrology from the turn of the tenth century,¹²⁷ of unknown origin and provenance. An annotator of the twelfth century intervened with various conjectural corrections, stylistic alterations, paratextual comments in Old English and Latin, and inconsequential marginal scribbles.¹²⁸ On fol. 91r, the annotator indicated the necessity of correcting ‘æsnungdrenceas drince’ to ‘cleansungdrenceas drince’ (Kotzor 82/5) by writing ‘clænsung’ in the right-hand margin. He also supplied a verb when one was lacking in the account of St Mamillian: ‘ða lattowas swiþe \wandroda/ for ða wundrum’ (fol. 153v/5; Kotzor 209/3-4). *Wandroda*, for *wandrode*, is not the kind of correction a modern editor would favour, but it solved the problem. Indeed Kotzor actually takes the annotator’s correction to the opening of the account of St Ceolfrið into his text: ‘On ðone .xxv. dæg þæs monðes bið ðæs | hal\gan weres gemind/ se wæs on ðisse brytene’ (fol. 159r/15-16; Kotzor 219/1-2). The annotator appears to have made all these corrections conjecturally. He also made a number of small, stylistic alterations to the account of St Mamillian, on occasions where there was no error in the manuscript, but he felt the reading could be tidied up. He changed a *punctus* into the tironian nota for *and*, when Mamillian offered food to two men sent by the bishop, as was

¹²⁷ Edited Kotzor 1981.

¹²⁸ Ker 1957, no. 161, notes only the alterations on fols. 153v, 159r, 160v.

his custom, ‘geþafode þæt oper 7 oðer | ðam wiðsoc. se wæs yldra 7 ofer|hydygra’ (fol. 153r/11-13; Kotzor 208/11-12). When the proud man who spurned the food suddenly developed a thirst, and asked Mamillian to help, Mamillian saw a suckling deer and seized it, allowing the thirsty man to milk the deer: ‘ða geseah se godes | | þeow \an/ wilde hinde melce’ (fols. 153r/17-153v/1; Kotzor 208/15-209/1). The addition of *an* (presumably for *ane*) clarifies the syntax of the manuscript reading. Furthermore, like Coleman, the annotator also made paratextual comments,¹²⁹ adding a comment on specially-ruled lines in the lower margin of fol. 160v: ‘þis sindon for ællum ifelum unkistum þingum’.¹³⁰ It is not clear to which part of the leaf’s text this note refers: possibilities include St. Justina’s miraculous dissipation of Cyprian’s magical powers ‘for hyre halignesse’ (Kotzor 220/13) or the medical abilities of SS Cosmas and Damian. He also wrote a short Latin prayer in the margin of fol. 135v, which was subsequently cropped when the manuscript was trimmed. This very common prayer is next to part of the account of the passion of St Afra, her mother Hilaria, and their three companions Digna, Eonimina and Eotropia (fols. 135r-136r) and reads ‘[Deus] qui tribus pueris | [mi]tigasti flammas | [ign]ium concede propicius | [et] nos famulos tuos | [no]n exurat flamma | [ui]ciorum’.¹³¹ The *Martyrology* reports that Afra was burned at the stake, which presumably inspired the reference to the *tribus pueris*. In addition to all these interventions, the annotator copied small portions of the text into the margins (e. g. ‘On þ’, fol. 60r) and scribbled in the margins (e. g. fols. 85v-87r).

¹²⁹ For Coleman, see below 140-2.

¹³⁰ This does not appear in Kotzor’s apparatus. ‘Unkistum’ must be taken as a dative plural adjective, though the usual adjectival form is *uncystig*.

¹³¹ There are also traces of a Latin note in the margin of fol. 149r.

The copy of his translation of the *Cura Pastoralis* which Alfred sent to Worcester also contains several post-Conquest interventions in a neat hand of the second half of the twelfth century:¹³²

fols. 4v/15 (*.i. formidant* above *forwandiad*) [Sw. 19/9], 4v/20 (*synreden* above *somrædenne*) [Sw. 19/18], 5v/2 (*ne* added before *weorðen*) [Sw. 23/2], 5v/4 (*ne* added before *scyle*) [Sw. 23/3], 8r/10 (*ðe* added before *to halgum*) [Sw. 31/23], 10r/20 (correction of *Feor* to *Feorðe*) [Sw. 41/15], 13r/11 (*hie* added after *ðæt he*) [Sw. 55/20], 13r/21 (*uel gelædd* above *keled*) [Sw. 57/9], 16v/17 (*ge* added before *netlives*) [Sw. 77/12], 22v/16 (*he* added before *gesio*) [Sw. 111/21], 33v/22 (*sua eac mid ðere* interlined above *sua eac mid ðære*, where the original words had become difficult to read on account of a crease in the parchment) [Sw. 173/21-2]

Some of these interventions should be seen as lexical glosses: for example, the Anglo-Norman French *.i. formidant* above *forwandiad* (fol. 4v/15) and *synrædenne* ‘married state’, above *somrædenne*, ‘married state’. Others amplify the syntax of the original (e. g. fol. 22v/16), while the last intervention replaces some text that had become difficult to read. The manuscript was also used for pentrials by a scribe who knew some French. These glosses only strengthen the conclusion that – once they realised what they were – Anglo-Norman readers found Old English texts very useful.

These examples decisively demonstrate that the glossing of pre-Conquest vernacular manuscripts in English, ‘an important but unexamined field’,¹³³ was always allied with other changes manuscripts. Indeed, most readers of these manuscripts seem ambivalent about whether they were glossing or correcting, since the ‘glosses’, though mostly interlined above the ‘lemmata’, are sometimes entered *in rasura* and sometimes with the ‘lemma’ underlined (presumably to indicate deletion). Such ‘glosses’ could be accompanied by orthographical alterations, repunctuations, conjectural emendations, minor stylistic modifications and

¹³² Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 20; Ker 1956.

¹³³ Thomson 2006a, 15-6. Thomson’s conclusion from this study of annotations in pre-Conquest Worcester vernacular manuscripts was that ‘there was continuous, sometimes heavy use of books wholly or partly in Old English throughout the twelfth century, [which] tells us that there were individuals who could comprehend the language to an indeterminate extent, but who found it helpful to provide a Latin crib or at least aide-memoire’: Thomson 2006b, 115. Likewise, Elaine Treharne has recognised that ‘a significant number of manuscripts contain glosses or marginalia or other work in English of the post-Conquest period focused primarily on homiletic texts, both by Ælfric and by other, anonymous authors’: Treharne 2006c, 339.

paratextual comments. It is very likely that these changes were made with the intention of actively using the text. Several of the annotations bear comparison with the well-known activities of Coleman, monk of Worcester.

Three manuscripts from Worcester contain annotations signed ‘Coleman’, in a cryptograph which substitutes for each vowel the following letter of the alphabet. The hand has also been found annotating other manuscripts.¹³⁴ This Coleman has been identified as the Worcester monk who wrote a Life of St Wulfstan in Old English, which William of Malmesbury subsequently translated into Latin. Coleman was chancellor of Worcester in 1089, and became the first prior of the refounded Westbury in 1093 (*VW* iii. 10. 2).¹³⁵ He died in 1113 (*JW* s. a. 1113). In addition, the *Vita Wulfstani* states that Coleman was Wulfstan’s pupil, his chaplain for fifteen years (*VW* Letter 4) and in later years preached on Wulfstan’s behalf (*VW* ii. 16. 1). Coleman would have been at most a young man in 1066.

His hand has now been found in six manuscripts, four of which are predominantly in Old English:¹³⁶

Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 3. 18

OE Bede: s. xi².

fols. 84v, 85r: titles to chapters vii and viii of Bk V, concerning King Ceadwalla and the death of Archbishop Theodore.

fol. 87r: Against Drihthelm’s Vision (*HE* v. 13), the note ‘Sumes goodes mannes gesihðe. be heofene rice 7 be helle wite. ræd hit. 7 well understond. 7 þu bist þe betere’ (signed).

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 178, pp. 1-270 + 162, pp. 139-60

OE homilies: s. xi¹.

CCCC 162, p. 142: To Alcuin’s *interrogatio* ‘Hwi beseah god ta abeles lacum . 7 hi underfeng. 7 nolde beseon to kaines lacum?’ and *responsio* ‘for þan þe abel geoffrode þa selestan lac gode. 7 cain þa waccran’, Coleman has added ‘for þy þe abel offrade mid goode mode. 7 mid soðre lufe. 7 cain offrade mid andan’ (signed).¹³⁷

¹³⁴ Ker 1949; McIntyre 1978, 40-5; Hill 1985, 121; Stoneman 1987; Jackson 1992; Orchard 2005, 41n17. Winfried Rudolf and David Johnson have an article forthcoming in *Medium Aevum* which identifies further occurrences of Coleman’s hand. I would like to thank Winfried for discussing Coleman with me.

¹³⁵ Greatrex 1997, 790-1.

¹³⁶ I include all attributions which have been made in published work. Further attributions are made by McIntyre 1978, 40-45. Most of the new attributions made by Winfried Rudolf and David Johnson are headings of the type found in CCCC 265 etc. The only manuscript they newly associate with Coleman is London, British Library, Cotton Otho C. i, vol. 2 (Werferth, *Dialogues* [f]: s. xi^{med}, prob. Worcester).

¹³⁷ Stoneman 1987, pl. (p. 79). Compare Alcuin’s *responsio* ‘[Quia] Abel Deo optima et naturalia offerebat, Cain uero uiliora et humana inventionem excogitata, ut putatur’ (*PL* 100, col. 518).

CCCC 178, p.97: 'Bysne be drymannum 7 be anum godan man macharius gehataen', referring to Ælfric's continuation to his Life of St Swithun concerning Macarius (*LoS* i. 470-2).

CCCC 178, p. 229: in response to Ælfric's statement that 'cirlice ðeawas forbeodað to secgenne ænig spell on þam þrim swigdagum' (*CH* 1, xiv. 220), Coleman comments 'Ac þis ne þynced no us well gesæd. forðy on ælcne timan mon ah to læranne 7 to tihtanne folc to behreowsunge. 7 to wirceanne ures drihtnes willan 7 allra swiðost folce is to reowsienne on ðissum ðrim dagum. þonne hi gehyrað. hu ure drihten hælend crist ðrowade for us. Eac biscepas æt heora bisceopstole sæggað larspel þonne hi lædað in penitentes. 7 hi doð absolutionem. 7 sume sæggað spell of þære crismhalsunge 7 of þæm balsome' (signed).¹³⁸

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 265

Version of Wulfstan's 'Handbook': s. xi^{med} - xi^{3/4}.

p. 41: 'Be mæislæhte 7 broðerslæhte' in rustic capitals against the heading 'De paricidiis et fraticidiis' in the penitential of St Egbert.

pp. 74, 75, 77, 78: headings 'Be manslihte', 'Be forligre', 'Be gehadodes mannæs slæhte', 'Be gehadodes mannes hæmedþinge', 'Be wiccecræftre', 'Be þam þæt gesinhiwan heora cild oflicgean' in rustic capitals.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 113 + 114

OE homilies: s. xi².

Hatton 113, fol. 70v: 'Gesihðe sumes haliges mannes', referring to Macarius in Napier no. 29.

Hatton 113, fol. 78r: 'Be andetnyssa' in Napier no. 30.

Hatton 113, fol. 78v: Against the passage 'Eal man sceal aspiwan synna þurh abryrde andetnysse. eal swa man deð unlybban þurh godne drenc' in Napier no. 30 is the note '7 wite ge to gewissan butan ge andettan eowre synnan. mid nane þinge. ne mid gebedum. ne mid almessen. ne bið hit well gebett wið godd' (signed). Coleman also glossed *abryrde*, 'ardent', as 'goode'.¹³⁹

Hatton 113, fol. 108v: 'Be deomes dæige' in a sermon for the octave of Pentecost (Pope no. 11).

Hatton 113, fol. 128v: 'Be ðam ðe men sceolan forgiuan swa swa hi wyllað þæt godd forgiue heom', referring to a passage in Ælfric's homily on St Stephen (*CH* 1, no. 3).

Hatton 114, fol. 86r: 'Dis is no wel gesæd', in objection to the pronouncement about not preaching on 'silent days' (cf. *CH* 1, xiv. 220).¹⁴⁰

Worcester, Cathedral Library, F. 48

Fols. 49-104: Rufinus, *Historia monachorum*: s. xi^{med}; fols. 105-164: selections from the *Verba seniorum*: s. x/xi or xi^{med}.

fol. 86r: 'Quomodo papnūtius orauit dominum ut sibi ostenderet similem sui'.¹⁴¹

fol. 148v: 'De quodam sene simplice. qui errabat in fide de corpore et sanguine domini'.¹⁴²

fol. 151v: 'De sanctimoniali quae se stulta simulauit. a sancto piterione cognita'.

fol. 152v: 'De paulo simplice'.

Worcester, Cathedral Library, Q. 21

Gregory, *Homiliae XL in Evangelia*: s. x/xi or xiⁱⁿ, France, prov. England by s. xi/xii.

Fol. 98r: 'Mistico intellectu'.¹⁴³

Coleman's annotations usually occupy the margins of the text. He signed any annotations which commented directly on the text, such as his donnish rebuke to Ælfric for failing to

¹³⁸ Compare Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 342, fol. 132v, where Ælfric's refusal prompted the comment 'ne gebyraþ ðys naht þerto, buton for ydelnysse'. The comment appears as part of the text proper in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 303.

¹³⁹ Ker 1949, pl.

¹⁴⁰ Hill 1985, 121. Winfried Rudolf informs me that he is very sceptical of this identification.

¹⁴¹ Thomson 2001, pl. 25(a).

¹⁴² Thomson 2001, pl. 25(b).

¹⁴³ Thomson 2001, 132. Thomson also suggests the notes on fols. 130v, 136r might be by Coleman.

supply homilies for the *swigdagum*, his typological explanation of why God turned down Cain's sacrifice and his remarks about the hortatory benefits of Drihthelm's vision. By attaching his name to the notes, Coleman identified himself as the author of what he wrote. The annotations which augment the *ordinatio* of the books (e. g. CUL Kk. 3. 18, fols. 84v, 85r) or offer summaries of subject matter are generally unsigned. These summaries were presumably added to assist the reader in finding relevant exempla, and in extemporising new homilies using existing materials. Two of Coleman's notes allude to Macarius, an Egyptian desert saint renowned for his asceticism. In many ways, Coleman's activities – particularly his use of a gallows-shaped paraph mark and his identification of exempla in the margin – reflect the practices of the Anglo-Norman world. Worcester is usually thought to have been conservative, but the earliest surviving vernacular books with running titles were produced at Worcester during the second half of the eleventh century.¹⁴⁴ It is also notable that Coleman tended to use Old English when annotating a vernacular manuscript, and Latin when annotating a Latin manuscript. Coleman's portfolio of annotations provides a useful comparison for the many anonymous annotators of vernacular manuscripts who followed him in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries.

Pre-Conquest vernacular manuscripts were also glossed in Latin after 1066. In some cases the glosses derive from the Latin source from which the translation was made. In other cases, the glosses seem to be *ad hoc* explanations of particular lemmata, where the glossator's *lingua franca* was Latin. Though some glosses define difficult Old English words, the majority of these glosses seem to be the remnant of an attempt to test the accuracy and reliability of

¹⁴⁴ Old English: Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 3. 18; London, British Library, Cotton Otho C. i, vol. 2 (fragments on fols. 5r, 24r, 31r, 64v, 106r); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 113 + 114; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121 (fols. 70v-84v, 102r-110v). Latin: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 9 + London, British Library, Cotton Nero E. i, vol. 2, fols. 166-180; London, British Library, Cotton Nero E. i, vol. 1 + vol. 2, fols. 1-155; Worcester, Cathedral Library, F. 48 (fols. 2r-48v). Winfried Rudolf has an article forthcoming on these running titles.

Old English texts. Such attempts encouraged some readers to create *ad hoc* bilingual versions of certain texts, by interlining a near-continuous Latin gloss to supplement the original Old English. The resulting format can be seen as a scruffier analogue to the bilingual formats for the Rule of St Benedict and other texts with which pre-Conquest scribes had been experimenting.¹⁴⁵

Sometimes substantial portions of translations produced during the Anglo-Saxon period were glossed in Latin during the post-Conquest period. The most spectacular example is a late Anglo-Saxon copy of the Old English Hexateuch.¹⁴⁶ Around a third of the leaves have Latin glosses from the turn of the eleventh century, largely drawn from the Vulgate.¹⁴⁷ The Latin glosses are usually heavily abbreviated.¹⁴⁸ Some sections of the text are more heavily glossed than others, but, overall, around 15% of the text is glossed. The glossator wrote ‘derelictus’ in the margin where there was an unsignalled omission in the Old English translation, though not on every occasion when such a break exists. He also added a rubric to Judges (fol. 98v) and capitula numbers iii-viii to Genesis. However, inconsistencies

¹⁴⁵ In most manuscripts of the Old English translation of the Rule, the Old English follows the Latin chapter-by-chapter: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 178, pp. 287-457 (s. xi¹, prov. Worcester); London, British Library, Cotton Titus A. iv, fols. 2-107 (s. xi^{med}); Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 197, fols. 1-105 (s. x^{4/4}, prov. Bury by s. xi^{med}); Wells, Cathedral Library, 7 [f] (s. xi^{med}). One post-Conquest copy also follows this pattern: London, British Library, Cotton Claudius D. iii, fols. 55-140 (s. xiii^m, prov. Whitney). See Jayatilaka 2003. This arrangement is also followed in three manuscripts of the Old English Rule of Chrodegang and in one manuscript of the Old English *Capitula Theodulfi*: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 191 (s. xi^{3/4}, Exeter); Canterbury, Cathedral Library and Archives, Add. 20 [f] (s. xi^{3/4}, Cant CC?); London, British Library, Additional 34652, fol. 3 [f] (s. xi²); and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 865, fols. 97-112 (s. xi¹, prov. Exeter). The format was also adopted in a number of post-Conquest legal documents, for example Pelteret 1990, nos. 28 (31 May 1081), 46 (1107), 48 (February 1123), 49 (1123x1135), 51 (1155x1161), 54 (1154x1161 or 1172x1189), 62 (1071x1082). All these documents survive in at least one original singlesheet. These bilingual formats provide a closer analogue than Latin manuscripts with Old English glosses where the vernacular *interpretamenta* are presented less prominently than the primary text.

¹⁴⁶ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud misc. 509 + London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D. xxi, fols. 18-40.

¹⁴⁷ Marsden 2005. Crawford 1922, pl. between 372 and 373 (fol. 97r, reduced) shows glosses.

¹⁴⁸ e. g. ‘*hominibus*’, ‘*noster*’, ‘*species*’.

in the gloss give rise to some suspicion about the glossator's understanding of Old English.¹⁴⁹

Comparison of a translation with its source sometimes led a post-Conquest scribe to make alterations to the manuscript. For example, a scribe of the first half of the twelfth century revised the Exeter copy of the Old English Gospels, by comparing it with the Vulgate.¹⁵⁰ The reviser concentrated on the Luke and John passion narratives (fols. 128-9, 158-9), where he made a number of small interventions to bring the Old English closer to the Latin.¹⁵¹ We might note that there are also two post-Conquest copies of the Old English Gospels extant.¹⁵² A later scribe, perhaps of the second half of the twelfth century, made several further changes to the Exeter copy, adding a pericope for Matthew XXII.15, 'Dis godspel sceal on .XXIII. wucan ofer pentecosten abeuntes pharisei concilium inierunt ut iesum in sermone'.¹⁵³

Post-Conquest scribes also glossed much shorter passages of vernacular manuscripts in Latin. In a late Anglo-Saxon copy of Werferth's translation of Gregory's *Dialogues*, a brief passage concerned with predestination was glossed in Latin (fol. 20r), drawing from a Latin manuscript of the *Dialogues*.¹⁵⁴ A strong case has been made that this Latin manuscript consulted by the glossator was one that had been produced at Worcester during St Wulfstan's episcopate.¹⁵⁵ The text was also rubricated during the second half of the twelfth century, with the beginning of each book signalled by a Latin incipit, and the end of the work being signalled with a Latin explicit. This strongly suggests the glossator intended the

¹⁴⁹ Marsden 2005, 140-1. Dr Marsden tells me he now has some doubts about this conclusion.

¹⁵⁰ Cambridge, University Library, li. 2. 11 + Exeter, Cathedral Library, 3501, fols. 0-7.

¹⁵¹ His revisions are recorded in the *apparatus criticus* of Liuzzi 1994, 152-3, 186-7.

¹⁵² London, British Library, Royal 1 A. xiv (s. xii^{med}, prov. Cant CC); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 38 (s. xii/xiii, Cant CC).

¹⁵³ For the pericopes, see, in general Lenker 1999.

¹⁵⁴ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 322. Glosses printed Yerkes 1978, 246.

¹⁵⁵ Cambridge, Clare College, 30, pt. i; see Yerkes 1978.

manuscript to be used by new readers. Similarly, two short passages in a Worcester copy of the Old English Bede were continuously glossed in Latin in the second half of the twelfth century.¹⁵⁶ The glosses, to Book I, chapter i (fol. 8v) and Book IV, chapter xxi (fol. 67r), derive from a C-type manuscript of the *Historia ecclesiastica*.¹⁵⁷

Sometimes, however, Latin simply seems to have been the glossator's *lingua franca*, and there is no indication the glossator was evaluating the accuracy of the Old English. In the fire-damaged mid-eleventh-century homiliary, London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius D. xvii, fols. 4-92, four saints' lives have twelfth-century interlinear Latin glosses in a tiny hand: the Passion of St Bartholomew,¹⁵⁸ the Nativity of St Stephen¹⁵⁹ and Passion of St Stephen,¹⁶⁰ and the Nativity of St Paul.¹⁶¹ To my knowledge, the glosses have never been printed.¹⁶²

Fols. 20-21 (*olim* fols. 38, 42): Passion of St Bartholomew

Fol. 21r/7 *mearciað* (445/185): signate
 Fol. 21r/9 *ateowde* (445/186): osten<dit>
 Fol. 21r/13 *lig* (446/190): flam<ma>
 Fol. 21r/14 *hæce* (446/191): terga
 Fol. 21r/16 *gehyrsum* (446/193): obe<diens>
 Fol. 21r/16 *hæsum* (446/193): precip<ium>
 Fol. 21r/26 *cynhelm* (446/200): coro<na>
 Fol. 21v/7 *drycrafte* (446/209): arte [...]

Fols. 26, 15, 16, 27 (*olim* fols. 52-56v): Birth of St Stephen

Fol. 26v/22 *geomerunge* (13/32): gemitu
 Fol. 26v/23 *arfæst(nysse)* (13/33): desiderio

Fols. 27v-32r (*olim* fols. 56v-61r): Passion of St Stephen

Fol. 28r/8 *tacna* (198/16): signa¹⁶³

Fols. 83, 85, 84, 87, 86 (*olim* fols. 197-201v): Birth of St Paul

Fol. 83v/7 *gemette* (400/16): [...]
 Fol. 83v/8 *sīde* (400/16): tempore
 Fol. 83v/9 *astrehte* (400/17): prostrauit

¹⁵⁶ Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 3. 18. See Graham 1997.

¹⁵⁷ The glosses are partially printed by Grant 1996. For clarification, see Franzen 2001b.

¹⁵⁸ Clemoes 1997, 439-50.

¹⁵⁹ Godden 1979, 12-18.

¹⁶⁰ Clemoes 1997, 198-206.

¹⁶¹ Clemoes 1997, 400-9.

¹⁶² Ker 1957, no. 222 (pp. 292-8) only recorded observing glosses on fols. 21, 83.

¹⁶³ Some traces of further annotation remain in the damaged outer margin.

Fol. 83v/10 *ebtst* (400/18): *persequeris*
 Fol. 83v/11 *fyr[bte]* (400/20): *tī[...]*
 Fol. 87v/4 *losiað* (406/189): *peribunt*

It is likely that the Cotton fire obliterated other twelfth-century interlinear glosses.¹⁶⁴ Those that survive seem to give straightforward lexical equivalents for the Old English lemmata.¹⁶⁵ As in the Hexateuch glosses, the Latin glosses are sometimes heavily abbreviated, suggesting they were the work of a reader very comfortable with Latin, and perhaps more comfortable in Latin than in Old English.

I would like to end this chapter with some thoughts about how the work of these glossators affects the understanding of the post-Conquest Latin glossator *par excellence*, the Tremulous Hand.¹⁶⁶ This scribe, who was probably working during the second quarter of the thirteenth century,¹⁶⁷ annotated some nineteen manuscripts¹⁶⁸ and copied one (Worcester, Cathedral Library, F. 174).¹⁶⁹ This manuscript contains Ælfric's *Grammar* and *Glossary*, now imperfect (fols. 1-63r),¹⁷⁰ a fragment in loose alliterative metre beginning 'Sanctus Beda was

¹⁶⁴ There are traces of glosses at fol. 40v/24 (*olim* fol. 70v) and fol. 76r/21 (*olim* fol. 174r), but I have been unable to decipher enough of these glosses to conjecture a reading.

¹⁶⁵ I have checked the glosses to the Life of St Bartholomew with Ælfric's source (BHL 1002) and found no correspondence. We can presume, then, that the glosses were *ad hoc* explanations of particular words.

¹⁶⁶ See Franzen 1991. For earlier discussion, see Zupitza 1878; Keller 1900; Crawford 1928. For recent, provocative analysis, see Johnson 2006, 192-203.

¹⁶⁷ Ker 1937.

¹⁶⁸ Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 3. 18 + ?London, British Library, Cotton Domitian ix, fol. 10 (OE Bede, s. xi²); Cambridge, Clare College, 30, pt i (Gregory, *Dialogi*, s. xi²); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 12 (OE Pastoral Care, s. x²); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 178, pp. 1-270 + 162, pp. 139-60 (OE homilies, s. xi¹); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 198 (OE homilies, s. xi¹); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 391 ('Portiforium of St Wulfstan', s. xi^{3/4}); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 557 + Lawrence, University of Kansas, Kenneth Spencer Research Library, Pryce C2:1 (OE homily [f], s. xi^{med}); Glasgow, University Library, Hunterian 431 (V. 5. 1) (Gregory, *Cura Pastoralis*, s. x/xi); London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. x, fols. 29, 30 (OE homilies [f], s. xi^{med}); London, British Library, Cotton Otho C. i, vol. 2 (OE Dialogues, s. xi^{med}); London, British Library, Harley 55, fols. 1-4 (OE laws etc [f], s. xi¹); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 20 (OE Pastoral Care, 890x897); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 76 (OE Dialogues, s. xi¹; OE medical texts, s. xi^{med}); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 113 (OE homilies, 1064x1083); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 114 (OE homilies, 1064x1083); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 115 + Lawrence, University of Kansas, Kenneth Spencer Research Library, Pryce C2:2 (OE homilies, s. xi^{3/4}); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 116 (OE homilies, s. xii¹); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121 (version of Wulfstan's 'handbook', s. xi^{3/4}); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc 482 (OE penitential, s. xi^{med}). Recent attempts to add to this corpus have not found favour: Grant 1996; Franzen 2001a; Franzen 2001b; Ramsay 2002; Franzen 2006.

¹⁶⁹ Ker 1957, no. 398 (pp. 446-7); Moffat 1985; Thomson 2001, 116-7 and pl. 27 (fol. 14r).

¹⁷⁰ Butler 1981.

iboren her' (fol. 63r),¹⁷¹ and fragments of a poem now known as *The Soul's Address to the Body*.¹⁷² The Tremulous Hand may also have been the scribe who copied the lyric '[þe]h þet hi can wittes fulewis' in pencil in the top margin of one leaf of an early-twelfth-century copy of Smaragdus, *Diadema monachorum*,¹⁷³ and the scribe who copied the lyric 'ic on effnigge stille þer istod swetest alre þingge mi mod' into the margins of the 'Harley Glossary'.¹⁷⁴

Study of the Tremulous Hand has been polarised between interest in the scribe's linguistic glossing,¹⁷⁵ and in his annotations.¹⁷⁶ However, Christine Franzen has shown that any interpretation of the Tremulous Hand's activities must account for four observable features of his work:¹⁷⁷

1. His approach changed quite suddenly and clearly between the D[ark] layer and the B[old] layer; glossing exclusively in Middle English was abandoned in favour of glossing in Latin.
2. Several texts which were glossed in the B layer had close Latin sources, and the glosses were largely cribbed from the sources.
3. Five manuscripts ... have collections of Latin-English and English-Latin word pairs written on one or more leaves which were for the most part drawn from glosses in the manuscripts.
4. The later states of the hand often corrected errors made by the earlier states.

Franzen interprets these phenomena by arguing that the Tremulous Hand progressed from glossing in Middle English to glossing in Latin. The Middle English glosses, which updated the phonology, lexis and morphology of the texts, may have been designed to prepare the manuscripts for use as exemplars. However, the Tremulous Hand subsequently switched to glossing in Latin, apparently focusing on Old English translations from which he could crib glosses by referring to their Latin sources, and began to compile an English-Latin glossary.

¹⁷¹ Edited Hall 1920, i. 1, ii. 223-8; Brehe 1990, 530.

¹⁷² Moffat 1987.

¹⁷³ London, British Library, Royal 8 D. xiii, fols. 2-83, fol. 25r: Boffey and Edwards 2005, no. 3512. For discussion, see Brown 1932, xii-xiii; Stemmler 1974, 247-8; Stemmler 1977, 411; Dronke 1978, 144, 280-1; Stanley 1983, 150.

¹⁷⁴ London, British Library, Harley 3376 (s. x/xi), fols. 16r-17r: Boffey and Edwards 2005, no. 1468.55. Printed Stemmler 1977.

¹⁷⁵ Franzen 1986; Page 1987; Schipper 1987; Franzen 1991; Franzen 2003.

¹⁷⁶ Evans 1979; Collier 1991; Collier 1995; Collier 1997; Collier 2000.

¹⁷⁷ Franzen 1991, 83. I would like to acknowledge my deep debt to Franzen's exhaustive work, and to emphasise that my discussion is intended not as a refutation of her arguments, but as a supplement.

Consequently, Franzen infers that he was trying to learn or improve his reading knowledge of Old English. She admits that the Tremulous Hand generally shows a good understanding of Old English, though occasionally erred by guessing at the sense of difficult words, misinterpreting familiar words in difficult contexts or forms, confusing similarly spelt words or misreading insular graphs.

The Tremulous Hand's wider activities are also significant. As Wendy Collier has shown, he also added a large number of *nota* marks to the manuscripts he annotated. These annotations frequently mark *exempla* and *auctoritates*.¹⁷⁸

Annotations mark theological concepts, such as the nature of Christ and the Trinity, and the ever-engrossing topic of predestination. He is interested in ecclesiastical concerns, such as the nature of the Mass and the other sacraments and the mechanics of their celebration, and marks passages on tithing and teaching. Penitential texts and notes about specific sins are marked consistently, as well as matters of everyday conduct. The Tremulous Hand also marks passages from the works of Augustine, Gregory, Bede and other writers by setting their names in the margin. He often extracts Latin versions of the Old English biblical quotations and sets them out into the margin.

The Tremulous Hand was thus capable of reading Old English texts and identifying material that interested him. Moreover, when he copied Worcester F. 174, the Tremulous Hand showed himself able to update the language of Ælfric's *Grammar* and *Glossary* into his local Middle English dialect.¹⁷⁹

Some of the Tremulous Hand's glosses can therefore be understood in the light of the contemporary vernacular glosses we have been discussing. Since the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 had made the availability of preaching materials in the vernacular a *desideratum*, the Tremulous Hand may have turned to Old English texts for models, but with little sense of their reliability or their orthodoxy. By closely comparing Old English translations with their Latin sources, the Tremulous Hand was able to convince himself of

¹⁷⁸ Collier 1995, 36.

¹⁷⁹ Moffat has argued that the exemplar for *The Soul's Address to the Body*, 'represented a more archaic version of a dialect not too different from his own': Moffat 1987, 25. On the other hand, Brehe found the Tremulous Hand's copy of 'Sanctus Bede', 'to say the least, imperfect': Brehe 1990, 530.

the essential accuracy of the translations. He may have found that his interlinear Latin glosses gave the translations a reassuring veneer of authority, and he began to gloss Old English homilies in Latin to convince himself and others that their content was orthodox. The glosses created, in effect, a bilingual homiliary. He also investigated non-homiletic manuscripts. The Tremulous Hand's decision to copy 'Sanctus Beda' suggests he had a strong personal commitment to vernacular preaching,¹⁸⁰ but that did not exempt him from the doubts about the problems of transmitting the bible in the vernacular which had earlier afflicted Ælfric.¹⁸¹

This chapter has investigated how and why post-Conquest readers glossed and annotated pre-Conquest books. Preconceptions about the effects of the Norman Conquest have often blinded historians to the degree to which English retained its status after 1066. In the hands of a number of scholar-annotators, Ælfric's remarkable *Grammar* and *Glossary* became a key textbook for post-Conquest pupils seeking to understand English, Latin and French grammar and lexis. While all three languages were also used to explicate standard school texts after 1066, Latin was dominant. Though individual glosses often seem to be operating in hermetically-sealed textual environments, occasional exceptions show us that post-Conquest readers were very much engaged by the scholarly approaches used by previous generations of Anglo-Saxon teachers and pupils. The free rein given to English in the schoolroom also encouraged new generations of readers to engage with vernacular manuscripts. Here we find lexical glosses accompanied by orthographical alterations, repunctuations, conjectural emendations, stylistic modifications and paratextual comments. These interventions were evidently made because readers still appreciated vernacular

¹⁸⁰ 'purh þeos weren ilærde ure leoden on Engliſc' (9); 'þeos læ[rden] ure leodan on Engliſc' (16).

¹⁸¹ The sentiment of Orm's 'Dedication' of the *Ormulum* attests that ideas about the use of the vernacular for religious instruction had not developed much since Ælfric's day: Holt 1878, 'Dedication' (unpaginated).

homiliaries and translations. However, the re-use of such materials created anxieties similar to those which had afflicted their original authors, so post-Conquest annotators began to translate short passages of the texts back into Latin to test their reliability and accuracy. As a consequence of this, annotators realised that the interlineation of Latin glosses could create *ad hoc* bilingual versions of particular texts, in which Old English and Latin could co-exist on the page. This chapter shows, I hope, that post-Conquest glossators of pre-Conquest manuscripts are more numerous, and more diversely motivated, than previous scholars have imagined. We now turn to examine the ways in which pre-Conquest prelates harnessed the symbolic capital of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, and Anglo-Saxon texts.

CHAPTER VI: RECORD-KEEPING IN PRE-CONQUEST MANUSCRIPTS

It has been said that medieval readers did not distinguish between books and records.¹ It is certainly true that books usually appeared to be the safest repository for records. Anglo-Saxon scribes preserved diplomas, writs, manumission documents and quotidian estate memoranda in this way. A variety of books was used. Gospel books offered the ultimate security, since they offered Christ's protection to anything stored within their boards. Liturgical manuscripts permitted a similar association with the divine, and ensured that benefactors would be remembered in the *opus dei*. Other manuscripts seem to have been chosen pragmatically; blank vellum in a book was less likely to be mislaid than a singlesheet charter or scrap of parchment containing memoranda. After the Conquest, more and more records were copied into manuscripts, lest future generations be left with an 'elusive scarcity of documents' (*scriptorum inopia fugax*, HN 1). Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, particularly gospel books, were often used for this purpose, because they gave the impression that records represented Anglo-Saxon practice, an important goal since the Domesday Book had set the basis for land tenure as the situation in Edward the Confessor's reign. The range of records being transcribed also expanded, encompassing fraternity notices,² obits,³ and meteorological data.⁴

¹ Clanchy 1993, 154.

² Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 5. 34 (s. x^{ex}, prob. Winchester), fol. 111v: 'Sæwine est *frater noster*. 7 Byrtgyt soror *nostra* | Sawii est *frater nostri* (Sagyt) \Godgyt/ soror *nostra*'. For this manuscript, which contains Classical and Anglo-Latin verse, see Lapidge 1972, 94-5; Carley 1987, 204-12.

³ Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, 144/194 (s. x¹, England), p. 87: 'Hugo adeliz .iiii. kal iunii o hugo. Ermen|gardys pridie kl iun. o Rodbertus in .x. kl augu|sti. o emme .ix kl octobris o Radulfus'. For this collection of school texts, see Bishop 1955, 187-9. It is identifiable as James 1903, no. 1467 ('Glose super sedulium et | super Catonem', 2o fo. paruus. D. xj. G. 2').

⁴ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 394 (s. x², prob. France, prov. Exeter), fol. 84r: '.IIII. NO IAN FR .I. LU .XXVIII. circa *terciam horam diei* . lenis *quidem* . sed horribilis tonitrum | fragor *factus est* apud nos . cum fulgure . grandine . et uento'. A. A. Rambaut, *apud SC* 2225, dates the note 1177.

ADDING LEGAL RECORDS TO GOSPEL BOOKS

Insular scribes were copying records into gospel books as early as the ninth century.⁵ Gospel books and bibles were treated with great respect in Anglo-Saxon England, bordering on awe.⁶ They were used prominently in the liturgy. ‘When a gospel book was carried in procession, laid on the altar, or held over the head of a bishop at his consecration, it became a symbol as well as a text, and in certain circumstances it could stand for Christ’.⁷ Riddle 26 (‘Gospel Book’) describes the manufacture of a codex, and its ability to inspire men:⁸

Nu þa gereno ond se reada telg
ond þa wuldorgesteald wide mære
dryhtfolca helm, nales dol wite.

Here, the poet depicts gospel books as high-status productions, whose luxurious decorations proclaimed God’s glory and hell’s torments. Gospel books could thus authenticate documents and discourage malefactors from violating particular legal provisions. They could be part of the ceremonies attendant on a grant. Many records include a clause recording that a record of the transaction would be copied into a gospel book (*cristes bec*).⁹ In a grant to Muchelney, King Æthelstan wrote:¹⁰

Et hujus doni confirmacionem in hoc sancto evangelii volumine perstrinxi ut nemo
sucessorum nostrorum audaciter livore percussus ex omnibus vel aliquid ab hoc cenobio
arripere audeat. Quod si aliquis, ut non optamus, presumptive fecerit hujus insania sacri
voluminis adhibicione hujus deterreatur, et si non adqueverit rogamus Deum ut illius hic

⁵ For brief comments on the practice, which has never been the subject of a full-length study, see Wormald 1957, 105-7; Cheney 1983, 8-11; Jenkins and Owen 1983, 61-6; Dumville 1992, 119-27; Jenkins 1994; Davies 2003, esp. 143-7.

⁶ In general, see Marsden 1998a.

⁷ Gameson 1995, 60.

⁸ Muir 1994, i. 306-7 (lls. 15-7). ‘Now the decoration and the red pigment and the glorious contents (*wuldorgesteald*) proclaim widely the protector of troops, not to mention (*nales*) the punishment for evil’.

⁹ For example, many of the Bath manumission documents transcribed into Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 140 + 111, pp. 7, 8, 55, 56 begin ‘her swutelað on ðissere cristes bec’.

¹⁰ S455 (934x939): Bates 1899, 38. Some diplomatists have considered the charter spurious, but it can be taken as representative of twelfth-century attitudes, if not those of Æthelstan’s reign.

‘And I bind fast this confirmation of my gift in this holy volume of the gospel[s] so that none of our successors, impelled by malice, dares audaciously to seize all or part from this monastery. Let anyone who, as we do not want, presumptuously does so, be deterred from this madness by the production of this holy volume, and if he does not conform, we ask God that his days be foreshortened, and his times of damnation eternally be undistinguished with mitigation and the veil of holy mercy’.

dies brevientur, et eterne sibi dampnacionis tempora sine refrigerio atque divine miserationis optentu prestantur.

Æthelstan's sanction shows that copying the confirmation of a grant into a gospel book was considered to secure it (*perstrinxi*), and that the gospel book could be produced as evidence for the terms of the grant. The transcription of the confirmation into the gospel book also enabled Æthelstan to ask God to punish anyone who infringed its terms. Moreover, the high status of gospel books enhanced the chances of survival for records copied within them. Indeed, the practice of copying documents into gospel books for increased protection can be seen as an extension of the practice of storing single-sheet copies of writs and wills with relics or within reliquaries.¹¹ The transcription of documents into gospel books also served as a constant reminder of the need for the liturgical commemoration of benefactors.

The earliest examples of the addition of records to gospel books appear to come from Wales, Ireland and Scotland.¹² The eighth-century 'Lichfield Gospels'¹³ were perhaps produced at Lindisfarne for donation to the community founded by St Chad at Lichfield,¹⁴ but subsequently passed to the church of St Teilo, apparently at Llandeilo Fawr in Carmarthenshire, in the early ninth century,¹⁵ where eight marginal entries resembling charters were added during the ninth and early tenth centuries.¹⁶ However, the Gospels had returned to Lichfield by the first half of the tenth century, when an Old English

¹¹ For example, the Will of Æthelric of Bocking (S1501) [c. 960x994] notes that one copy (of three) will be preserved 'æt þæs cinges haligdome'. There are similar clauses in S981 [1016x1035] (spurious); S1478 [1053x1055]; and S1521 [1035x1044]. London, British Library, Cotton Augustus ii. 3 (S89, Æthelbald, King of the Mercians to Cyneberht, *comes*, A. D. 736) appears to have been kept at the beginning of the Vespasian Psalter (London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian A. i), a secondary relic of St Augustine of Canterbury (below 186-7), in the early seventeenth century, but it is not clear if this reflects its medieval location since the singlesheet is endorsed in a Worcester hand of the second half of the eleventh century.

¹² See, in particular, Jenkins 1994.

¹³ Lichfield, Cathedral Library, 1. There is a partial facsimile online at <http://lichfield-cathedral.org/ttp/st-chads.htm> (accessed 14/05/08).

¹⁴ Brown 2007.

¹⁵ Chad 1 records that 'emit † gelhi † filius . ariht iud. hoc euangelium . de cjngal. et dedit . illi pro illo equum optimum. et dedit pro anima sua istum euangelium deo et sancti teliaui. super altare ...': Jenkins and Owen 1983, 141. One of the witnesses to the gift, 'Cincenn filius Gripiud', has been identified as the son of 'Gripiud filius Cincen', who died in 814: James 1996, 52.

¹⁶ Edited and discussed Jenkins and Owen 1983; Jenkins and Owen 1984.

memorandum was added (p. 4).¹⁷ Literary sources mention the presence of similar gospel books containing legal records at two other Welsh houses – St Bueno at Clynnog and Llancarfan – but these have not survived.¹⁸ Another early example is the ‘Book of Deer’, an imperfect tenth-century pocket gospel book, possibly written at a provincial centre in Scotland, which contains a large number of property records written in blank spaces, some virtually contemporary with the manuscript itself.¹⁹ Early English examples include the bounds added to the ‘Book of Nunnaminster’ at the turn of the eighth century,²⁰ and the tenth-century records transcribed into the ‘Bern Gospels’.²¹ During the tenth century, records were added to Latin gospel books both old and new.

Ancient gospel books seem to have been particularly attractive as repositories for records. London, British Library, Royal 1 B. vii is a gospel book from the first half of the eighth century.²² Around 925, a record of King Æthelstan’s manumission of a certain Eadhelm and his descendants was added in Old English below the ‘breviarum’ of Matthew (fol. 15va).²³ The text does not follow the original rulings, but manages to stay within the column boundary. It was presumably added at the royal court. The later provenance of the manuscript is unknown and there are no other documentary additions to the gospel book, though a few very minor textual additions and corrections were made in the late eleventh or

¹⁷ Ker 1957, no. 123 (p. 158). A thirteenth-century title ‘*textus euangelii sancti cedde*’ (p. 1) and an entry in the sacrist’s roll of 1345 (Lichfield, Chapter Muniment, O. 1), ‘*duo libri uetustissimi qui dicuntur libri beati cedde*’, attest that the manuscript was associated with St Chad in the later middle ages.

¹⁸ Davies 2003, 144.

¹⁹ Cambridge, University Library, Ii. 6. 32: Hughes 1980; Broun 2000.

²⁰ London, British Library, Harley 2965 (s. viii/ix or ix¹, Mercia or S England, prov. Nunnaminster), fol. 40v. The document is S1560, printed Birch 1885, no. 630.

²¹ Bern, Burgerbibliothek, 671 (s. ix¹, SW England, Cornwall or Wales, prov. Great Bedwyn, Wiltshire s. x¹), fols. 75v-6. See Merritt 1934.

²² I have not seen this manuscript, and know it only through the .jpg images available from the Superintendent of the Manuscript Reading Room at the British Library. On the manuscript, see Lowe 1972, no. 213; Gameson 1994.

²³ Printed Birch 1885, no. 639. See also [Anon] 1884, pl. 16 (fol. 15v).

early twelfth century.²⁴ A lack of further blank space may perhaps explain why there were no other documentary additions. Tenth-century records were also added to eighth-century gospel books at Ely²⁵ and Exeter.²⁶

Before the Conquest, records were also added to newly-produced gospel books such as the early-eleventh-century Christ Church gospel book, copied by Bishop's 'Scribe B'.²⁷ A brief Old English note of the confraternity between the Christ Church monks and Cnut was entered on the verso of the leaf containing the preface to Mark's gospel (fol. 43v), and Cnut's writ confirming the privileges of Christ Church was transcribed on the verso preceding the opening of Mark's gospel (S985, fol. 45v). Both additions used the existing rulings, and may be in the hand of Eadwig Basan.²⁸ Similarly, a survey of the diocese of Hereford was copied into a lavishly-illustrated mid-eleventh-century gospel lectionary shortly after its production.²⁹ This survey, purportedly compiled at the request of Æthelstan, bishop of Hereford (1012-1056), was added on a blank leaf between the canon tables and the beginning of Matthew, in a hand that has been dated to the second half of the eleventh century. It has recently been suggested that the manuscript was produced at Worcester, and that the bounds were therefore most likely added for Ealdred, bishop of Worcester, who supervised the see after Æthelstan's death.³⁰

After the Conquest, the practice of copying documents into gospel books continued, and arguably became more frequent. Gospel books held the same associations for Norman

²⁴ Gameson 1994, 28n6.

²⁵ Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 1. 24 + London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. v, part i, fols. 74 and 76 + Sloane 1044, fol. 2 (s. viii, prob. Northumbria, prov. Ely s. x). The records occupy Cotton Tiberius B. v, fols. 74v, 76v: Ker 1957, no. 22 (pp. 35-6).

²⁶ London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. v, part i, fol. 75 (s. viii, prob. Northumbria, prov. Exeter by s. x¹): Rose-Troup 1931, pls. II, III.

²⁷ London, British Library, Royal 1 D. ix. For Scribe B, see Bishop 1967, 39-40; Heslop 1990, 181-2.

²⁸ Heslop 1990, 154. For Eadwig, see above 96.

²⁹ Cambridge, Pembroke College, 302, fol. 8r: Ker 1957, no. 78 (pp. 125-6).

³⁰ Heslop [2007], 70.

prelates as they had held for Anglo-Saxons. When Duke William invaded Maine in 1064, Orderic reports that Arnold, bishop of Le Mans, met the Duke's army 'ceremoniously in full robes, with his clergy and monks, bearing gospel books and crosses' (OV ii. 119).³¹ Post-Conquest churchmen knew the value of associating house records with copies of the bible or gospel books. Bishop Wulfstan ordered a copy of the *Liber Wigornensis* be bound with the 'Offa Bible', an early eighth-century pandect which now survives only in fragments.³² Cartularies were themselves often accompanied by biblical texts or liturgical materials. The Sherborne Cartulary, compiled shortly after 1146, contains the gospels preceded by collects and liturgical prayers in addition to charters,³³ and it has been suggested that the Christ Church 'Domesday monachorum' was originally bound in a *textu magno*.³⁴ This was not just an English phenomenon. The Welsh Book of Llandaf, produced during the episcopate of Urban (1107-1134), who had trained at Worcester, also includes saints' lives and a copy of Matthew's Gospel,³⁵ while the eleventh-century cartulary of Landévennec in Brittany incorporates hagiographical materials for the cults of St Winwaloe, whom Landévennec claimed as their founder, and his companion St Ethbin.³⁶ Though Anglo-Norman churchmen did copy documents into newly-produced gospel books and bibles,³⁷ records copied into pre-Conquest gospel books accrued a special type of symbolic capital, since the antiquity of the gospel book could reflect favourably on the antiquity of the practices described in the records.

³¹ Orderic reports a similar procession occurred when Exeter submitted to the Conqueror in 1068 (OV ii. 213-5).

³² London, British Library, Additional 37777 + Additional 45025 + Loan 81. These fragments are at present unavailable to scholars. Part of the cartulary survives as London, British Library, Additional 46204 + Cotton Nero E. i, vol. 2, fols. 181-4. See Atkins 1940, 220-22; Atkins and Ker 1944, 77-9.

³³ London, British Library, Additional 46487: Wormald 1957.

³⁴ Cheney 1983.

³⁵ Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, 17110E: Davies 2003.

³⁶ Quimper, Bibliothèque Municipale, 16: Lapidge and Sharpe 1985, no. 999.

³⁷ e. g. London, British Library, Royal 1 B. xi, a gospel book produced between 1140 and 1160, contains records added on three blank leaves at the end (fols. 145v-147). For its date, see Dodwell 1954, 34.

Sometimes post-Conquest scribes used gospel books which already contained Anglo-Saxon records. At Christ Church, the monks used the ‘Æthelstan Gospels’ to enhance the validity of a series of recently-forged papal bulls, which they had produced to defend their primacy over York.³⁸ Robert Cotton’s decision to excise most of the documents severely hampers analysis of the additions to the manuscript.³⁹ I list below the records which were added before the Conquest:

Probably between Luke and John

Claudius A. iii, fols. 2-6r: King Æthelred’s privilege to Christ Church, misdated 1006 (for 1002). In Latin and Old English.⁴⁰

Claudius A. iii, fol. 5v: writ of Edward the Confessor, datable 1051x63, copied in lower margin.⁴¹ In Old English.

Claudius A. iii, fol. 6r: statement by Lady Ælfgifu (Emma), mother of King Edward that she had acquired from King Cnut an estate at Newington, Oxon., on behalf of Christ Church when it was forfeited by Ælfric, which the king then granted to the community.⁴² In Old English.

Claudius A. iii, fol. 6r: Æthelnoth, archbishop of Canterbury, to Christ Church; grant of land at Godmersham which he had bought from Earl Sired for 72 marks of gold.⁴³ In Old English.

Claudius A. iii, fol. 6r: Thored to Christ Church; grant of land at East Horsley, Surrey, ?1036.⁴⁴ In Old English.

Claudius A. iii, fol. 6v: Edward the Confessor to Christ Church, Canterbury; grant of land at Chartham, Kent, and Walworth, Surrey, and confirmation of other lands.⁴⁵ Various place-names have been erased from the list of estates. In Old English.

These additions appear to be broadly contemporary with the legal acts recorded, though the entries on fol. 6rv are in a single hand. The last document includes a clause which indicates that King Edward made the grant with his hand on this gospel book.⁴⁶ These are the post-Conquest additions:

³⁸ London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. ii + Cotton Claudius A. iii, fols. 2-7, 9* + Cotton Faustina B. vi, fols. 95, 98-100 (s. ix/x, Lobbes). I would like to thank Julian Harrison for facilitating my access to Cotton Tiberius A. ii. For its donation by Æthelstan, see Keynes 1985, 147-53.

³⁹ The original structure of the manuscript was reconstructed by Ker 1938, 130-1. My examination did not uncover any evidence that would lead me to question Ker’s reconstruction. Matthew Hussey and Paul Szarmach are preparing a description of the manuscript for the Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile series: Dr Hussey tells me that they also have not found any evidence to dispute Ker’s findings.

⁴⁰ S914: Kemble 1839, no. 715.

⁴¹ S1090: Harmer 1952, no. 35.

⁴² S1229: Robertson 1956, no. 96.

⁴³ S1389: Robertson 1956, no. 89.

⁴⁴ S1222: Robertson 1956, no. 88.

⁴⁵ S1047: Robertson 1956, no. 95. See also Kissin 1939.

⁴⁶ *þisne cwyde ... þe ic mid minre agenre hand on þissere cristes bec | criste betæhte on uppan cristes weofod*’.

Between the 'Breviarum' for Matthew and the Canon Tables

Tiberius A. ii, fols. 13-14r: King Æthelstan to Christ Church, Canterbury; grant of land at Folkestone, where there was once a *monasterium* and an *abbatia* for holy virgins and where St Eanswith is buried, A. D. 927.⁴⁷ In Latin.

Between Matthew and Mark

Tiberius A. ii, fol. 73v, Faustina B. vi, fol. 95r: bull of Pope Boniface V, 'susceptis vestrae'.⁴⁸ The beginning of the bull on Tiberius A. ii, fol. 73v has been partly erased.

Faustina B. vi, fol. 95v: bull of Pope Honorius I, 'susceptis vestrae'.⁴⁹

Between Mark and Luke, after Tiberius A. iii, fol. 111v

Claudius A. iii, fol. 7rv: bull of Pope Boniface IV, 'dum Christianitatis'.⁵⁰

Claudius A. iii, fols. 7v, 9*r: bull of Pope Sergius I, 'sicut nobis'.⁵¹

Claudius A. iii, fol. 9*rv: bull of Pope Sergius I, 'donum gratiae spiritualis'.⁵²

Claudius A. iii, fol. 9*v: letter of Pope Paschal II to Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, 'fraternitatis tuae'.⁵³

Supplementary leaves from the end of the gospel book

Faustina B. vi, fol. 98r: bull of Pope Vitalian I, 'inter plurima'.⁵⁴

Faustina B. vi, fol. 98rv: bull of Pope Gregory III, 'dei omnipotentis immensae'.⁵⁵

Faustina B. vi, fols. 98v-99v: bull of Pope Leo III, 'pontificali discretioni'.⁵⁶

Faustina B. vi, fols. 99v-100r: bull of Pope Formosus I, 'auditis nefandorum', preceded by 'memorable factum'.⁵⁷

The bull of Boniface IV confirming the monastic status of Christ Church was probably added around 1070.⁵⁸ However, the bulk of the additions constitutes the famous portfolio of documents known as the 'Canterbury Forgeries', used to bolster Canterbury's case for its primacy over York. These were copied into this gospel-book in the early twelfth century. When these documents were fabricated is disputed,⁵⁹ though historians have recently favoured a date shortly before the bulls were presented at Rome in 1123 (*HCY* 114-5). It is an intriguing possibility that the twelfth-century portrait of St Dunstan now bound with the *disjecta membra* was produced for insertion into the 'Æthelstan Gospels' to add St Dunstan's

⁴⁷ S398: Birch 1885, no. 660.

⁴⁸ J-W 2007; Boehmer 1902, Nr. 2 (pp. 147-8). The portion of the text in Faustina B. vi begins 'animum ad uerae agnitionis uiam esse correctum'.

⁴⁹ J-W 2021; Boehmer 1902, Nr. 3 (pp. 148-9).

⁵⁰ J-W 1998; Boehmer 1902, Nr. 1 (pp. 145-6).

⁵¹ J-W 2133; Boehmer 1902, Nr. 6 (pp. 152-3).

⁵² J-W 2132; Boehmer 1902, Nr. 5 (p. 151).

⁵³ J-W 5955; *Anselmi Ep.* no. 303.

⁵⁴ J-W 2095; Boehmer 1902, Nr. 4 (pp. 149-50).

⁵⁵ J-W 2243; Boehmer 1902, Nr. 7 (pp. 153-4).

⁵⁶ J-W 2510; Boehmer 1902, Nr. 8 (pp. 155-6).

⁵⁷ The bull is J-W 3506; Boehmer 1902, Nr. 8 (pp. 156-7), Nr. 9 (pp. 157-9).

⁵⁸ For other work by this scribe, see Chaplais 1973, 61n29.

⁵⁹ The suggested dates range from 1072 to 1123 or later, and Lanfranc, Osbern, Eadmer and the monastic community in general have all been accused of the actual forgery: Boehmer 1902; Macdonald 1931; Southern 1958; Gibson 1978, 231-7; Gibson 1995, 49-51; Cowdrey 2003, 97-8.

weight to the guarantee offered to the documents.⁶⁰ Both the ‘Gospels of St Augustine’⁶¹ and the ‘Bodmin Gospels’ likewise contain post-Conquest records, as well as Anglo-Saxon memoranda.⁶²

Post-Conquest scribes also added records to Anglo-Saxon gospel books which had hitherto contained no documents. Around the turn of the eleventh century, the Barking nuns copied two records into a gospel book written in insular minuscule.⁶³ A portfolio of five documents was added at the end of the ‘Bury Gospels’ in the late eleventh century:⁶⁴ (1) an abbreviated Latin report of a dispute between Gundulf, bishop of Rochester (1077-1108), and Picot, sheriff of Cambridge concerning lands belonging to Freckenham (Suffolk) in Isleham (Cambridgeshire);⁶⁵ (2) Cnut’s bilingual charter of privileges in favour of Bury St Edmunds;⁶⁶ (3) Pope Alexander II’s bull placing Bury under papal protection (1071);⁶⁷ (4) the Latin report of the trial of Bishop Arfast of East Anglia’s claim that Bury should be his episcopal church (1081);⁶⁸ and (5) a writ addressed to Roger Bigod, sheriff of Norfolk, enacting William’s verdict.⁶⁹ It is likely that the leaves on which the documents were written are integral to the manuscript, though it is ‘practically impossible to determine the physical

⁶⁰ Cotton Claudius A. iii, fol. 8r. For the date and origin of this picture, see Heslop 1984.

⁶¹ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 286 (s. vi or vi/ii, Italy (Rome?), prov. S England (Minster-in-Thanel?), s. vii/viii, perh. Canterbury s. viii/ix, prov. Cant StA s. x (or ix?)). Two charters were added before the Conquest (S1198 (fol. 74v); S1455 (fol. 77v)), and later additions occupy the front flyleaves (fols. i-vi). The earliest of these documents apparently dates from around 1110.

⁶² London, British Library, Additional 9381 (s. ix/x, Brittany, prov. St Petroc’s Padstow then Bodmin s. x). At least fifty one manumissions were added, five of which (nos. I, XXX, XXXI, XXXIII and XXVII) postdate the Conquest: all are printed Förster 1930. It is possible the boards of the gospel book were once metal-plated and housed jewels or relics: [Anon] 1884, 34-5; Pollard 1975, no. 19 (p. 158).

⁶³ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 155 (s. x/xi). For the records, see Hart 1957a, 469; Hart 1957b, 25-7.

⁶⁴ London, British Library, Harley 76, fols. 137v-141r.

⁶⁵ Bates 1998, no. 225 (pp. 712-4).

⁶⁶ S980; Kemble 1839, no. 735.

⁶⁷ J-W 4692: *Ep.* 81 (*PL* 146, cols. 1363-4); Hervey 1925, i. 3-4.

⁶⁸ Bates 1998, no. 39 (pp. 200-209).

⁶⁹ Bates 1998, no. 40 (p. 210).

structure'.⁷⁰ The addition of the Rochester document, copied in a campaign which preceded the addition of the four other records, is rather perplexing.

The Rochester document was compiled during the reign of William Rufus, but refers to events which occurred between 1077 and 1080. It describes how Hugo Picot claimed that lands at Isleham were part of the royal demesne, while Gundulf insisted they belonged to Rochester. Twelve men of the shire, afraid of Picot, testified under oath that the lands belonged to the crown. Here the Bury account ends. However, the *Textus Roffensis* (fols. 175v-76v) gives details of subsequent events. A monk called Grim, once the reeve of Freckenham, informed Bishop Gundulf that the twelve men had perjured themselves. Questioned by Odo, one of the witnesses immediately admitted his perjury. The lands were confirmed to Gundulf,⁷¹ and, despite protestations, the twelve men were found guilty of perjury and were made to pay a fine of £300 to the king. Picot was sheriff of Cambridgeshire by 1071, and still in office in 1086.⁷² Though he founded Barnwell Priory (a house of Augustinian canons near Cambridge) in 1092, his relations with other religious houses were not harmonious and the Ely monks remembered him with particular hostility (*LE* ii. 131). The abbey of Bury held soke over the freemen of the manor of Freckenham, which was part of the eight-and-a-half hundreds of Thingoe (*LDB* ii fol. 381r). This feudal interest, or Picot's evident East Anglian celebrity, may explain the copying of the document into the Bury Gospels.

The transcription of the remaining documents was a response to Herbert Losinga's attempts to reprise a claim originally made by Herfast, Bishop of East Anglia (1070-1084),

⁷⁰ Rushforth 2002, 147. Readers are not now permitted to attempt to collate this manuscript.

⁷¹ See the bilingual writ confirming Freckenham to Archbishop Lanfranc (who had general oversight of Rochester's affairs): Bates 1998, no. 226. The Rochester canons later supplied themselves with a charter of King Alfred that purported to grant them Freckenham and Isleham (S349).

⁷² Green 1990, 29.

that he should be allowed to move his episcopal see to Bury, or, failing that, exercise diocesan control over Bury. They are in a single hand of the late eleventh century.⁷³ Herbert first reprised the claim in the context of the 1094 translation of St Edmund's relics. According to Hermann the Archdeacon, the bishop wished to officiate, but was rebuffed when the abbey's papal and royal privileges were read.⁷⁴ Nonetheless, Herbert visited Rome in 1102 hoping to restore his authority over the abbey (*HN* 132).⁷⁵ The four added texts provide copies of the records with which Baldwin originally secured victory over Herfast in 1081, and document that success.

The four central points of Baldwin's case for Bury's independence are evident from the trial report: (1) King Cnut expelled clerks from Bury and introduced monks (therefore reintroducing clerks would set a historical precedent); (2) the monastic church was dedicated by Æthelnoth, archbishop of Canterbury (1020-38), and, by implication, not by the Bishop of East Anglia;⁷⁶ (3) the first abbot was consecrated by the bishop of London, the second by the bishop of Winchester and Baldwin himself by the archbishop of Canterbury, and thus (again) the bishop of East Anglia had no involvement; (4) King Cnut and Edward the Confessor both exempted Bury from interference from the diocesan bishop. The writ addressed to Roger Bigod enacts the verdict of this trial, and the other documents are those which supported Baldwin's case. Thus, Alexander II's bull includes a prohibition on the monastery ever becoming an *episcopalem sedem*, while Cnut's charter demands that Bury always be inhabited by monks and free from all episcopal domination, insists that the monks should be allowed to elect an abbot of their own free will (*bonae uoluntatis uoto*), and concludes by

⁷³ Rushforth 2002, 30. She disputes Thomson's identification of the scribe in Cambridge, St John's College, C. 23 (73): Thomson 1980, 118-9.

⁷⁴ Arnold 1890, i. 87.

⁷⁵ See also JW s. a. 1102. It is possible Henry I's general confirmation of Bury's privileges, which was addressed to Herbert, was issued in response to his designs on Bury: see Douglas 1932, no. 21.

⁷⁶ These two historical 'facts' were copied into three other Bury manuscripts: the 'Vatican Psalter', the Bury copy of the bilingual rule of St Benedict and a recent Latin homiliary; see the discussion below 167-8.

pronouncing an anathema on anyone reintroducing *clericos*.⁷⁷ This portfolio of documents stressed that Bury was protected by papal, Anglo-Saxon and post-Conquest privileges; adding the documents to the gospel book ensured Christ too appeared to support Bury against Herbert Losinga.⁷⁸

Copies of the Old English Gospels were also used to store records after 1066, and it is evident that Christ's words were felt to lose none of their authority when translated into the vernacular. Since a Bath copy of the Old English Gospels contains manumission documents referring to Abbot Ælfric, who was probably abbot in the 1060s, it would seem that this habit imitated very late Anglo-Saxon practice.⁷⁹ At Exeter, records seem to have begun to be added to a copy of the Old English Gospels shortly after Leofric's death in 1072. Copies of manumission documents, records of bequests and episcopal *acta* were copied into the gospel book well into the mid-twelfth century.⁸⁰ However, the twelfth-century canons did possess other gospel books which might have been used to store such records, including at least two complete Latin gospel books⁸¹ and probably a third.⁸² Though records occupied much of the once spare space in these books,⁸³ there nonetheless remained space for further additions. Space could also have been provided in the gospel books

⁷⁷ I summarise the Latin portion. Though the English portion is far from identical to the Latin, its central points are the same.

⁷⁸ It is possible that the twelfth-century monks later attempted to use the gospel book to guarantee that obedientiaries were elected in accordance with appropriate traditions, as an incomplete passage suggests: 'Prior . sacrista . Celerarius. Camerarius. in capitulo elegendi' (fol. 141v).

⁷⁹ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 140 + 111, pp. 7, 8, 55, 56. For a full description, see Liuzza 1994, i. xxv-xxxiii. For Ælfric's dates, see Kelly 2007, 42.

⁸⁰ Inventoried Chambers, Förster et al. 1933, 44-54.

⁸¹ Leofric's donation list mentions 'ii. mycele Cristes bec gebonede': Lapidge 1985, X. 1. One of these is probably Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. D. 2. 16 (s. x¹, Landévennec).

⁸² Now surviving only as a single leaf: London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. v, vol. 1, fol. 75.

⁸³ Two quires were added to Auct D. 2. 16 to hold copies of Leofric's donation list and a list of the relics given to Exeter by Æthelstan (fols. 1-2v, 6v, 8-14). Some leaves remain blank. No attempt was made to enter post-Conquest records on these leaves (though it is worth noting that an erased and now illegible English text appears at the end of St John's Gospel, fol. 190r). Two manumissions and a guild notice (added s. x¹-xi¹) occupy the margins of Cotton Tiberius B. v, fol. 75.

commissioned for or written at Exeter after the Conquest.⁸⁴ However, these possibilities do not appear to have occurred to Exeter's scribes and their second repository for legal records was the 'Leofric Missal'.⁸⁵ The priority given to the copy of the Old English Gospels probably reflects the veneer of authenticity associated with vernacular writing after the Conquest.

This brief discussion has barely touched upon many interesting features of the use of gospel books to store, sanctify and legitimate records. A full study of the practice is a major desideratum. Such a project would investigate whether scribes prioritised particular locations within gospel books, and why some gospel books received documentary additions and not others. Many surviving Anglo-Saxon gospel books contain no records,⁸⁶ and it is not clear in what circumstances a gospel book would not be used for this purpose. A full study would also be able to explore the line of argument tentatively advanced here, that Anglo-Saxon gospel books were increasingly used to store documents after the Conquest because of their status as a symbol of events *tempore regis Edwardi*.

RECORDS IN LITURGICAL AND CEREMONIAL BOOKS

Liturgical books also offered a divine stamp to records copied within them.⁸⁷ For example, a quire of four leaves was added to the end of Bury copy of the bilingual Rule of St Benedict during the abbacy of Leofstan (1044-1065), and this was steadily supplemented into the

⁸⁴ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Lat bib. d. 10; Paris, BNF, lat. 14782. For these manuscripts, see de la Mare 1982-85; Alexander 1966.

⁸⁵ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 579 (s. ix/x, St Vaast). Late-eleventh-century manumissions occupy fols. 1rv, 377v, which are reproduced by Rose-Troup 1937, pls. 57-9. Other blank spaces were available for the addition of documents (e. g. fols. 5v, 7r). For an account of the structure of this complex manuscript, see Drage 1979, 73-82.

⁸⁶ For example, none of the blank leaves in the 'Trinity Gospels' (Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 10. 4 (215)), 'Pembroke Gospels' (Cambridge, Pembroke College, 301) or the 'Kedderminster Gospels' (London, British Library, Loan 11) contain documentary additions. This may be because they were privately owned or because they were considered too luxurious. Other gospel books, which only survive in fragmentary form, may once have contained records, such as the 'Bradfer-Lawrence Gospels' (Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, 45-1980), where fol. 13 is a stub.

⁸⁷ I generally define 'liturgical books' like Gneuss 1985. I have however also included the Rule of St Benedict, because of its status in Benedictine monasteries.

twelfth century.⁸⁸ The recto of the first leaf is blank, with a survey of Bury's estates and possessions compiled during the abbacy of Leofstan beginning on the verso (fol. 106v).⁸⁹ The hand of this survey is datable to the mid-eleventh century, and is 'high grade and stately'.⁹⁰ It is a curious and disorganised document, beginning with a memorandum of food rent due to the abbot from one Ætheric and the *fermfultum* due from abbot Leofstan, the prior Brihtric and Thurstan, apparently a monk. There is then a list of the *manslot* held by the abbey in various hundreds in Norfolk followed by a short perambulation from *Suðtun* to *Walbec*; an inventory of the books and church equipment belonging to the abbey prefaced by an encomiastic account of God's support for King Edward and St Edmund; a list of estates which supplied *anes monðes ferme* to the abbey; and a survey of farm goods at Egmere, Norfolk. Around the turn of the century, the last piece was glossed, predominantly in Latin, but with the Roman numerals expanded into Old English and *flice* rendered by French *bacun*.⁹¹ In the mid-eleventh century, Ælfric II, bishop of Elmham, had bequeathed thirty acres at Egmere to Ælfwine, his priest at Walsingham, leaving the rest of the estate to Ufi 'the prior' (*prouast*).⁹² By 1086, Egmere appears to have again been part of the demesne of the bishop of East Anglia (*LDB* ii fol. 192v). The Latin glosses to the passage concerning Egmere in the survey show that the Bury monks referred back to the old memoranda and make one wonder if Bury was involved in litigation concerning the estate during Baldwin's abbacy.⁹³

The survey is followed by a series of records added after the Conquest, beginning with a memorandum of a grant of the rent from two mills (*mylnegafoþ*) at Lackford (Suffolk),

⁸⁸ Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 197, fols. 106-9; Rushforth 2002, 14-19.

⁸⁹ Printed and discussed by Douglas 1928; Robertson 1956, 192-201, 440-47. See now Lowe 2008.

⁹⁰ Rushforth 2002, 16.

⁹¹ ME 'bacoun' is only attested from 1330; note also ML *baco* (< OF bac(o)un).

⁹² S1489 (1023x1038); Whitelock 1930, no. 26.

⁹³ Lowe suggests 'it may be that Bury had recently embarked on some tenurial relation with the bishop': Lowe 2008, 61.

made by Abbot Baldwin to the bretheren. The record is phrased from the perspective of the bretheren ('we sculan habban'), which suggests it was the monks and not the abbot who recorded the details of the grant. Another scribe added a further clause, augmenting the grant with two fatted pigs (or three *ora* in lieu). Beneath, a memorandum records that Baldwin granted a half-pound for fish to the monks on the annual commemoration (*geargemynde*) of Edward the Confessor's death, and a half-pound on the anniversary of his appointment to the abbacy. Another scribe recorded that, for the annual commemoration of abbot Ufi (*Uuiges gearimynd abbodes*), the monks were to have a half-pound for fish, forty pounds for mead and two measures of wheat, all of which would come from Lackford.

A fourth scribe added details of a pittance instituted by Abbot Baldwin in memory of King William and Queen Matilda. Twenty *solidos* were to come from Warketon (Northants) *ad opus fratrum*,⁹⁴ half on the anniversary of Matilda's death, and half on the anniversary of William's death. The pittance can be dated between 1087, when the Conqueror died, and 1097/8, when Abbot Baldwin died. This is the first pittance to be recorded in Latin rather than English. The impression that Latin was replacing English as the language in which house business was being conducted towards the end of Baldwin's abbacy is reinforced by the inclusion of Latin summaries of the other pittances instituted by Baldwin below this pittance. These appear to be the work of a fifth scribe, though his hand is similar to that of the fourth scribe. However, we should be careful not to imply English became obsolete in abbey administration. The final leaf of the added quire bears another list of farm rents due to the abbey. The list is in English, and the hand dates from the first half of the twelfth century.

The addition of post-Conquest documents to the quire at the end of Bury's copy of the bilingual Benedictine Rule continued a practice instigated under Abbot Leofstan. It

⁹⁴ Warkton was granted to Bury by Matilda (*Memorials* iii. 4), but held by Baldwin from the King in 1086 (*GDB* fol. 222r).

shows the monks recording the pittances due specifically to them, rather than the rights of the abbey itself. The choice of book is significant. While details of Bury's victory at the 1081 trial properly belonged in a gospel book, matters pertaining to the monks themselves belonged in a book that was still in use in chapter.⁹⁵ Their copy of the Benedictine Rule was a fitting place for the monks to record what was due to them and ensure the continuation of their rights and ceremonies.⁹⁶ Moreover, the additions and glosses to these records show that the monks continually referred back to them. The Rule of St Benedict was thus not only a safe place for the storage of records, but a repository which was convenient.

The Bury monks not only continued late Anglo-Saxon practice by recording details of pittances in their bilingual copy of the Rule of St Benedict, but also imitated the practice in an illustrated Life of St Edmund, produced around 1124.⁹⁷ A quire containing contemporary additions precedes the illustration cycle (fols. 1-6). It includes a letter from Henry I to Abbot Anselm, forbidding him to travel abroad because his convent objects;⁹⁸ a letter from Prior Talbot and the convent to Abbot Anselm, imploring him to return home, employing descriptions of longing drawn from Song of Songs;⁹⁹ details of pittances instituted by Abbot Anselm, probably between 1125 and 1135;¹⁰⁰ and four lections for the Vigil of the feast of St Edmund.¹⁰¹ As they used their bilingual copy of the Benedictine Rule to record

⁹⁵ The consistent replacement of *-que* with *-q*; argues that the manuscript and was used as a lectionary during the twelfth century.

⁹⁶ A similar case concerns a writ of Walcher, bishop of Durham (1071-1080) copied into a magnificent *libellus* containing Bede's *Vitae Cuthberti* which had been presented to the *Congregatio* by King Æthelstan in 934 (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 183, fol. 96v). It is arguable that Ealdgyth, the beneficiary of the grant, was the widow of Ligulf, who had been murdered in 1080, possibly by Leobwin, Walcher's chaplain and archdeacon. The transcription of the writ into the Cuthbert *libellus* aligns Walcher's conciliatory efforts with the saint. For the writ, see Robertson 1956, 230-1; Offler 1968, no. 1. The identification of Ealdgyth is proposed by Aird 1998, 96-7.

⁹⁷ New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 736.

⁹⁸ Davis, Whitwell et al. 1913, ii, no. 1340.

⁹⁹ Thomson 1972.

¹⁰⁰ Printed Gransden 1973, 96-9. See also Thomson 1971, 217-20; Thomson 1977, 817.

¹⁰¹ See Thomson 1971, 213-4. In addition, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 135, fols. 101, 102 may have come from this manuscript: see McLachan 1986, 284-5.

the annual pittances due to them, so the monks used their lavishly-illustrated Life of St Edmund to ensure Abbot Anselm would in future heed their wishes.¹⁰²

The Bury monks also recorded the most important elements of the narrative by which they understood their obscure pre-Conquest history in three manuscripts belonging to the house: the ‘Vatican Psalter’,¹⁰³ the bilingual copy of the Rule of St Benedict and a post-Conquest Latin homiliary.¹⁰⁴ A scribe supplemented the Easter Tables of the Vatican Psalter with two annals:¹⁰⁵

Hinc denique presul Ælfwinus sub comite Ðurkylo constituit regulam monachorum sancti Eadmundi monasterio; et sub uoluntate licentiaque Cnutoni regis permanet usque in presens (fol. 16v, opposite year 1020, extending to 1024).

Hic sub Cnutone rege constructam basilicam beate memorie Ægelnoðus consecrauit eam in honore Christi et sancte Marie sanctique Eadmundi (fol. 17v, opposite year 1032, but extending to 1035).

The hand of the additions seems to date from the last third of the eleventh century.

Somewhat later, two similar annals were below the end of the Rule of St Benedict:¹⁰⁶

M^r .xx. Hic denique presul Ælfuinus sub comite Thurkillo constituit regulam monachorum sancti EADMVNDI in monasterio et sub uoluntate licentiaque Cnutoni regis permanet usque in presens.

M^r .xxxii. Hic sub Cnutono rege constructam basilicam beate memorie archipresul Ægelnothus consecrauit in honore Christi et sanctæ Mariæ sanctique Eadmundi.

The scribe apparently intended the annals to appear as an integral part of the original manuscript, so tried to imitate the proportions of the Anglo-Caroline script of the Latin

¹⁰² It has been suggested that Anselm was required to swear an oath on the Illustrated Life, but this does not admit of proof: see Thomson 1971, 215.

¹⁰³ Rome, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. Lat. 12, fols. 16v-19: Temple 1976, no. 84; Ohlgren 1992, 2-3 and pls. 3.1-3.49; Rushforth 2002, 105-45 and pls. 38-40 (fols. 16v, 36r, 154r).

¹⁰⁴ Cambridge, Pembroke College, 25 (s. xi^{ex} or xi²), fol. 181v: Cross 1988. A new digital facsimile and edition is being prepared *curante* Thomas N. Hall.

¹⁰⁵ Most recently printed and discussed by Rushforth 2002, 120-22. A third entry was made by a different scribe opposite the year 1056: ‘hic ab anno passionis nostri Eadmundi ducenti anni sunt transacti’. The dating is difficult to explain.

¹⁰⁶ Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 197, fol. 105r: printed and discussed by Dumville 1993, 31-2. See also the comments of Rushforth 2002, 19.

sections of the Rule. The end flyleaf of the homiliary Pembroke 25 also bears a similar inscription:¹⁰⁷

Anno ab incarnatione domini millesimo uicesimo a passione glo|riosi regis et martiris
ædmundi centismo quinquagesimo | regnante chnutone piisimo [...] olizantur monachi aput
| *sanctum* ædmundum [...]atis clericis preficitur abbas Uvius | uir prudens et modestus.

The inscription is now very faded, and consequently difficult to read and date, though it would appear to be early-twelfth-century at the latest. Similar information was also interpolated into the appropriate annals of the Bury copy of John of Worcester's *Chronicle*, when it was copied in the 1130s.¹⁰⁸ The Bury monks seem to have believed that anyone who doubted that their monastery had been founded in 1020 and that their abbey church had been consecrated in 1032 would be convinced when confronted with manuscript evidence to this effect. It is significant that two of the manuscripts chosen were high-status pre-Conquest ceremonial books.

Just as the monks used a pre-Conquest copy of the Rule of St Benedict to keep track of pittances and farm dues, so they employed a lavishly-illustrated *libellus* to control their difficult relationship with Abbot Anselm. In daily use, liturgical books were an effective place to record administrative details and document hard-won rights because they were readily accessible and associated these records with God, to whose glory the liturgy was directed.

RECORD-KEEPING IN OTHER MANUSCRIPTS

Records were also transcribed into copies of patristic texts, because it was felt such books offered a secure place for the storage of archival memoranda. The most obvious class of texts preserved in this way are booklists and inventories. For example, before the Conquest,

¹⁰⁷ This is Rebecca Rushforth's transcription, derived from the digital manipulation of an image of the leaf. I am grateful to Professor Thomas N. Hall for sharing Dr Rushforth's transcription with me. See also James 1905, 29.

¹⁰⁸ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 297, pp. 350, 353-4; McGurk, Darlington et al. 1995-, ii. 643.

a list of books belonging to a certain Æthelstan was copied into a mid-tenth-century copy of Isidore's *De natura rerum* shortly after its production,¹⁰⁹ while a short mid-eleventh-century list of Worcester books was added to a booklet containing the Life of St Kenelm.¹¹⁰ This practice continued after the Norman Conquest when both pre- and post-Conquest manuscripts were used as repositories for booklists. An inventory was added to an early-eleventh-century copy of Gregory's *Dialogues* around 1100,¹¹¹ while the Rochester monks used a copy of Augustine's *De doctrina christiana*, produced during the first half of the twelfth century, for their catalogue of 1202.¹¹² Later legislation suggested that such inventories should be copied into liturgical books:¹¹³

Scribant autem sacerdotes in missalibus et in aliis libris possessiones et redditus ecclesie et nomina librorum et vestimentorum et ornamentorum ecclesie, nec ipsi nec parochiani sui sine consensu nostro aliquid alienare presumant de hiis que sunt ecclesie.

An inventory of items belonging to the church of Sherburn-in-Elmet, copied into the 'York Gospels' in the mid-eleventh century, anticipates this recommendation.¹¹⁴ The injunction to use liturgical books reflects the frequency with which valued records could be mislaid when the host manuscript migrated to another house. For example, some Dorchester estate records were copied into a tenth-century penitential shortly after the Conquest,¹¹⁵ but the

¹⁰⁹ London, British Library, Cotton Domitian i, fol. 55v: Lapidge 1985, no. 3.

¹¹⁰ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 367, pt. 2, fol. 48v: Lapidge 1985, no. 9.

¹¹¹ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner 3, fols. 189v-190r: Lapidge 1985, no. 11.

¹¹² London, British Library, Royal 5 B. xii, fols. 2r-3r: Sharpe, Carley et al. 1996, B79. Another example is London, British Library, Additional 23944, fol. 157v (above 56).

¹¹³ Synodal Statutes of Bishop Richard Poore for the diocese of Salisbury (1217x1219): 'Priests [should] write in missals and other books the lands and dues of the church and the names of the books, vestments and ornaments of the church, and the parishioners themselves should not presume to remove anything belonging to the church without our permission'. Printed Powicke and Cheney 1964, i. 57-96 (82).

¹¹⁴ York, Minster Library, Add. 1, fol. 161r: Lapidge 1985, no. 6. See also Alexander, McGurk et al. 1986, 96-7.

¹¹⁵ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 718, fol. 179r; printed Blair 2005.

manuscript was acquired by Bishop Leofric only a few years later.¹¹⁶ Library books could only lend a tenuous security to records.

Estate records were also copied into patristic manuscripts, both before and after the Conquest. The famous Ely farming memoranda, which now survive only as three binding strips, seem to have been copied on the flyleaf of an unknown manuscript after the flyleaf had already been used for *probationes pennae*.¹¹⁷ They refer to the day-to-day management of Ely estates between 1007 and 1025.¹¹⁸ Post-Conquest examples are also found. Around the turn of the eleventh century, a record of the provisions required for a funeral was transcribed on the first page of a copy of Bede's commentary on Luke, which had been produced at Saint-Denis during the first half of the ninth century.¹¹⁹ It had certainly reached Bury by Kirkstede's time,¹²⁰ and was probably brought to England by Baldwin, who had professed as a monk at Saint-Denis.¹²¹ The balance of probability is thus that the record was added by someone associated with Bury. After assigning payments to the priests, deacons and clerics, and for the coffin and pall, and for ale, bread, bacon, a goat and wax, details are given of the two funeral feasts and the food that should be provided. The text of Bede's commentary was itself still of interest in the late twelfth century, when the manuscript was

¹¹⁶ An added bifolium (fols. 180-1) contains Pope Leo's letter to Edward the Confessor, granting Leofric permission to move his see from Crediton to Exeter, in the hand of a known Exeter scribe (Drage's scribe 9): Drage 1979, 161-2.

¹¹⁷ The innermost and central strips (*olim* Cambridge, Queen's College, Horne 74) were discovered by W. W. Skeat in the binding of Diophantus, *Rerum arithmeticum libri sex*, Basel 1575, now D. 2. 7, in a plain brown-leather binding, donated to the college in 1626 by a fellow, James Betton. The outermost strip belonged to W. A. Cragg of Threkingham House, where it was found by Frank Stenton. All three strips were sold at Sotheby's, 11 December 1979, and are now mounted together between glass as London, British Library, Additional 61735. See Backhouse, Turner et al. 1984, no. 150.

¹¹⁸ Hart 1966, 32, 47.

¹¹⁹ Cambridge, Pembroke College, 83, fol. ir; printed Robertson 1956, 253. See also Rushforth 2002, 61-2 and pl. 4. For the script and origin, see Vezin 1986, 38-9.

¹²⁰ Pressmark 'B. 28A' (fols. iv, 1r) and *ex libris* 'Liber sancti Edmundi Regis in quo continetur | Beda super Lucam' (fol. iv); identifiable as Sharpe, Carley et al. 1996, B13.209.

¹²¹ On Baldwin, see Gransden 1981.

overhauled and twenty supply leaves were introduced at the end.¹²² Another example from Bury is a short inventory, transcribed at the end of a copy of Laidcenn's *Egloga de Moraliibus in Job*, probably produced in France during the first half of the tenth century,¹²³ though it contains insular abbreviations and decoration.¹²⁴ Corrections may be in the hand of a scribe from St Augustine's Abbey, suggesting the manuscript was in Canterbury by the second half of the tenth century.¹²⁵ The earliest evidence the book was at Bury is an *ex libris* inscription from the late twelfth or early thirteenth century. The last leaf of the manuscript (fol. 167v) bears a short (and perhaps fragmentary) inventory of the livestock and crop renders offered by a large estate. The script, late-eleventh-century high-grade insular minuscule, contrasts with the more informal script of the funeral record added to the copy of Bede on Luke and the Ely farming memoranda.

Though this practice was not restricted to Bury, the number of records that survive in the abbey's manuscripts may reflect the *genius loci*.¹²⁶

Even when records were not being assiduously copied, the abbey concentrated on its business side. We know far more about the cellarers and sacrists of our period than we know of the priors . . . The road to greatness was through the administrative departments of the sacristy or cellar.

Attractive though the image is, we cannot conclude that Bury obedientiaries went from farm to farm reading Bede and Laidcenn, and using these manuscripts to record their day's work. Rather books presented a reasonably secure repository for records which – excepting unforeseen alienations from the monastic library – would remain *in situ* for the foreseeable future. Scribes do not seem to have minded what books they used to store such records, and they are found in both pre- and post-Conquest manuscripts.

¹²² See above 40-1.

¹²³ Cambridge, Pembroke College, 88: Bischoff 1998, no. 832 (p. 183); Gransden 1998, 253 and pl. LXVIb (fol. 87).

¹²⁴ Bishop 1971, xii.

¹²⁵ Bishop 1971, xxv, 5, 18; McKee 1997, 96-109, 120-2.

¹²⁶ Davis 1936, 231.

ADDING LETTERS TO MANUSCRIPTS AT WORCESTER AND ELSEWHERE

As we have seen, patristic manuscripts could provide a haven for information a community wanted to preserve. Over a period of two centuries, Worcester monks transcribed letters on the flyleaves of manuscripts, apparently indifferent to whether these manuscripts were pre- or post-Conquest.¹²⁷ The practice has been described as ‘almost diagnostic’ of Worcester provenance,¹²⁸ though there are examples from other houses. At Worcester, it seems to have begun in the early twelfth century, probably during the episcopate of Samson (1096-1112),¹²⁹ when the monks seem to have taken pains to document contemporary history. At the instigation of Bishop Wulfstan, John of Worcester began his chronicle in the 1090s (OV ii. 189), a work which ‘realised the value of a document cited *verbatim* to substantiate its record’.¹³⁰ Indeed, when Lanfranc wrote to Wulfstan and Peter, bishop of Chester, regarding the consecration of the Bishop of Orkney, he urged them to preserve copies of this letter and Archbishop Thomas’s letter to Lanfranc in their archives (*in archivis*).¹³¹ The Worcester monks seem to have taken the archival impulse very seriously. More generally, the eleventh and twelfth centuries saw a ‘prodigious flowering of letter writing’,¹³² which was presumably accompanied by increased concern to preserve letters.

During the early twelfth century, letters were added to a copy of Cassian’s *Collationes* and Bede’s commentary on Tobit, produced at Worcester early in Wulfstan’s episcopate.¹³³ Only shortly after the events described, a letter from Pope Paschal II to the clergy and people of Bayeux, dated October 8, announcing the deposition of Bishop Turolde (1103 or

¹²⁷ For a useful, but incomplete, survey see McIntyre 1978, app. D (pp. 229-262).

¹²⁸ Thomson 2001, xxiii. See also Ker 1960, 20n4.

¹²⁹ For Samson, see Southern 1963, 140-2; Galbraith 1967.

¹³⁰ Gransden 1974, i. 147.

¹³¹ Clover and Gibson 1979, no. 13 (p. 82).

¹³² Constable 1976, 31.

¹³³ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 23.

1106) was transcribed at the end of the manuscript (fols. 145rv).¹³⁴ Paschal deposed Tuold of Evermeu for receiving his appointment from a lay power without election and for being ordained deacon without passing through the minor orders; Tuold retired to Bec in 1107.¹³⁵ He was succeeded by Richard (1107-1133), the son of Samson, bishop of Worcester. A single leaf containing a letter of Alexander, abbot of Citeaux and Pontius, abbot of Clairvaux, to William, archbishop of Sens, relating to negotiations between Alexander III and Frederick Barbarossa in 1169, was subsequently added at the end of the manuscript (fol. 146v).¹³⁶ Another scribe began to copy a letter of Archbishop Thomas Becket regarding a petitioner named Walter Mansellus on the first leaf of the manuscript (fol. 1r), but barely got beyond the salutation.¹³⁷

Letters and a charter were also added at the end of a copy of Gregory's commentary on Ezechiel, another manuscript produced early in Wulfstan's episcopate.¹³⁸ The first added document (fol. 155v) is a letter which Reinald of Citeaux and Bernard of Clairvaux sent to Pope Innocent II in 1141 concerning the see of Lisieux, where Geoffrey, Count of Anjou was obstructing the consecration of Arnulf because of his loyalty to King Stephen.¹³⁹ The next leaf bears a letter that was sent by Archbishop Theobald of Canterbury to Alfred, bishop of Worcester (1158x1160) and concerns a subdeacon who had married, gone to the continent and been made a priest, while his wife had married a second time (fol. 156r).¹⁴⁰

¹³⁴ Not in J-W. Printed, from this manuscript, by Ramackers 1937, no. 5 (pp. 58-60).

¹³⁵ See OV v. 210; Gleason 1936, 17-23; Spear 2006, 32.

¹³⁶ Printed, from this manuscript, in Holtzmann 1929-30, 408-9.

¹³⁷ 'Thome dei gratia Cantuariensis ecclesie minister humilis priori 7 conuentui | maluensis [over w[i]g[ornen]s[i]s?] ecclesie dilectis filiis in xpo salutem. presentium lator | walterus mansellus in auditorio nostro lacrimabilem [*breaks off*]. The letter is not in Duggan's edition of Becket's correspondence, though the address formula occurs in e. g. Duggan 2000, nos. 182, 232.

¹³⁸ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 223. 'Dilectissimo ... redeatur' and 'Dei ... animum'; 'flamma ... AMEN' are supplied in a hand of the first half of the twelfth century (fols. iii, 1, 154, 155): Adriaen 1971, Praefatio/1-15, i. I/1-117, ii. X/531-630.

¹³⁹ Printed, from this manuscript, in Leclercq and Rochais 1977, no. 252 (pp. 332-3). For the background, see Schriber 1992, 18-9.

¹⁴⁰ Printed, with reference to this manuscript, by Miller and Butler 1986, no. 99.

Overleaf is a foundation charter of the priory of St Mary of the Isle at Alcester, dated 1140, which emphasises the obedience which the abbot owed to the bishop of Worcester (fols. 156v-157r).¹⁴¹ It is probable that Ralph Pincerna of Oversley actually founded Alcester in 1138. The abbey was in dispute with Worcester about its right to freely elect an abbot as early as 1154x1158, which may explain the transcription of its foundation charter into a Worcester book.¹⁴² A stub (fol. ii^r) shows that the manuscript once contained further records or documents in at least two other hands.

Very ancient manuscripts also became repositories for letters. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 93 is a copy of an exposition of the Mass known by its incipit '*Primum in ordine*',¹⁴³ written in the early ninth century in a calligraphic cursive minuscule, similar to the script of the Book of Cerne.¹⁴⁴ The manuscript, decorated in green, blue, yellow, red and brown, is a small, thin, portable volume. No annotations to the text itself date from the Anglo-Norman period. However, a letter from Pope Innocent II (1130-1143) to King Henry I, dated 1133, requesting assistance, was added below the end of the text (fol. 41r).¹⁴⁵ On the verso, we find a letter to Reginald Foliot, abbot of Evesham (1130-1149) from the monks of Worcester, probably written shortly after Reginald's consecration, complaining that he had not presented the vestments in which he was consecrated to the sacrist at Worcester.¹⁴⁶ Moreover, the first leaf of the manuscript is an unruled singleton leaf of vellum much limper than the rest of the manuscript, which contains the famous forged bull of Boniface IV, defending the right of monks to preach (fol. 1r).¹⁴⁷ The position of the bull before *Primum in ordine* may be deliberate, since it advocates the place of monks in the *cura animarum* and thus

¹⁴¹ Printed, from this manuscript, by Dugdale 1817, iv. 175.

¹⁴² See Styles 1941-2.

¹⁴³ Edited Mazzuconi 1982.

¹⁴⁴ Brown 1996, 42.

¹⁴⁵ Printed, from this manuscript, by Liebermann 1888.

¹⁴⁶ Atkins 1940, 226-7.

¹⁴⁷ J-W 1996; *PL* 80, cols. 105-6; see also Gilchrist 1988-1990.

in the administration of the sacraments, with the significance of which *Primum in ordine* is itself concerned.

Post-Conquest manuscripts were also used to store letters at Worcester. A twelfth-century copy of Augustine's *De doctrina christiana*, which now survives only in fragments, received very extensive additions:¹⁴⁸

Vespasian E. iv, fol. 203v: Henry, bishop of Winchester and papal legate to the prior and convent of Worcester (1139-1143). Complaint that Peter's Pence has not been paid.¹⁴⁹

Vespasian E. iv, fol. 204rv: Lanfranc to Domnall Ua h-Énna, bishop of Munster and his colleagues (29 August 1080 – 28 August 1081), concerning unbaptised infants and the Eucharist.¹⁵⁰

Vespasian E. iv, fol. 205rv: Lanfranc to bishops Wulfstan of Worcester and Peter of Chester (29 August 1072 – February 1073), concerning the consecration of the bishop of Orkney.¹⁵¹

Vespasian E. iv, fols. 205v-6: Thomas of York to Lanfranc (June 1072 – February 1073), concerning the consecration of the bishop of Orkney.¹⁵²

Vespasian E. iv, fol. 206rv: Anselm, *De Malo et Nichil*.¹⁵³

Vespasian E. iv, fol. 207r: Alfgætas of Wilton and the bishop, prior and monks of Worcester (1116). Confraternity agreement.¹⁵⁴

Vespasian E. iv, fol. 207r: Ralph of Canterbury to Bishop Theowold and the clergy and people of Worcester (1115-1122). A legal dispute which had been sent to Canterbury from Worcester has been settled.¹⁵⁵

Vespasian E. iv, fol. 207v: Pope Paschal II to Bishop Osbern and the clergy of Exeter, 'et patrum'. Incomplete (ends 'consuetudinis stab[ilitas]'). Complete copy on fol. 209v.¹⁵⁶

Vespasian E. iv, fol. 208rv: Pope Urban II to Manassus, archbishop elect of Rheims (March 1096), 'auditum est apud', concerning bishops who still have contact with the excommunicate King Philip I of France.¹⁵⁷

Vespasian E. iv, fol. 209rv: brief summaries of letters between Paschal and Anselm.

¹⁴⁸ London, British Library, Cotton Appendix 56, fols. 1-4 + Cotton Vespasian E. iv, fols. 203-10 (s. xii¹). Cotton Appendix fol. 1rv contains 'sunt precepta ... intellexisse [praedicatur]': Green 1963, 3/3-4/29. A leaf is missing between fols. 1 and 2. Fol. 2 is bound wrongly, so that the original recto is now the verso. It contains 'alienigena ... nec dum [sic]': Green 1963, 6/25-8/18. Fol. 3 is contiguous with fol. 2 and contains 'habetur quomodo ... utendum': Green 1963, 7/24-10/19. Between 90 and 100 leaves are probably missing between fols. 3 and 4, since fol. 4 contains the very end of the text, 'frustra ... disserui': Green 1963, 168/12-169/23. It is not clear where the leaves now bound with Cotton Vespasian E. iv came in the original manuscript, or indeed that fols. 203-10 were all part of this original manuscript. However, given the usual position of the relevant *retractio* in such manuscripts, it seems likely Cotton Vespasian E. iv, fol. 203 once preceded Cotton Appendix 56 fol. 1. The original manuscript also seems to have contained Anselm, *Cur deus homo*, as fol. 207v attests. There is a *schema* outlining the different divisions of *doctrina* on Cotton Vespasian E. iv, fol. 203r, which strongly suggests the manuscript is closely related to London, British Library, Royal 5 B. xii, fols. 4-165 (s. xii¹, Rochester), which also contains this *schema* (headed 'DIVISIONES BEATI AUGUSTINI IN LIBRO DE DOCTRINA CRISTIANA') and the relevant *retractio* (fol. 4rv).

¹⁴⁹ Printed McIntyre 1978, 259.

¹⁵⁰ Clover and Gibson 1979, no. 49 (pp. 154-61).

¹⁵¹ Clover and Gibson 1979, no. 13 (pp. 80-3).

¹⁵² Clover and Gibson 1979, no. 12 (pp. 78-81).

¹⁵³ This treatise is also partly transmitted in *Anselmi ep.* no. 97.

¹⁵⁴ Printed McIntyre 1978, 235-6.

¹⁵⁵ Printed McIntyre 1978, 236.

¹⁵⁶ J-W 5911.

¹⁵⁷ J-W 5637.

Vespasian E. iv, fol. 209v: Paschal II to Osbern of Exeter (1099-1102), 'et patrum', forbidding the canons to prevent the burial of the monks of St Nicholas in a monastic cemetery. Complete copy of letter on fol. 207v.¹⁵⁸

Vespasian E. iv, fol. 210r: Paschal II to Anselm, 'tibi reverentissime'. Confirmation of Christ Church's privileges¹⁵⁹

Vespasian E. iv, fol. 210r: Paschal II to Anselm, 'de *presbiterorum* filiis', giving Anselm permission to consecrate the sons of priests and receive back into communion Richard of Ely.¹⁶⁰

Vespasian E. iv, fol. 210r: Anselm to Paschal II, 'non debeo tacere excellentiae', notifying Paschal that Henry has given up the investiture of churches.¹⁶¹

Vespasian E. iv, fol. 210v: Paschal II to William, archbishop of Rouen (28 Jan 1106), 'licet causae', asking him to receive Anselm hospitably.¹⁶²

Vespasian E. iv, fol. 210v: Paschal II to Anselm, 'quod anglici regis cor', rejoicing that Henry I has consented to obey the pope in the investiture crisis.¹⁶³

This is a formidable collection of letters concerning local, national and international events, showing a particular interest in the investiture crisis and its consequences. The letters from Thomas to Lanfranc and Lanfranc to Wulfstan and Peter of Chester are the two letters which Lanfranc had asked Wulfstan to keep in Worcester's archives. How Worcester acquired the text of Paschal's letter to Osbern, or even Pope Urban's letter to Manassus, is more obscure. What interest such letters held for the Worcester monks, beyond the mere accumulation of documents, is unclear. Though letters were being copied into pre-Conquest manuscripts at other houses – Christ Church¹⁶⁴ and Winchester,¹⁶⁵ for example – the Worcester monks show a remarkable enthusiasm for the practice.

The Norman Conquest reminded the literate of the importance of record keeping.

To fulfil this need, writers turned to the tried and trusted method of transcribing the records

¹⁵⁸ J-W 5911.

¹⁵⁹ *Anselmi ep.* no. 304.

¹⁶⁰ J-W 6152; *Anselmi ep.* no. 422.

¹⁶¹ *Anselmi ep.* no. 430.

¹⁶² J-W 6074.

¹⁶³ J-W 6073; *Anselmi Ep.* no. 397.

¹⁶⁴ Paschal II's 1103 letter to Anselm confirming the primacy (*Anselmi ep.* no. 303) was copied at the end of a late-tenth-century collection of patristic texts (Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 4. 27 (141), fol. 182v). The manuscript contains the work of Christ Church scribes, and was there in the later middle ages: James 1903, no. 60 (p. 154); Bishop 1971, xxv, 6.

¹⁶⁵ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 448, fols. 87-103, a miscellaneous booklet copied in Style I Anglo-Caroline Minuscule, bears on its last leaf (fol. 103v) the *incipit* of a letter of Henry of Blois, bishop of Winchester (1129-1171), to his archdeacon Richer (occ. before 1128). For the script, see Bishop 1971, 20n1; Dumville 1993, [55-]6n245. The copying of Fulk of Reims' letter to King Alfred into the 'Grimbald Gospels' (London, British Library, Additional 34890, fols. 158r-160v) in the late eleventh century is a special case. For its scribe, see Bishop 1955, 190-1.

into books. The variety of records kept is enormous, and dwarfs surviving Anglo-Saxon examples. Monks at Worcester and other houses obsessively transcribed letters, not minding who had sent the letters or why; it is no wonder that John of Salisbury was able to comment in the 1160s that he had found 'in church archives notes of memorable events which could be of help to any future writers who may appear'.¹⁶⁶ Elsewhere, obedientiaries took care to copy details of house observances, and business memoranda where they would be most secure, in either liturgical books or patristic manuscripts. Gospel books became the natural place to record a house's most treasured (or most contested) privileges, where Christ's everlasting sanction threatened malefactors. Those who transcribed the records were generally indifferent to the age of the books they used, except in the case where the use of an ancient or vernacular manuscript could give a stamp of authenticity to a document. We now turn to examine ancient Anglo-Saxon manuscripts which were venerated as relics after the Conquest.

¹⁶⁶ Chibnall 1956, 2.

CHAPTER VII: THE VENERATION OF PRE-CONQUEST MANUSCRIPTS

Like scraps of saints' clothing, manuscripts were venerated as secondary relics during the medieval period. Books also played key roles in the foundation myths of particular houses. There is plentiful evidence that the post-Conquest religious continued to venerate certain key insular manuscripts on account of their saintly associations, and promoted new legends concerning other books. It is clear that it was not 'unusual for a medieval writer [to] attach value to books because of their age and appearance'.¹ This chapter begins by examining the veneration of ancient books at Durham around the turn of the eleventh century, before evaluating evidence from other houses, including Malmesbury and Waltham. It suggests that some books which were venerated during the later Middle Ages, particularly Elmham's *Libri Augustini*, may have developed their reputation during the Anglo-Norman period. The second half of the chapter examines one particular venerable book, the Durham *Liber vitae*, and contextualises the decision to resume using this ancient book within the politics of the relationship between the Durham monks and their bishop at the end of the eleventh century.

POST-CONQUEST ATTITUDES TO ANCIENT MANUSCRIPTS

Symeon of Durham's *Libellus de exordio* is particularly notable for its persistent attention to Durham's pre-Conquest books. It is likely the work is representative of the communal mentality of the monks, rather than Symeon's personal interests. While recounting the tortuous wanderings of the Community of St Cuthbert, Symeon tells us that Bishop Eardwulf of Lindisfarne (854-883) and Abbot Ealdred of Carlisle decided to move

¹ Emms 2006, 26.

Cuthbert's body to Ireland (*LDE* ii. 11).² They set out along the River Derwent (which flows into the Irish Sea at Workington), but an enormous storm blew up to prevent the departure of Cuthbert's body. Three huge waves turned into blood,³ and 'the ship turned on its side, and a gospel book ornamented with gold and gems fell down and was carried down to the depths of the sea'. Symeon subsequently recounts its miraculous recovery. St Cuthbert appeared to one Hunred and ordered him to look for the book at Whithorn in Wigtownshire, along with a bridle that would help a horse to pull a cart bearing his body (*LDE* ii. 12). Whithorn is some fifty miles west of Workington, across the Solway Firth. When Hunred arrived, the sea receded three miles further than normal and he recovered the book. It 'retained its enrichment of gems and gold on the outside, as on the inside it showed the former beauty of its letters and pages, as if it had not been touched by the water at all'. Hunred then found the bridle. Symeon recounts what he knew of the history of this gospel book:

Now the aforementioned book is today preserved in this church which has merited to have the body of that same holy father, and in it (as we have said) there is no sign that it has been harmed by the water. This circumstance is believed certainly to be due to the merits of St Cuthbert himself and also of those who had been the makers of the book, that is: Bishop Eadfrith of venerable memory, who wrote it with his own hand in honour of St Cuthbert; his own successor, the venerable Æthelwald, who ordered it to be adorned with gold and gems; and also St Billfrith the Anchorite, who executed Æthelwald's wishes and commands with a craftsman's hand, producing an outstanding piece of work. For he was distinguished in the goldsmith's art. These men, who were all fervent in their love of the confessor and bishop beloved of God, left in this work something through which all those who come after them may appreciate their devotion towards the saint (*LDE* ii. 12).

These details make it clear that the book in question is the famous 'Lindisfarne Gospels'.⁴ It is probable that Symeon drew most of his information from the vernacular colophon which Aldred added to the Gospels in the tenth century, though there are some discrepancies

² Symeon's source for his account of the loss of the book (and the body) is the *Liber de translationibus et miraculis Sancti Cuthberti* (Miracle no. 2, *SMO* i. 234-7; below n8), but this text does not give an account of the book's recovery.

³ Thanks to God, Moses was able to turn river water into blood to show the Israelites the truth of his message (Ex IV.9).

⁴ London, British Library, Cotton Nero D. iv (687x689, Lindisfarne): Kendrick 1956.

between the two accounts.⁵ Most significantly, Symeon states that Æthelwald ordered Billfrith to ornament the binding, while Aldred (who uses the obscure phrase *gīðryde 7 gibelde*) apparently believed that Æthelwald had bound the gospels, and Billfrith, independently, decorated this binding. Symeon also adds the information that Eadfrith wrote the volume in his own hand. He does not mention Aldred's gloss. Later in the *Libellus*, Symeon describes the attempts of Alfred Westou to locate the relics of Billfrith (*LDE* iii. 7).

Symeon also mentions 'a book which is still preserved in this church and which was one from which Cuthbert learned under Boisil's instruction' (*LDE* i. 3)⁶ and finds it 'a wonderful thing that after so many years it retains its original newness and elegance' (*prisca nouitate ac decore*, *LDE* i. 3). The book in question cannot now be identified, though a 'liber s[an]c[t]i Boysili Magistri Sancti Cuthberti' appears in a fourteenth-century relic list.⁷ Moreover, according to the *Liber de translationibus et miraculis Sancti Cuthberti*,⁸ Ranulf Flambard proudly displayed Boisil's copy of the gospels during his only sermon to the Durham monks, preached at Cuthbert's translation in 1104 (Miracle no. 20, *SMO* ii. 361).⁹ The sermon was so dire that the monks were grateful a rain shower cut it short (Miracle no. 18, *SMO* i. 260).

The Durham monks encountered an ancient gospel book at firsthand when the tomb of St Cuthbert was opened. This manuscript was the famous 'Stonyhurst Gospel',¹⁰ which has a thirteenth- or fourteenth century inscription 'Ewangelium Iohannis quod inuentum fuerat | ad capud beati patris nostri Cuth|berti in sepulchro iacens Anno

⁵ See, most recently, Brown 2003, 110-4; Roberts 2006, esp. 37-8. Aldred's colophon is on fol. 259r.

⁶ In his prose *Vita sancti Cuthberti*, Bede states that, during the last seven days of his life, Boisil taught Cuthbert from a copy of John's Gospel in 'quaterniones septem': Colgrave 1940, cap. 8 (pp. 180-5).

⁷ Fowler 1898-1900, ii. 426.

⁸ *SMO* i. 229-61, ii. 333-62. For the transmission, see Colgrave 1950; Aird 1992. I follow Colgrave's numeration of the miracles here.

⁹ It should be noted that Miracle no. 18 (*SMO* i. 247-61) makes no mention of Ranulf's use of a gospel book in his sermon.

¹⁰ London, British Library, Loan 74 (s. vii/viii): Brown 1969b.

'Translacionis ipsius' (fol. iii^v).¹¹ Though Reginald of Durham does not mention the discovery of a gospel book in his account of the translation, the *Liber de translationibus et miraculis* records that the monks saw a gospel book lying at the head on the board (Miracle no. 20, *SMO* ii. 361). While it only contains John, the Stonyhurst Gospel is probably this book and may in fact be the gospel book displayed by Flambard during his sermon.¹²

During the Anglo-Norman period, Durham arguably possessed more ancient manuscripts than any other house in England. Whether all these manuscripts had been carefully guarded by the Community of St Cuthbert through two centuries of wanderings, or whether some were acquired later through a specific initiative awaits study. Not all these ancient manuscripts appear to have been venerated. Both the Stonyhurst Gospel of St John and the Lindisfarne Gospels are in immaculate condition, which may have been a necessary characteristic of a venerated manuscript. Manuscripts in poor condition and containing scribbles and pentrials are unlikely to have been venerated. For example, the fragmentary 'Durham Gospels' have the plain pressmark and description 'C Ewangelia iohannis marci et luce non glo[sata] de le splendement' (fol. 2r) in hand of Thomas Swalwell (d. 1539), chancellor of Durham.¹³ Though a poem praising King Æthelstan was copied into the gospel book during the tenth century (fol. 31v), the position of the poem (in the lower margin) suggests it was an occasional addition rather than an 'act of *pietas*', for which a blank leaf preceding one of the gospels would have been more appropriate.¹⁴ Moreover, the surviving leaves also contain many crude attempts to imitate the original script. Pentrials in this hand

¹¹ The removal of a piece of parchment which had been pasted to the top of the first leaf (fol. 1r) revealed an erased twelfth-century inscription, which is identical except for the spelling of Cuthbert's name (*Chutberti*) and in having *iacentis* for *iacens*.

¹² Brown 1969b, 2-5. For a different view, see Mynors 1956, 359-60.

¹³ Durham, Cathedral Library, A. II. 17, fols. 2-102: Verey, Brown et al. 1980.

¹⁴ For the addition of the poem as an 'act of *pietas*', see Lapidge *apud* Verey, Brown et al. 1980, 35.

refer to Aldred, bishop of Chester-Le-Street (d. 968).¹⁵ The ‘Uncial Leaves’, fragments of another early Northumbrian gospel book, now bound with the Durham Gospels,¹⁶ also contain pentrics in this ugly hand, suggesting that these leaves were abused on account of their obscurity rather than venerated for their antiquity. Likewise, the minor post-Conquest scribbling in the ‘Durham Ritual’, a collectar supplemented by Aldred during the second half of the tenth century, gives us no reason to think this volume was venerated during the Anglo-Norman period.¹⁷

Nonetheless, the Durham monks may have begun to associate certain ancient books with Bede during the Anglo-Norman period, even though they were imperfect. Bede’s saintliness is implicit in Elfred Westou’s acquisition of his relics during the mid-eleventh century (*LDE* iii. 7), and in Wulfstan’s dedication of a church to him (*VW* i. 14), though his cult was surprisingly limited. The 1391 *spendement* catalogue includes three items which are described as ‘de manu Bedae’ and two of these can be identified with surviving manuscripts.¹⁸ None of these can be accepted as being in Bede’s hand, but the desire to associate ancient manuscripts with Wearmouth-Jarrow’s most famous monk is typical of the cultural attitudes we have identified at Durham.¹⁹ It may be that the manuscripts mentioned in the 1391 catalogue began to be associated with Bede’s name as a result of the acquisition of Bede’s relics, or attempts to defend Durham’s legitimate possession of those relics.

¹⁵ Verey, Brown et al. 1980, 35. See Keefer 1997.

¹⁶ Durham, Cathedral Library, A. II. 17, fols. 103-111. Despite the strong arguments to the contrary, it does not seem possible to dismiss the possibility that the two sets of fragments were bound together as an act of conservation sometime during the Middle Ages: Verey, Brown et al. 1980, 63.

¹⁷ Durham, Cathedral Library, A. IV. 19: Brown 1969a. The scribbles include *bloetsa drihtin* (fol. 47v/7, left hand margin), copied from a gloss, and the Norman name *Ricardus* (fol. 78r, bottom margin). However, the incipits of psalms LV and LXX were changed from the *Gallicanum* to the *Romanum* text during the twelfth century, suggesting the collectar retained some liturgical function.

¹⁸ Botfield 1838, 16, 18 (cf. 92, 93). See also James 1935, 235-6.

¹⁹ Both Malcolm Parkes and Paul Meyvaert have considered the possibility that Bede was ‘Hand D’ of the ‘Leningrad Bede’ (above 89): Parkes 1982, 27n45. For arguments that Bede’s scholarship underlies emendations made in the ‘Offa Bible’ (above 156), and that these emendations may be in Bede’s own hand, see Marsden 1998b.

The three surviving books alleged to be *de manu Bedae* are eighth-century. Two are biblical commentaries, the other is a gospel book. The gospel book was apparently written in three stages:²⁰ part one is in eighth-century uncial (fols. 1-23, 34-86, 102 and the Pepys fragment);²¹ part two is in eighth-century insular majuscule (fols. 24-33 and 87-101);²² and part three, John's gospel, is in late-eighth-century insular majuscule (fols. 103-34).²³ The first two parts derive from an Echternach-type text, but John's gospel is related to the Codex Amiatinus. Additions to the gospel book include the purported bull of Gregory VII granting William of St Carilef permission to monasticise the chapter,²⁴ a document of 1127 in which the Bishop of St Andrews promised not to extract customary dues from Durham's church at Coldingham,²⁵ and a version of Thomas of York's spurious confirmation of Durham's privileges.²⁶ The two spurious documents seem to have been forged as a result of tensions between the monks and Bishop Hugh de Puiset (1153-1195).²⁷ A pre-existing association with Bede may have made the monks more likely to choose this gospel book as a repository for the records. However, the manuscript was already imperfect when it was described in the 1391 *spendement* catalogue as 'quatuor evangelia, de manu Bedae. II fo. 'Baptizatus'',²⁸ and it is not clear which section, and style of script, the compiler of the catalogue believed to be Bede's.

²⁰ Durham, Cathedral Library, A. II. 16 + Cambridge, Magdalene College, Pepys 2981 (18): *New Pal Soc* I, pls. 54-6 (fols. 12r, 28r, 121r), Mynors 1939, no. 7 and pls. 5(a), (b), 6, 7 (fols. 37r, 34v, 91r, 125v); Story 1993. For the text see Verey 1999. I have not seen this manuscript.

²¹ Lowe 1972, no. 148a.

²² Lowe 1972, no. 148b.

²³ Lowe 1972, no. 148c.

²⁴ Fol. 101v; printed Holtzmann 1930, ii. 132-6.

²⁵ For the history of Coldingham, see Cowan and Eason 1976, 55-8.

²⁶ Printed Burton 1988, no. 3 (not from this manuscript).

²⁷ Bates 1994.

²⁸ Botfield 1838, 16.

The second surviving manuscript is a glossed copy of the *Epistolae Pauli* produced during the first half of the eighth century.²⁹ The script is cursive insular minuscule. At least twenty-three leaves have been lost from the beginning of the manuscript. A small piece of parchment now pasted to the first of the London leaves (fol. 85r) bears the late medieval title: 'L Epistolae pauli de manu bede'. It was probably originally attached to the end board. The 1391 *spendement* catalogue contains two entries referring to glossed copies of Paul's letters 'K Epistolae Pauli glo de manu bedae II fo. Paulus' and 'L Epistolae Pauli glo de manu bedae II fo. et post'. Ours is the second, as the late medieval title makes clear.

One further Durham manuscript has an inscription associating it with Bede. This is a one-volume abbreviation of Cassiodorus's commentary on the psalms, produced in the second quarter of the eighth century.³⁰ The inscription reads 'E Cassiodorus super psalterium de manu Bede' (fol. 1v). The manuscript is not identifiable in the 1391 *spendement* catalogue. Three supply-leaves were introduced in the twelfth century (fols. 3, 4, 265), and some small repairs were made to the original leaves. These repairs may have been intended to ensure the manuscript was in appropriate condition for veneration as a relic, or to produce a working copy of the text that could be read. If the leaves were intended to produce a working copy, the association with Bede may not have developed until later. Finally, there is an outside possibility that the forgery of the colophon 'Beda famulus Christi indignus' at the end of the 'Leningrad Bede' should be seen as an attempt to associate the manuscript more closely with Bede, and to provide a counter or companion to Durham's manuscripts in Bede's own hand.³¹

²⁹ Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 10. 5 (216) + London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius C. viii, fols. 85-90: Bishop 1964. The London folios were the last five leaves of the original manuscript.

³⁰ Durham, Cathedral Library, B. II. 30: Bailey 1978. I have not seen this manuscript.

³¹ St Petersburg (Leningrad), Russian National Library, Q. v. I. 18, fol. 161r: Arngart 1952. On the forgery, see Meyvaert 1961, 285.

The books which the Durham monks believed to be in Bede's hand are an interesting group, written in a variety of scripts, and, unlike the Lindisfarne and Stonyhurst Gospels, often in very imperfect condition. They were stored in the Spendement in 1391, with 'the more old-fashioned books',³² which may suggest they were no longer actively venerated as relics, although their associations were still known. It is thus quite likely that they became connected with Bede during the Anglo-Norman period.

Durham is unusual because the evidence that books were venerated comes from its historians, library catalogues, and the surviving books themselves. For other houses, the evidence is more uneven. In his life of St Aldhelm, William of Malmesbury narrates a miracle in which some sailors attempted to sell a bible to Aldhelm at an exorbitantly high price (*GP* v. 224). Aldhelm balked at the amount and the sailors departed, only for Aldhelm to rescue them from a storm. Aldhelm then bought the pandect for a fitting price and they departed. William states the bible could 'still be seen at *Meldunum*, with all the signs of venerable antiquity on it'. Similarly, the twelfth-century canons of Waltham claimed to possess 'a book called the Black Book, a text of the Gospels such as we can scarcely overvalue, [which] to this day the church at Waltham holds ... in honour because of the many miracles which we ourselves have witnessed with our own eyes'.³³ The Black Book had been discovered along with a bell and two crosses at Montacute in Somerset during the reign of Cnut after their location had been divulged to a local thegn in a vision, a discovery which prompted the foundation of the secular college at Waltham. The book itself does not survive, and there is no way of knowing how old it actually was.³⁴ The survival of the Black Book at Waltham

³² Piper 1978, 220.

³³ Watkiss and Chibnall 1994, 11.

³⁴ It appears in the early-thirteenth-century relic list as the 'liber ... qui inuentus fuerat cum ipsa cruce qui et nigra dicitur, pro eo quod littera et parcamenum uilissima sint et antiquissima': Rogers 1992, 175. London, British Library, Harley 3766, fol. 18v, compiled shortly after 1345, carries the colophon 'Explicit liber qui

during the later Middle Ages, in whatever form, provides an interesting counterpoint to the immediate and convenient destruction which befell many such miraculous discoveries.³⁵

For St Augustine's, Thomas of Elmham's vivid description of the manuscripts which the fifteenth-century monks believed to have belonged to their founder hints at which books may already been considered venerable during the Anglo-Norman period:³⁶

In primis, habetur in librario 'Biblia Gregoriana', in duobus voluminibus, quorum primum habet rubricam in primo folio 'De Capitulis Libri Geneseos'. Secundum volumen incipit a 'Prologo beati Ieronimi super Ysaïam prophetam'. In principio vero librorum, in eisdem voluminibus, inseruntur quaedam folia, quorum aliqua purpurei, aliqua rosei sunt coloris; quae contra lucem extensa mirabilem reflexionem ostendunt.

Habetur etiam in eodem librario 'Psalterium Augustini' quod sibi misit idem Gregorius [...]

In vestario etiam habetur 'Textus Evangeliorum' in cuius principio x. canones annotantur; et vocatur 'Textus sanctae Mildredae', eo quod quidam rusticus in Thaneto, super eundem textum falsum iurans, oculos amittere perhibetur.

Est etiam aliud 'Psalterium' supra tabulam magni altaris positum; quod habet exterius imaginem Christi argenteam planam, cum quatuor Evangelistis [...]

Item in librario habetur alius textus Evangeliorum, in quo x. canones praeponuntur, cum prologo, qui sic incipit, 'Prologus Canonum'.

Item super tabulam magni altaris ponitur liber cum imagine Christi erecta, argentea et dextra benedicente; in quo continentur, 'Conflictus apostolorum Petri et Pauli cum Simone Mago, et Passio eorundem. Item Passio sancti Andreae apostoli. Item Passio sancti Jacobi, Passio sancti Thomae apostoli, Passio sancti Bartholomaei apostoli, Passio sancti Matthaei apostoli et evangelistae, Passio sanctorum apostolorum Simonis et Judae; vita sancti Johannis apostoli et evangelistae.'

Item est et alius liber positus super eandem tabulam magni altaris, qui habet exterius imaginem divinae majestatis argenteam, deauratam, cum lapidibus crystalinis et beryllis per circuitum positis; in quo continentur 'Passionarium Sanctorum', incipiens a sancto Apollinare, et finiens in passione sanctorum martyrum Simplicii, Faustini, et Beatrix.

Item super eandem tabulam ad magnum altare ponitur liber, cuius exterior apparatus habet unum magnum beryllum in medio, cum pluribus aliis lapidibus crystalinis ex omni parte; in quo continentur, 'Expositio super epistolas et evangelia a Dominica iii. post octavas Paschae usque ad Dominicam iv. post octavas Pentecostes'. Et haec sunt primitiae librorum totius ecclesiae Anglicanae.

Three of these volumes have been identified with surviving manuscripts. The 'alius textus evangeliorum' is probably the Cambridge-London gospels, since both Cotton and Parker reported an association with Augustine, apparently independently.³⁷ The 'aliud psalterium' is

intitulatur liber niger qui fuit inuentus | cum cruce magna de Waltham *sancte crucis*'. The text, which begins imperfectly (fol. 1r), consists of excerpts pertaining to the cult of the cross, and the lives of the evangelists and of other saints.

³⁵ For example, the mysterious volume concerning St Alban allegedly discovered at *Verulamium* during the abbacy of Eadmer (*GASA* 26-8).

³⁶ Hardwick 1858, 96-99. For commentary and translation, see James 1903, lxiii-lxvii.

³⁷ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 197B + London, British Library, Cotton Otho C. v + Royal 7 C. xii, fols. 2 and 3; Budny 1997, i. 57-8.

almost certainly the ‘Vespasian Psalter’,³⁸ though it is notable that Elmham ignores the eleventh-century additions in his description.³⁹ Finally, the ‘textus sanctae Mildredae’ may be the so-called ‘Gospels of St Augustine’, an Italian gospel book that may actually be contemporary with Gregory the Great.⁴⁰ It is notable that a miracle is recorded in association with it. Both the Vespasian Psalter and the Gospels of St Augustine are written in uncials, but the Cambridge-London Gospels are written in insular majuscule. It is arguable that the association with Augustine may go back to the immediate post-Conquest period, when house tradition would have preserved some knowledge of the kind of scripts practised immediately after the conversion and when Augustine’s cult was being vigorously promoted.⁴¹ The other manuscripts do not survive or have yet to be identified.⁴² Moreover, Elmham later mentions the ‘Textus Sancti Adriani’, a gospel book containing charters and memoranda that survived at St Augustine’s into the later middle ages.⁴³

Several books from Worcester also contain inscriptions which also associate them with saints, and which may suggest they were considered minor relics. The first leaf of the ‘Portiforium of St Wulfstan’ is inscribed in red letters ‘liber sancte marie Wygornensis per sanctum Oswaldum’.⁴⁴ Given the inclusion of several hymns to St Oswald, as well as his prominent place in the litany, the association seems rather absurd to our eyes. However, the Portiforium was extensively overhauled during the late eleventh century, and subsequent readers may have assumed the references to St Oswald were added during this refurbishment. The ninth-century continental collection of canons, Hatton 42, may be

³⁸ London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian A. i: Wright and Campbell 1967, 37-41. For arguments against the identification, see Kuhn 1948, 599-602; Kuhn 1957, 358-62.

³⁹ For these additions, see above 96.

⁴⁰ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 286. Mildred Budny has made this identification repeatedly, but has never given any evidence: Budny 1991, 1; Budny 1997, i. 11; Budny 1999, 252.

⁴¹ For Augustine’s cult, see Sharpe 1995.

⁴² On the ‘Biblia Gregoriana’, see Budny 1999.

⁴³ Hardwick 1858, 237-8. For discussion, see Kelly 1995, xxxvi-vii.

⁴⁴ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 391, p. 1.

another example. The inscription on the spine, now read as ‘LIBER S. WUFSANI’, is usually assigned to the twelfth century.⁴⁵ Though Hatton 42 contains the hand of Archbishop Wulfstan,⁴⁶ the most likely identification of this St Wufsan is with Wulfstan, bishop of Worcester. It is possible Hatton 42 was being venerated for its supposed association with him before his canonisation in 1203.⁴⁷

Finally, sixteenth-century antiquarians associated several surviving pre-Conquest manuscripts with ancient figures, associations which may conceivably rest on genuine medieval tradition. For example, an inscription at the beginning of the ‘Classbook of St Dunstan’ reads ‘pictura et scriptura huius pagine subtus | uisa est.’ de propria manu *sancti* dunstani’.⁴⁸ The script of the inscription is very artificial, and may be the work of a later scribe imitating an earlier hand.⁴⁹ It is now accepted that this manuscript contains the hand of St Dunstan.⁵⁰ Likewise, the Parkerian inscription – ‘hoc Psalterium laminis argenteis deauratis et gemmis ornatum, quondam fuit N. Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi, tandem uenit in manus Thomæ Becket quondam Cantuariensis archiepiscopi quod testatum est in veteri scripto’ – which associates a tenth-century Gallican psalter with Canterbury may rest on genuine medieval tradition.⁵¹ If .N. is the first letter of an archbishop’s given name, then Nothelm (735-739) must be meant, though it is questionable what feature of Nothelm’s biography prompted the monks to venerate a psalter for its supposed association with him.⁵²

⁴⁵ Barker-Benfield 1993.

⁴⁶ Ker 1971, 328-30.

⁴⁷ For the development of Wulfstan’s cult, see Mason 1990, 254-85.

⁴⁸ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct F. 4. 32, fol. 1r: Hunt 1961.

⁴⁹ ‘It seems to me ... probably of the early 16th century ... In 1508 the old controversy between the two houses [Christ Church and Glastonbury] over their claims to the possession of the body of St Dunstan broke out afresh. I would put forward the suggestion that it was about this time that the surviving quire of Eutyches was joined to parts II and III-IV as a relic of St Dunstan and that inscription was added on fol. 1’: Hunt 1961, xv.

⁵⁰ See, most recently, Budny 1992.

⁵¹ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 411, fol. 140v.

⁵² Nothelm was a correspondent of Bede, sending him information from Albinus, abbot of St Augustine’s, about the early history of Kent, transcripts of papal letters gathered on a visit to Rome during the papacy of Gregory II (715-731), and the questions which underlie Bede’s *In regum librum XXX quaestiones*. He received a

Alternatively, Parker may have misunderstood a generic donation inscription or even an instruction in a liturgical *ordo* in which .N. stood for *nomen*.

Some pre-Conquest books were cherished for their supposed association with notable figures after 1066. A number – like the Lindisfarne Gospels – were venerated as relics. Many featured in miracle stories and were a testament to the antiquity of a foundation, such as the *libri Augustini* described by Elmham. Others were cherished for their association with notable Anglo-Saxons, like the books *de manu Bedae* at Durham. Some cherished manuscripts were actively used to promote the interests of the community. It is to these books we now turn.

VENERATION IN PRACTICE: THE DURHAM *LIBER VITAE*

Sometimes the veneration of ancient books found a practical outlet, and the ancient books in question were treated not as inviolate objects that demanded preservation, but as working manuscripts that could be used by the community. This is the case with the Durham *Liber vitae*,⁵³ a list of members of the Community of St Cuthbert and their allies to whom prayer was due, begun between 800 and 840 and sporadically maintained during the pre-Conquest period, but only resumed wholeheartedly after 1066.⁵⁴ The *Liber vitae* is a very complicated manuscript, and was the subject of a recent project, just completed, which has provided a digital facsimile, description and edition of the manuscript, as well as full linguistic and

pallium in 736, which may also have recommended him to subsequent members of the Christ Church community.

⁵³ London, British Library, Cotton Domitian vii: *Pal. Soc.* i. 238, Thompson 1923; Mynors 1939, no. 13; Ker 1957, no. 147; Watson 1979, no. 527 and pl. 7.

⁵⁴ Only one other pre-Conquest *Liber vitae* survives: London, British Library, Stowe 944 (1031, Winchester NM). See also London, British Library, Additional 40000, fols. 1-12 (s. xi/xii, Thorney) and, in general, Geuenich 2004.

prosopographical commentaries.⁵⁵ I begin by summarising the basic structure of the manuscript:⁵⁶

Part I (fols. 4-14): originally a quire of twelve, but now lacking the first leaf. Contains extracts from the Gospels, s. xii^{med} or xii^{3/4}.

Part II (fols. 15-45): the main core of the *Liber vitae*.

Part III (fols. 46-55): six leaves of insular parchment (fols. 46, 51-55), noticeably thinner than in Part II; one leaf of insular parchment like Part II (fol. 47); and one bifolium added during the twelfth century (fols. 48-9). Fol. 47 may formerly have belonged with Part II.

Part IV (fols. 56-83*): added leaves; the oldest group, fols. 56-61, was added during the late twelfth century.

According to the most recent description of the manuscript, a substantial number of leaves were removed during the mid-twelfth century, when the *Liber Vitae* was divided into two volumes, the first of which contained the Original Core (Part II) and the newly-produced gospel extracts (Part I).⁵⁷ Our focus here must be on the additions to Parts II and III. I begin with the former, printing original contents in bold typeface and additions in plain typeface:⁵⁸

Fols. 15rv	‘Nomina regum uel ducum’.
15r2	Name of King Æthelstan entered at top of page (s. x ¹ , 924x929).
15v2	Names of Godwine, earl of Wessex (d. 1053) and Tosti, earl of Northumbria (d. 1066) entered in gold (s. xi ²). Erased after s. xii ⁱⁿ .
15v3	Names, including kings of England and Scotland (s. xii ⁱⁿ , 1100x1107). Same scribe as 15v4 and 46v1.
15v4	List of entourage of King Æthelstan (924-939), perhaps copied from a lost charter issued during his visit to the North in 927 (s. xii ⁱⁿ).
15v5	Name of King Alexander of Scotland (s. xii ¹ , 1107x1124). Same scribe as Durham, University Library, Cosin V. II. 6, the earliest extant copy of the <i>Libellus de exordio</i> .
15v6-10	Lists of names (s. xii ¹).
Fols. 16r-17v	‘Nomina reginarum et abbatissarum’.
17v2-30:	Lists of names, both male and female (s. xii ⁱⁿ -xii ¹). 17v2 and 17v3 are in the same hand.
Fol. 18r	‘Nomina anchoritarum’.
Fol. 18v-19r	‘Nomina abbatum gradus presbyteratus’.
19r2	‘Ægeluui presbiter’, perhaps in continuation of the original list (s. xi/xii).
19r3	Lists of Bishops of Lindisfarne and Archbishops of York (s. xii ⁱⁿ , 1108x1114).

⁵⁵ Rollason 2004; Rollason and Rollason 2007. The latter only appeared very recently and I have been unable to consult it as fully as I would wish.

⁵⁶ The (pencil) foliation now in use is three, then four, ahead of the old foliation: hence fol. 12 in the old foliation is fol. 15 in the new foliation; fol. 42 is fol. 45, fol. 42+ is fol. 46, fol. 43 is fol. 47, and thereafter the foliations are four apart. My reconstruction is heavily indebted to Gullick 2004. Fols. 4-14 are not reproduced in Thomson’s facsimile. For the script, see Gullick 2004, pl. 8 (fol. 9r).

⁵⁷ Rollason and Rollason 2007, i. 20-1.

⁵⁸ I have followed the division of stints and datings adopted in Rollason and Rollason 2007. I have excluded all stints dated s. xii² or later, as well as stints dated s. xii (except those on fol. 51rv, which, despite the dating given, must be earlier than s. xii^{med}).

19r4	List of four names (s. xii ¹), headed by Roger of Mowbray, who inherited the Honour of Mowbray from his father (d. 1129).
Fol. 19v	'Nomina abbatum gradus diaconatus'.
19v2	'ÆDRED diaconus' (s. x or xi), perhaps in continuation of the original list.
19v3-12	Lists of names (s. xii ¹ -xii ^{med}).
Fols. 20r-21r	'Nomina abbatum'.
20v2	'Ælfred abba. Ælfwald abba' (s. x or xi), perhaps in continuation of the original list.
20v3	List of names (s. xi/xii)
Fols. 21v-25r	'Nomina praesbyterorum'.
23v2	Four names (s. xii ¹).
23v3	Eight names (s. xii ^{med}).
24r2	'Ulfstan presbyter. Æðelstan presbyter' (s. xi ¹).
24r3	'Afun presbyter. Auun presbyter. Oðelrig presbyter' (s. xi ¹).
24v2-3	Two pairs of names of priests (s. x).
24v4	'Hermer. presbyter' (s. xi/xii).
24v5	'Ælfwine presbyter' (s. xi/xii).
24v6	54 names of monks of Evesham (s. xii ⁱⁿ).
24v7	Two names, perhaps additions to the list of Evesham monks (s. xii ⁱⁿ).
25r1	Names of Wulfstan and Samson, bishops of Worcester (s. xi/xii, 1095x1112). Same scribe as 25r2.
25r2	62 names of Worcester monks (s. xi/xii, 1095x1112).
25r3	Two further names, perhaps monks of Worcester (s. xii ⁱⁿ).
25r4	Three names (s. xii ¹).
25v1	Names of William Bona Anima (1079-1110) and Geoffrey Bret (1111-1128), archbishops of Rouen, canons of Rouen and members of the archbishops' households (s. xii ⁱⁿ , ?1115). Written by Symeon.
25v2	List of three names (s. xii ¹).
25v3	List of names (s. xii ¹), including Robert de Bonneville and family.
25v4-16	Lists of names (s. xii ¹)
25v17	Posthumous entry for Peter de Humet, lord of Brancepath (Durh.) entered during reign of Henry I (s. xii ¹).
25v18-28	Lists of names (s. xii ¹).
25v29	Three names (s. xii ¹), the last being Hugh, abbot of Chertsey (1111-1128).
25v30	'Robertus' (s. xii ¹).
Fols. 26rv	'Nomina diaconorum'
26r2-3	Names of eight deacons (s. x ¹ -xi).
26r4-5	Lists of names (s. xi/xii-xii ¹).
Fols. 27r-36v	'Nomina clericorum'.
36r2	'Eadstan' (s. x or xi).
36r3	'Lefsi' (s. xi/xii).
36r4-5	Four names (s. xii ⁱⁿ).
36r6	Three names (s. xii ⁱⁿ) including 'Abbas Wido', probably Guy, abbot of Pershore (1088-1136/7).
36r7-13	Lists of names (s. xii ⁱⁿ).
36v1-8	Confraternity agreements (s. xi/xii or xii ⁱⁿ). 36v1-2 are in Symeon's hand.
Fol. 37r-45v	'Nomina monachorum'.
44v2	'Albinus monachus. et Adam monachus socius eius' (s. xi/xii).
45r2	Two names (s. xi/xii).
45r3	List of bishops and monks of Durham (s. xi/xii, 1099x1109). Written by the scribe William.
45r4	List of eight names, headed by William de Warelwast, bishop of Exeter (s. xii ¹ , 1107x1137).
45r5-8	Lists of names (s. xii ¹).
45r9	'GAUFRIDUS Dunhelmensis episcopus' (s. xii ² , 1133x1141).
45v1	Continuation of 45r3.

45v2-15 Names of Durham monks (s. xiiⁱⁿ-xii^{med}), apparently entered as they joined the community.

These are the additions to Part III (here pre-Conquest contents are printed in bold):

46r1-2	Lists of names (s. xii ⁱⁿ).
46r3	List of names (s. xii ⁱⁿ , 1107x1112), including Odalarin, schoolmaster of Rheims, Geoffrey, prior of St. Bénigne, Dijon, and Vitalis, monk of that monastery.
46r4	List of group of clerics, including Humphrey Bigod, royal chaplain and later canon of St Paul's (s. xii ⁱⁿ).
46r5-20	Lists of names (s. xii ⁱⁿ).
46v1	List of 44 names (s. xii ^l), including Fulcher, bishop of Lisieux (1101/2-1102), brother of Ranulf Flambard, and names perhaps copied from a list of Æthelstan's retinue on a visit to Chester-le-Street in 934.
46v2-41	Lists of names (s. xii ^l).
47r1	Parts of two manumissions (s. xi^{med}).
47r2-33	Lists of names (s. xi ^{ex} -xii ^l).
47v1:	Grant of land by Earl Thureth [S1660] (s. x^{ex}).
47v2	Grants of land by Earl Northman and Ulfcytel, son of Oswulf [S1659, S1661] (s. xiⁱⁿ).
47v3-18	Lists of names (s. xi/xii-xii ^l).
48r1	Partial and modified transcript of parts of damaged fol. 51 (s. xii ^{med}).
48v1	Continuation of 48r1.
51r1	Incomplete document in which a certain family took action against one Gosfrith, in relation to the estate of Dalton, Durh. (s. xii).
51r2-3	Lists of names (s. xii).
51r4	Writ of David I of Scotland to Edward, monk of Coldingham (s. xii ^{med}).
51r5	Charter of Bishop Robert of St Andrews (1127-1159) to Prior Algar (1109-?1138), renouncing any claim to Coldingham. Dated 17 July 1127 (s. xii ^l).
51r6	† Edwine munuc seruus dei et Sancti Cuðberhti sit nomen eius in libro uitae. †Eadmund munuc seruus dei et Sancti Cuðberhti sit nomen eius in libro uitae' (s. xi/xii).
51v1-38	Lists of names (s. xii ^l).
52r1	Confraternity agreement between William of St Carilef and Vitalis, abbot of Westminster (s. xi ² , 1083x1085).
52r2-4	Confraternity agreements (s. xi ^{ex}).
52v1-7	Confraternity agreements (s. xi ^{ex}).
53r1	General confirmation of William of St Calais (s. xii ^l).
53v1	Continuation of 53r1.
54r1	Continuation of 53v1.
54v1	Confirmation by William I of a grant of Welton (Yorks.); confirmation by William I of a grant of the appendages of Welton (Yorks.); memorandum of a grant of William II of Northallerton (s. xii ^l).
55r1	Continuation of 54v1.
55v1-46	Lists of names (s. xii ⁱⁿ -xii ^l). 55v1 is in the hand of the scribe of Durham, University Library, Cosin V. II. 6, the earliest extant copy of the <i>Libellus de exordio</i> ; 55v30 is in Symeon's hand.

Scattered entries suggest that names were occasionally added to the relevant leaves throughout the tenth and eleventh centuries (e. g. 15r2, 19r2, 24v2 etc), but this happened only rarely. The first major phase of additions seems to be the late-eleventh-century

confraternity agreements (52r1-4, 52v1-7). Then, around the turn of the eleventh century, there was a sudden increase in activity: additions include a list incorporating kings of England and Scotland (15v3),⁵⁹ the list of bishops of Lindisfarne and Archbishops of York (19r3), and the list of Durham monks (45r3).⁶⁰ The inclusion of a similar list of monks in the *Libellus de exordio*,⁶¹ and Symeon's responsibility for early additions (25v1, 36v1-2) both suggest that he was closely involved in the resumption of entries in the *Liber vitae*.⁶² This first phase of additions was swiftly followed by the additions of many hundreds of names, belonging to prominent magnates, lay people, and local, national and international religious. These additions seem to have been made wherever blank space was available, though it is evident that space was notionally blocked off for the continuation of the list of Durham monks (45v2-14). Later scribes were much less selective about where they added names, often using the first blank space they encountered.

Whatever the chronology, the central item is the list of Durham monks entered in order of profession in blank space at the end of the 'Nomina monachorum'.⁶³ The names were copied in four columns, breaking with the original three column format, presumably because of concerns about space. Nonetheless, the added fourth column is approximately the same width as the original columns, and the number of lines per page is the same. Appearance was obviously important. The list is in the hand of the scribe William, who wrote the third volume of a set of Augustine on the Psalms for William of St Carilef.⁶⁴

⁵⁹ This scribe also added two other lists of names (15v4, 46v1), which may derive from the witness lists of lost charters of Æthelstan: Barker 1978; Rollason and Rollason 2007, iii. 438. The witnesses must have been believed to be early benefactors of Durham.

⁶⁰ The lists of Evesham and Worcester monks (24v6, 25r2) must surely postdate the list of Durham monks.

⁶¹ Durham, University Library, Cosin V. II. 6, fols. 7r-8v: see Piper 1998.

⁶² For Symeon's activities as precentor, see above 36-7.

⁶³ Piper 2004, 117-18.

⁶⁴ Durham, Cathedral Library, B. II. 14, fols. 7-200. The colophon is printed by Rud 1825, 111. For other manuscripts and charters copied by William, see Bishop and Chaplais 1957, no. 9; Gullick 1990, 68-9.

Documents were first added to the *Liber vitae* before the Conquest, when their presence was restricted to just one leaf (47r1, 47v1-2).⁶⁵ As notifications rather than charters, none of these documents had any great legal weight; and it is likely that the *Liber vitae* was chosen because it provided a convenient place to ensure the preservation of the documents,⁶⁶ and enabled benefactors (and manumittors) to be remembered in the community's prayers. The earliest substantial post-Conquest additions were probably, as we have noted, the confraternity agreements (52r1-4, 52v1-7). Copying the agreements into the *Liber vitae* ensured that they would be honoured in perpetuity, and suggests that, until the records were recopied into the 'Durham Cantor's Book',⁶⁷ the *Liber vitae* was consulted when compiling the daily services. Subsequent additions were also intended to record and safeguard communal practices. This is most evident in the addition of William of St Carilef's spurious general confirmation of the properties belonging to the monks (53r1, 53v1, 54r1).⁶⁸ The *Liber vitae* could now also record royal donations (54v1),⁶⁹ and the hard-won rights of Durham over its properties (51r5).⁷⁰ In addition to providing the security of preservation, the copying of a record into the *Liber vitae* ensured Durham's benefactors would be remembered, and assured the monks that their rights would not be forgotten.

The reason the Durham monks resumed entering their names in the *Liber vitae* is not hard to find.⁷¹ Durham's importance for the control of the North and the Scottish borders led the Conqueror and Rufus to appoint powerful authoritarian men to the bishopric. After

⁶⁵ Manumissions printed Birch 1885, no. 1254. Documents printed Robertson 1956, nos. 60, 68.

⁶⁶ This may also be the reason why an inconsequential writ of David I of Scotland to Edward, monk of Coldingham (51r4) requesting him to replenish the royal log-pile at Berwick-upon-Tweed, was copied into the *Liber vitae* after the Conquest. The writ is printed Lawrie 1905, no. 174; Barrow 1999, no. 43.

⁶⁷ Durham, Cathedral Library, B. IV. 24, fol. 5r. For this manuscript, see Gullick 1994.

⁶⁸ Offler 1968, no. 3.

⁶⁹ The 'notices' of grants by William the Conqueror are printed Bates 1998, nos. 112, 113. The similar document of Rufus is printed Farrer and Clay 1914-1965, no. 931.

⁷⁰ The charter of Robert, bishop of St Andrews, in which he exempts Coldingham from all burdens, is unprinted. For discussion, see Barrow 1994, 316-8.

⁷¹ See now Rollason and Rollason 2007, i. 34-5.

the murder of Walcher in 1080, the Conqueror chose as his successor William of St Carilef, abbot of Le Mans, former prior and monk of St Calais and oblate of Bayeux.⁷² St Calais and Le Mans had been only fitfully under Norman control, and the expertise in secular politics he gained in these places probably recommended Carilef to the Conqueror as a reliable bishop of Durham. Carilef became an important royal servant, a ‘governmental factotum’,⁷³ witnessing many royal writs and charters, serving as a Domesday commissioner and perhaps even masterminding the whole project.⁷⁴ By 1083 Carilef had monasticised the cathedral church of St Mary and St Cuthbert, restaffing it with monks from the new foundations at Wearmouth and Jarrow and permitting only one secular canon (the dean) to take monastic vows and remain (*LDE* iv. 3).⁷⁵ Despite Symeon’s praise for his intelligence and eloquence, Carilef’s spiritual commitment to monasticism at Durham does not appear to have been great, though he took care of the monastery’s endowment.⁷⁶ His letter to the monks, prescribed weekly reading in chapter and incorporated in the *Libellus* (*LDE* iv. 6), is not an especially distinctive exhortation to the monastic ideal. Indeed, it has been questioned whether the bishop spent much time in Durham whatsoever, so busy was he with his administrative duties.⁷⁷ In the bishop’s absence, responsibility for the administration of the chapter fell upon the prior. When he founded the chapter, William appointed as prior Aldwin, former prior of Winchcombe and leader of the mission to refound Jarrow. Little is known of Aldwin’s time as prior.⁷⁸ When he died in 1087, the bishop appointed Turgot in

⁷² For William of St Carilef, see Offler 1946-53; Aird 1994a.

⁷³ Aird 1994a, 291.

⁷⁴ Chaplais 1987. Doubt has been cast on the importance of St Carilef by Lewis 1990.

⁷⁵ The accuracy of Symeon’s account has been questioned; see Aird 1998, 121-22.

⁷⁶ ‘Because he had a position of great familiarity with the king, he took pains always to guard and defend as far as he could the liberty of churches and monasteries’ (*LDE* iv. 1).

⁷⁷ Aird 1994a.

⁷⁸ See Rollason and Rollason 2007, iii. 129. Symeon’s description of Aldwin is disappointingly conventional: ‘he was distinguished in his contempt for the world, very humble in character and in mind, patient in adversity, modest in prosperity, sharp of mind, wise in counsel, grave in word and deed, a companion to the humble,

his place.⁷⁹ Turgot was a native of Lindsey (Lincs), who had been ill-treated by the Normans after the invasion. Captured and held hostage in Lincoln castle, Turgot escaped to Norway where he was patronised by King Olaf III (d. 1093). He returned to England, was shipwrecked, and was encouraged by Bishop Walcher to join Aldwin at Jarrow. He took monastic vows at Wearmouth in 1075. Turgot's importance at Durham is evident from his prominence in the miracles collected as the *Liber de translationibus et miraculis sancti Cuthberti*, and from the mortuary roll that was produced to mark his death in 1118.⁸⁰ With William of St Calais, he laid the foundation stone of the new cathedral in 1093 (being appointed archdeacon to mark the occasion)⁸¹ and masterminded the translation of St Cuthbert's relics in 1104. He was also notably close to Scottish royal family,⁸² composing a *vita* of Malcolm III's wife, Margaret of Scotland (d. 1093),⁸³ probably acquiring her gospel lectionary for the cathedral,⁸⁴ and encouraging the presence of Malcolm at the ceremony of 1093 and of his son, Alexander, at the Cuthbert's translation in 1104.⁸⁵ He was probably the man who commissioned Symeon to write the *Libellus de exordio*. When William of St Carilef was sent into exile for assisting Odo of Bayeux to encourage an invasion by Robert Curthose,⁸⁶ Turgot seems to have taken on the duties of bishop. This was very beneficial to the monks because Turgot, a monk himself, naturally favoured their interests.

burning with zeal for justice against those who were contumacious, desiring always heavenly things, and inspiring everyone he could to go along with him' (*LDE* iii. 21).

⁷⁹ For Turgot, see the *Historia Regum* s. a. 1074 (= *SMO* ii. 202-5), Foster 1907; Aird 1992.

⁸⁰ The roll now survives only in fragmentary form, as the flyleaves of London, British Library, Harley 491. See Harrison 2004.

⁸¹ It was an unusual honour to be both prior and archdeacon. See Brooke 1985. When Turgot became bishop of St Andrews, Ranulf determined that future archdeacons should be secular clerics.

⁸² On Durham's connections with the Scottish monarchy, see Aird 1994b; Barrow 1994.

⁸³ BHL no. 5325: printed Hinde 1868, 234-54. For discussion, see Baker 1978; Huneycutt 1989.

⁸⁴ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Lat. liturg. F. 5; see Gameson 1997; Rushforth 2007.

⁸⁵ Barrow 1994, 313, 316.

⁸⁶ The reasons for William's exile are recorded in the anonymous and partisan report of his trial, *De iniusta vexatione Willelmi episcopi*, see Offler 1951; Caenegem 1990, i. 90-106 (no. 134); Philpott 1994.

William of St Carilef died on 2 January 1096 at the king's court in Windsor. William's successor, Ranulf Flambard, was only appointed in 1099 after the see had been in royal custody for three years.⁸⁷ Ranulf's arrival was a shock to the monks, who had enjoyed the freedoms which resulted from an absentee bishop and Turgot's oversight. Ranulf's character and early conduct as bishop were arguably the main reason why the monks resumed entering their names in the *Liber vitae*. His appointment coincided with further changes in the secular organisation of Northumbria, with baronies created to replace the vast earldom of the Conqueror's reign.⁸⁸ Ranulf had been a very important figure in Rufus's administration, and was the architect of the king's hated scheme for profiting from episcopal and abbatial vacancies. The Winchester annalist records that in 1097, Flambard had sixteen vacant bishoprics and abbeys under his care, each yielding three or four hundred marks (c. £250) to the king.⁸⁹ Ranulf's career and fearsome reputation cannot have endeared him to the Durham monks, who feared he might secularise the chapter. He was equally unpopular with other English ecclesiastics, notably Anselm who petitioned Paschal II to declare Flambard's purchase of the bishopric simoniacal and uncanonical (*Anselmi epp.* nos. 214, 225). Anselm also complained about the indecent haste with which Ranulf had sought to force Turgot to take his episcopal seat at St Andrews (*Anselmi ep.* no. 442),⁹⁰ so he could replace him with Algar as prior and a secular cleric as archdeacon. Ranulf's attempt to remove their protector cannot have impressed the monks. Moreover, nepotism controlled Ranulf's ecclesiastical appointments and he used funds belonging to the monks to complete the building of the

⁸⁷ For Ranulf, see Southern 1970; Offler 1971; Prestwich 1994.

⁸⁸ Aird 1998, 193-94.

⁸⁹ *Annales Wintonenses* in Luard 1864, ii. 39.

⁹⁰ Turgot's career at St Andrews is not well-documented, but he received two papal letters from Paschal II concerning irregular customs in the Scottish church, which are printed Somerville 1982, nos. 2, 3. See also Bethell 1970.

cathedral. Only nearing death did he make amends for his mistreatment of the monks.⁹¹ Flambard's disregard for the monks and outright hostility to their traditions may have prompted them to resume entering their names in the *Liber vitae* to remind their bishop of the Community of St Cuthbert's illustrious pedigree.

The addition of *Ego Wilhelmus*, William of St Carilef's alleged confirmation of the monk's lands, to the *Liber vitae* during the early twelfth century suggests the *Liber vitae* came to represent the monks' interests against those of the bishop. By entering their names during the contentious episcopate of Ranulf Flambard, the monks confirmed themselves as the rightful heirs to the Community of St Cuthbert, whatever discontinuities the monasticisation of the chapter had caused, and committed themselves to maintaining the traditions of the earlier community. Their actions stressed their entitlement to Cuthbert's protection and support, and demonstrated that custodianship of the community's traditions lay with them and not with the bishop.

Manuscripts like the Durham *Liber vitae* made manifest to post-Conquest monks the antiquity of their foundations. Such manuscripts gave them the assurance that their traditions would remain three hundred years hence. Similarly, manuscripts like the Stonyhurst Gospel of St John, a secondary relic of St Cuthbert, and the Lindisfarne Gospels, which had survived under miraculous circumstances, reassured monks of the ongoing involvement of God and St Cuthbert in their evolving history. Each of St Augustine's Abbey's *libri Augustini* demonstrated their status as *fons et origo* of English Christianity, Waltham's Black Book was physical proof of the authenticity of its account of the cross found at Montacute, and Malmesbury's pandect evinced their antiquity and Aldhelm's

⁹¹ Offler 1968, nos. 24, 25. Both survive as original singlesheets, copied by Symeon.

sanctity. In these ways, pre-Conquest manuscripts played a vital role in the way religious communities defended their status during the Anglo-Norman period.

CHAPTER VIII: CONCLUSION: READING PRACTICES AND THE PLACE OF ENGLISH

When William the Bastard was crowned in 1066, William of Poitiers tells us that the Englishmen who were present ‘all shouted their joyful assent’:

But the men who, armed and mounted, had been placed as a guard round the minster, on hearing the loud clamour in an unknown tongue, thought that some treachery was afoot and rashly set fire to the houses near to the city (*GGWP* ii. 30).

It was hardly an auspicious start. For many years afterwards, most monastic chroniclers insisted that the Norman Conquest was a disaster for their country and way of life.¹ The ‘Peterborough Chronicle’ provides a retrospect of the Conqueror’s reign that is generally negative,² and is even more damning about Rufus.³ Things were so bad by 1135 that men used the darkness provided by an eclipse to rob each other.⁴ Yet, as this thesis has repeatedly shown, the traces left by post-Conquest readers of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts demonstrate that the Conquest did not sweep away insular literary culture, but made it more heterogenous and provided readers and writers with a new diversity of materials and approaches. I want to use this conclusion to summarise my findings and trace two main implications of my research – its consequences for how we understand medieval readers to have read, and its impact on our conception of the nature of ‘English Literature’ between 1066 and 1200 – as well as to highlight some important directions for future research.

¹ For a convenient summary, see Gillingham 1981, 59-60. Gillingham suggests five themes underlie the complaints of most chroniclers: the devastation of monastic estates, the plunder of ecclesiastical treasures, demands for oppressive tribute, the reckless donation of estates to kinsmen and the requirements of knight service.

² The prose portion of the obituary is generally positive, but the metrical section complains about William’s needless taxation, the consequences of his love of hunting and his arrogance (*ASC* E s. a. 1086).

³ ‘and þeah þe ic hit lang ylde, eall þet þe Gode wæs lað 7 ri\h/tfulle mannan, eall þet wæs gewunelican on þisan lande on his tyman’ (*ASC* E s. a. 1100).

⁴ ‘þa þestre sona þes landes, for æuric man sone ræuede oþer þe mihte’ (*ASC* E s. a. 1135). The general tone of the Peterborough Chronicle for these years reminds one of Bethell’s comments on the faults of English Benedictine monks in the 1120s: ‘litigiousness, parochialism, conservatism, and total unreasoning commitment to the most irrational claims that the most tenuous precedents could advance’: Bethell 1969, 684.

This thesis has tried to account for the major ways in which post-Conquest readers used Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. In some ways, the late eleventh and twelfth centuries saw increasing expectations regarding the presentation of texts. Each was to have its *titulus* and author identified, and each was to be packaged via clear, consistent and thorough rubrics. The absence of some or all of these features from many Anglo-Saxon Latin manuscripts was off-putting to foreign-born precentors, whose job it was to assay the contents of pre-Conquest books and begin building up collections around existing holdings. Other rebarbative features like script, orthography and textual redaction were touched on in Chapter IV. Despite these difficulties, most pre-Conquest manuscripts came to be treated identically to newly-produced volumes, and were copied, traded, sold and incorporated into libraries. Some types of pre-Conquest manuscripts were especially treasured: high-grade liturgical books were taken back to Normandy to be used ceremonially while others were sympathetically updated so they could remain in use in England; ancient manuscripts were venerated as relics; records were copied into Anglo-Saxon gospel books to stress that they represented Anglo-Saxon practice and were not a post-Conquest innovation; and particularly significant books like the Parker Chronicle were manipulated to help advocate on behalf of modern interests.

Latin became the *lingua franca* of the Anglo-Norman church. It was the language in which men like Eadmer, William of Malmesbury and John of Worcester wrote; contrast this to the Anglo-Saxon period, when English-born prelates like Dunstan, Oswald, Ælfric and Wulfstan wrote little in Latin, and Latin composition was generally the province of foreigners like Lantfred and Adelard of Ghent. Latin also dominated in the post-Conquest classroom; English and Anglo-Norman French had a role, but to judge from the evidence of glosses, it was a minor one. French became literary language among a small coterie of

patrons, centred on the royal court. Some classes of Old English texts retained their popularity – homiliaries and texts of spiritual instruction particularly⁵ – but vernacular poetry, at least in written form, held little interest. The four major Old English poetic codices contain no indication they were sympathetically read in the twelfth century,⁶ and the annotators of the Parker Chronicle showed little interest in the Chronicle poems. This pattern is broadly reflected in the type of Anglo-Saxon texts which were copied afresh in the twelfth century.

It is a nice question how important the events of 1066 actually were to the history of the English libraries. The Norman invasion undoubtedly ensured the arrival of foreign-trained prelates who rapidly brought English book collections into line with newly-developing foreign trends, but, as Chapter III showed, books generally continued to circulate in accordance with long-established patterns. The Conquest did make the English realise that they were distinct: the Normans did not use insular minuscule or write very frequently in the vernacular, and they spelt differently and had texts of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica* and other works which were startlingly unlike Anglo-Saxon copies. The result of these differences was the hybridisation of insular culture. For the most part Norman prelates seem to have valued Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, even if they unashamedly exploited their symbolic capital and seem to have tacitly assumed their manuscripts of Bede were better than English copies even though Bede was Northumbrian. Much can be learnt from about the cultural politics of the Anglo-Norman period from small corrections in pre-Conquest manuscripts. In the

⁵ Vernacular medical manuscripts – such as London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius C. iii, fols. 11-85 (s. xi¹ or xi^{med}, Cant CC) and London, British Library, Harley 585 (s. x/xi and xi¹) – were also very heavily-used after 1066, but my lack of expertise in this field prevented me discussing them in any detail.

⁶ For example, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11 ('The Cædmon Manuscript') contains three pentrics in a twelfth-century hand (pp. 211, 212, 219) and two added sketches (pp. 31, 96). Six single leaves containing text were excised when the manuscript was rebound in the thirteenth century: Raw 1984, 206. This may suggest the manuscript was valued primarily for its illustrations.

remainder of this conclusion, I will be addressing the Conquest's effects on English literature and reading practices.

ENGLISH LITERATURE, 1066-1200

English literature lost two of its main patrons in 1066 when Latin became the *lingua franca* of the church and the secular elite was replaced. Composition in English undoubtedly decreased, but there was no cataclysmic destruction of English literary culture orchestrated by prelates hostile to the English and their culture. This section examines the much-neglected English literature of the period between 1066 and 1200 in the light of the findings of this thesis.

The traditional periodisation of the English language into Old, Middle and Modern phases has left the language and literature of the years between 1066 and 1200 without an obvious disciplinary home. Unlike either Anglo-Saxon or early Middle English literature, works of this 'transitional period' have been treated as the last, valiant flourish of pre-Conquest letters, the definitive proof that the Norman Conquest had no impact on English literature, or the first exciting indication of what writers like Chaucer were going to achieve.⁷ These works have never been studied on their own merits.

In his six-volume *magnum opus*, *The History of the Norman Conquest of England*, Freeman included a chapter entitled 'The Effects of the Norman Conquest on Language and Literature', which argued that 'the abiding corruption of our language' was the 'one result of the Norman Conquest which has been purely evil'.⁸ He correlated linguistic changes like the decay of the inflectional system and the substitution of Romance synonyms for English lexemes with the decline of English literature, identifying the obituary of the Conqueror in

⁷ For a different survey, see Georgianna 1998.

⁸ Freeman 1877-1879, v. 547.

the Peterborough Chronicle as the last true work of (Old) English prose, and accusing Layamon of ‘treason’.⁹

Other literary historians countered that the Norman Conquest was an event that had no significant effect on the course of English literature. Halfway into a piece on the ‘Lost Literature of Medieval England’, R. W. Chambers quoted a dictum of Sir Walter Raleigh that ‘nothing is more striking than the way English people do not alter’.¹⁰ His later, very influential survey, ‘On the Continuity of English Prose from Alfred to More’, set out to demonstrate that:¹¹

The Sermons of Ælfric were being transcribed throughout the eleventh centuries, and were presumably read even in the early thirteenth. And by this time other writers of distinction had arisen to carry on Ælfric’s work.

The researches of R. M. Wilson followed those of Chambers very closely. In the introduction to his edition of the *Sawles Warde* – subtitled ‘English Literature, 1066-1200’ – Wilson surveyed the large number of manuscripts of pre-Conquest vernacular texts produced in the twelfth century and argued there was ‘no break in the tradition’.¹² On the evidence of AB language, and the activities of the Worcester Tremulous Hand, Wilson suggested that ‘the tradition of writing in the vernacular survived mainly in the West’, and attributed this to the ‘long episcopacy of Wulfstan of Worcester’, who died in 1095.¹³ Chambers even went as far as to state that the *Ancrene Wisse* ‘is all in the tradition of Ælfric’.¹⁴ Such views about prose harmonised neatly with that other sacred cow of medieval English

⁹ Freeman 1877-1879, v. 548, 592.

¹⁰ Chambers 1925, 304.

¹¹ Chambers 1932, lxxxi.

¹² Wilson 1938, xix.

¹³ Wilson 1938, xxv, xxvi. The doctrine of ‘Worcester exceptionalism’ is still key to much criticism of Layamon’s *Brut*: see, for example, Weinberg 1995; Frankis 2002.

¹⁴ Chambers 1932, xcvi.

literary history, ‘the alliterative revival’, whereby after a long oral existence, Old English alliterative metre was vividly revived in the fourteenth century.¹⁵

A third group of literary historians takes the view that the Norman Conquest temporarily silenced English Literature, and uses this alleged silencing to glorify later Middle English texts. For example, Sampson argued that:¹⁶

The poetic spirit of the English language never died, and the wonderful assimilative capacity of the language was soon to reveal itself. The gain to English literature that accrued from the Norman Conquest was immense ... The new singers were able to give fuller expression to their creative impulses. They were preparing the way for the coming of Chaucer.

In a more modest way, Bennett and Smithers found that the recopying of Old English homilies after the Conquest ‘hardly impugn[s] the traditional view that the reigns of William and his sons mark a hiatus in our literature’.¹⁷

Traces of these three strategies remain today, even in the work of self-consciously revisionist critics. Lerer suggests that ‘much of the ‘literary culture’ of the [eleventh and twelfth centuries] has a certain self-consciousness about writing in a language and in literary forms which are no longer current’.¹⁸ Cannon begins his book *The Grounds of English Literature* with a chapter entitled ‘The Loss of Literature: 1066’, and states that ‘sudden silencing is not the exception, but the rule’.¹⁹ Treharne argues that:²⁰

The very act of committing to writing copied texts, adapted texts, and new texts in English is an overt rejection by those writers ... of privileging French in learned circles. It may be possible to read the politics behind the use of the native vernacular and, in many cases, its own script – Anglo-Saxon insular minuscule – as a deliberate refusal to comply with the Norman hegemony in terms of education and the prestige that accompanied it.

She claims that writing in English ‘valoris[es] the culture denigrated by colonialism’ and that literary historians should in future focus on mapping the efforts made to ‘maintain a native

¹⁵ See Hanna 1999.

¹⁶ Sampson 1941, 19.

¹⁷ Bennett and Smithers 1968, xii.

¹⁸ Lerer 1999, 10.

¹⁹ Cannon 2004, 19. See the review by Hanna 2006. As my argument below shows, I do not find it problematic to talk about ‘English Literature’ as ‘Literature in English’, and temporarily set aside writing in Anglo-Latin and Anglo-Norman.

²⁰ Treharne 2006a, 260. For a similar view, see Thomson 2006a, 16.

vernacular that equates to a literature of resistance'.²¹ With their insistence that writing in English was rare after 1066 and that to write in English required self-conscious antiquarian effort, these critics have reproduced Freeman's view that the Conquest repressed English literature.

The findings of this thesis make such assumptions untenable. I have shown that some post-Conquest readers who handled Anglo-Saxon books were trilingual, and used English, French and Latin whenever each was appropriate. I have shown that post-Conquest readers became convinced that much Old English literature was both reliable and useful. There is also considerable evidence that English and its literature were actually valorised after the Conquest. However, as far as we can tell, there was little new composition in English after the Conquest. The only texts that can definitely be dated between 1066 and 1200 are the lyrics of Godric, the *Poema Morale*, the *Proverbs of Alfred*, the *Ormulum*, later annals of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, and two homilies.²² Moreover, early Middle English texts like the *Ancrene Wisse* (and related works), Layamon's *Brut* and *The Owl and the Nightingale* still have no obvious English antecedents,²³ even though we know many contemporary readers were familiar with Old English literature.²⁴

This thesis can shed some limited light on these problematic issues. Some post-Conquest readers of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts anticipated the concerns of 'transitional' and early Middle English texts. For example, Coleman expanded Ælfric's suggestion that God rejected Cain's offering simply because Abel's offering was better by explaining that Cain did

²¹ Treharne 2006a, 261, 269.

²² See above 13.

²³ See Salter 1988, 36-37.

²⁴ For claims that Layamon and Orm knew Old English texts, see Frankis 1979; Morrison 1984; Morrison 1995. See also Millett 1983.

not make his offering ‘mid goode mode’.²⁵ This is similar to the *Poema Morale*’s advice that ‘lutel lac is gode lof þæt kumeð of gode wille | 7 ec-lete muchel geue of þan þe herete is ille’.²⁶ Coleman was also experimenting with the use of running titles and marginal summaries in vernacular manuscripts, a feature of the earliest manuscript of Layamon’s *Brut*.²⁷ Many Anglo-Saxon manuscripts contain post-Conquest alterations to English and Latin orthography, a pertinent reminder that Orm was not alone in his pedantic attempts to ensure orthographical consistency.²⁸ Moreover, the trilingualism of the post-Conquest monastic classroom – evident in glosses to manuscripts of Ælfric’s *Grammar* and *Glossary* and to schooltexts – provides a context for linguistic borrowing in English, French and Latin after 1066. The freedom with which authors used lexis from a foreign language during this period is evident in the ‘Canterbury annal’ for 1100, which, though in English, uses the Latin word *peregrinatione*;²⁹ in the macaronic incipits of some Katherine Group texts;³⁰ in Benedeit’s *Voyage of St Brendan*, which uses two nautical loanwords from English, *raps* ‘ropes’ and *haspes* ‘hasps’;³¹ and in the many Old English words borrowed into Latin.³² The way in which these readers anticipate ‘transitional’ and early Middle English texts helps us realise that these later texts are not totally isolated or miraculous.

It is less easy to explain why these many readers were content to read, update and adapt old texts, and did not try to compose new literature in English.³³ The answer may lie in

²⁵ See above 140.

²⁶ Edited Hall 1920, i. 30-53 (lls. 73-4, Lambeth MS).

²⁷ Weinberg 1994.

²⁸ See the interesting comments of Cannon 2004, 104.

²⁹ Baker 2000, 131.

³⁰ For example, ‘Her cumseð þe uie of seinte iuliane. ant telleð of | liflade | hire’ (London, British Library, Royal 17 A. xxvii, fol. 56r). Though ‘vie’ is in the MED (‘vie’ n1 (c)), this is the first occurrence of this Old French word in English. See Wogan-Browne 2001, 14.

³¹ Sneddon 2001, 221n54.

³² For these, see Howlett 1996, 19.

³³ Compare Susan Irvine’s remark that ‘the twelfth century seems to have lacked not readers of English, but writers of English’: Irvine 1993, liii.

the lack of patronage for English literature in the twelfth century. Most of the readers this thesis has described were probably monks or canons, or priests using books belonging to a monastery or cathedral. For their purposes, the literature of Anglo-Saxon England – its homilies, its translations of key Christian texts and its chronicles – was sufficient. They had no obvious need to compose any more vernacular literature. By contrast, twelfth-century Anglo-Norman literature was aimed at a lay audience.³⁴ Benedeit and Phillipe de Thaon dedicated texts to Henry I's queens;³⁵ and Geoffrei Gaimar and Samson de Nantuil dedicated their works to the wives of prominent landowners.³⁶ As far as we can tell, lay patronage for English literature only became forthcoming in the thirteenth century, though early Middle English authors are seldom explicit about the person or people for whom they are writing.³⁷ A lack of patronage may partly explain 'the silence of (the) English' during the twelfth century, but pre- and post-Conquest manuscripts need much more study before this explanation can be accepted as convincing.

READING THE BOOK, 1066-1200

The Conquest influenced the *status quo* for readers, as well as authors. Textual and literary critics often make assumptions about the ways in which medieval readers read Latin and vernacular texts. Though some research has analysed what early medieval authors say about the ideal methods and end benefits of reading,³⁸ little attention has been paid to the empirical evidence offered by the traces such readers left in manuscripts. This thesis has been primarily concerned with the uses of Anglo-Saxon books – as commodities, as cultural objects, as repositories, and only occasionally as codices which were read – but some of its

³⁴ See Short 1992.

³⁵ Dean 1999, nos. 504, 348.

³⁶ Dean 1999, nos. 1, 458.

³⁷ For example, though the *Ancrene Wisse* appears initially to have been written for three well-born lay anchoresses, this is never explicitly stated: see Edwards 2003.

³⁸ e. g. Leclercq 1961; Smalley 1983; Irvine 1994.

findings are germane to textual and literary critics making assumptions about medieval readers.

There are, however, two weaknesses with an account of reading practices which draws only on empirical evidence. First, it can say nothing about the many users of manuscripts who left no trace of their presence; second, we do not know if these readers were typical. Despite these weaknesses, the implications of this thesis for textual and literary critics are significant. It is broadly true that modern annotators ‘reproduce the common practices of readers since the Middle Ages’.³⁹ Anglo-Saxon manuscripts contain interventions in post-Conquest hands which amplify, annotate, appropriate, correct, emphasise, exhort, explicate, organise, identify rhetorical tropes, simplify and translate. The printed marginalia of Renaissance books thus feature only two types of intervention not practised by twelfth-century readers: justification and parody.⁴⁰ But this long list gives a misleading picture, since some types of intervention are substantially more common than others. Ambiguous *nota* marks which draw attention to particular bits of the text without revealing why the reader found them interesting, relentless but inconsistent textual corrections, improvements to *ordinatio*, and expository glosses copied from glossing traditions that had the authority of centuries of circulation far outnumber interventions which show an individual’s distinctive engagement with a text. This is particularly true of Latin manuscripts. In part, this may be a reflection of the communal ownership of most early medieval manuscripts:⁴¹

The physical nature of the book and the history of the circulation of books ensure that there is always a third party tacitly present at the writing of marginalia.

Using a book belonging to his community, the Anglo-Norman monk or canon must have been acutely aware of this third-party audience. But, reading *calamo tenente*, he was delighted

³⁹ Jackson 2001, 5.

⁴⁰ For this taxonomy, see Slights 1989, 685-6.

⁴¹ Jackson 2001, 95.

to compare, collate and emend, albeit eclectically rather than systematically. The sheer diversity of hands which inject corrections into early medieval manuscripts suggests such critical reading was an ‘intellectual discipline’ which kept readers alert.⁴² Future research might usefully investigate whether different practices prevailed in monastic books, where *ruminatio* was the ideal mode of reading, to manuscripts owned by secular houses.

Though there is some overlap between the methods adopted for reading Latin and vernacular texts, vernacular manuscripts seem to have been more likely to accrete personal interventions than Latin books. In vernacular manuscripts, later editors felt free to change the author’s *ipsissima verba* by modernising, expanding, abridging and rearranging. The closest parallel in Latin books is the subdivision marks and accents introduced by a lector preparing a passage for liturgical reading. This willingness to alter a vernacular author’s *ipsissima verba* is a confirmation of Ælfric’s concerns about the circulation of his writings, and a reminder to editors that each manuscript text of a homily is a version rather than a copy. These changes, like the alteration of a Latin manuscript’s text to that of a different textual tradition, are communal in the sense that they create a new, hybrid text for future generations of readers.

Idiosyncratic interventions which comment directly on the text do exist, but may not provide most reliable evidence of how readers actually interacted with manuscripts. As theorists have recognised:⁴³

Every note entails a degree of self-assertion, if not aggression. The reader leaves a mark and thereby alters the object.

Few personal reactions are expressed in the margins of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. The Tremulous Hand’s non-lexical annotations largely consist of ambiguous *nota* marks, scriptural citations and the identification of *auctoritates*. Coleman, with his recommendations

⁴² Jackson 2001, 30.

⁴³ Jackson 2001, 90.

about the benefits of particular *exempla* and his aspersions about Ælfric's laziness, is the exception that proves the rule, and even he felt the need to sign his more personal interventions. Our familiarity with Coleman's work should not blind us to his egregiousness. It is difficult to think of any other contemporary annotator who was this forthright. We should therefore be reluctant to interpret individual words or phrases as comment glosses; it is far more likely they represent pen trials with no real connection to the text.⁴⁴

This thesis has also shown that the abilities and interests of post-Conquest readers could vary considerably. We may never know how restricted a skill reading Uncial or Square Minuscule was. Textual critics are accustomed to make emendations (and even to date Old English poems) on the basis of the ambiguity of particular letter forms in particular scripts, though remarkably little work has been done on how accurately scribes could actually copy these scripts.⁴⁵ Moreover, the perceptions people held regarding the antiquity and cultural affiliations of different scripts are very obscure. Yet they are significant, because, for example, the association of the *libri Augustini* with Augustine of Canterbury must have developed from an understanding that the books were ancient, an understanding which can only have derived from their script. Nevertheless, obvious disparities between the ancient script of a gospel book and the more recent style of added documents do not seem to have bothered medieval readers unduly. Textual and literary critics should therefore be wary of adducing 'typical' reactions to medieval readers, for – even looking at the traces left by actual readers – it is very difficult to know who they were, and why they read as they did.

⁴⁴ The name 'Eadgip' appears, erased, in the lower margin of Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare, CXVII, fol. 41v, below the end of the section of *Andreas* describing his journey to Mermedonia. It has been argued the name refers to Edith of Wilton, who was famed as a storm-calmer: Dockray-Miller 2005.

⁴⁵ Lapidge 2000; Stanley 2002.

QUO VADIS?

This thesis has decisively demonstrated that the English language and English texts were not suppressed after the Conquest. There was no ‘fresh start’ in book collecting, which took the form of a ‘deliberate policy’ orchestrated to supersede Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. Rather, the English language, English texts and English and Latin manuscripts actively participated in a culture which was newly hybrid. The complexity of the interactions between English, Latin and French is only beginning to be appreciated.

Yet 1066 remains a watershed in popular and scholarly imagination, a symbolic date after which everything changed. This date is woven deep in the fabric of literary history, and is a key thread in our understanding of early Middle English texts and late medieval alliterative poetry. Informed by stodgy and outdated history of the language textbooks, undergraduates leave Oxford with the impression that the hundred and fifty years between 1066 and 1200 constitute a lacuna in English language and literature. It is very much incumbent on scholars working on this period to ensure their findings filter down to undergraduate teaching and the scholarly imagination more broadly.

However, research in this area remains tentative and its conclusions are always uncertain. In this thesis, I have endeavoured to establish almost everything from first principles and have consciously foresworn grand narratives for fear of creating a new orthodoxy every bit as misleading as current scholarly understanding of the ‘transitional period’. This means it is not yet possible to make any statement which is as compelling as seeing the Conquest as a disaster for the English.

A number of types of use have been excluded from this thesis for want of space. One particularly significant exclusion is the whimsical addition of pen trials and sketches to pre-Conquest manuscripts. Are these the traces of a reader whose exuberant mind wandered

when he was reading the book, or an indication that the text had ceased to be of interest and the manuscript had become someone's private jotting pad? What of drawings added to manuscripts whose artistic programme had inadvertently been left incomplete? Given the pragmatism of most post-Conquest precentors and readers, books that do not seem to have been touched after 1066 present another enigma. Examples range from the luxurious 'Trinity Gospels'⁴⁶ to a grossly-imperfect copy of Juvenecus's poem on the four evangelists, where there is no sign any reader ever recognised the massive lacuna.⁴⁷ I have also had to shy away from discussing classes of manuscripts with which I have limited experience, like medical manuals and liturgical books.

This thesis has also identified several very important areas for future research which need to be explored before the definitive literary history of this period can be written. As was remarked in Chapter I, we know almost nothing about pre-Conquest Norman literary culture, and particularly about the validity of Orderic's claim that it barely existed before the accession of Duke William II.⁴⁸ Major research in this area is an essential precursor to an accurate assessment of the literary effects of 1066. Other types of evidence have also been insufficiently examined. The composition, forgery and transcription of legal records can tell us much about the linguistic interactions of the post-Conquest period. Anglo-Latin hagiography, much of it now properly edited for the first time, has anecdotal evidence to offer. Detailed philological examination of annotations and glosses and the publication of the Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English should also tell us much more about how 'standard Old English' maintained its force after 1066, and why it eventually gave way.

⁴⁶ Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 10. 4 (215).

⁴⁷ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barlow 25, fol. 13r/4-5, where some 500 lines of text are missing: Huemer 1891, I. 472 – II. 209.

⁴⁸ See above 8.

Post-Conquest readers' traces in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts can also still tell us a great deal. Ideally, we will eventually have a catalogue of manuscripts and manuscript fragments written or owned in England up to 1100, a volume akin to Ker's *Catalogue* but covering the manuscripts listed in Gneuss's *Handlist*. Each description would include a section devoted to signs of use. However, for such descriptions to be useful, it is vital to develop an accurate, consistent vocabulary for describing readers' interventions.⁴⁹ As signs of use become better documented, it may be possible to identify the portfolios of different annotators and thereby provenance unlocalised books.

William of Poitiers' account of the Conqueror's coronation foregrounded the disastrous consequences which ensued when the king's knights heard raised voices in a tongue which they did not recognise. Their reaction – a suspicion which bred fear and violence – is all too typical of man's instinctive fear of 'the other'. Remarkably, events that followed generally broke with this archetype. Foreign readers engaged closely with Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, appreciating much of what they found. Understanding how this tolerant, mutually-appreciative atmosphere developed, without political intervention, holds an interest beyond the merely historical and plays into vociferous modern debates about national identity and assimilation. It may be for this reason that the date 1066 still matters.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ I have compiled an informal handlist of traces of use in manuscripts I have seen; a copy can be obtained via email.

⁵⁰ Bates 2005.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography includes only works cited in the thesis. I have not distinguished between editions of texts, and monographs, articles, or other 'secondary' publications. Works are listed in alphabetical order by author, and within that by date of publication. For convenience, authors' forenames appear as initials.

[Anon] (1884), *Catalogue of Ancient Manuscripts in the British Museum: part II: Latin*. London.

[Anon] (1959-), *Catalogue des manuscrits en écriture latine portant des indications de date, de lieu ou de copiste*. 7 vols. to date. Paris.

[Anon] (1879), *Notice sur divers manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Vaticane*. Paris.

Adriaen, M., ed. (1971), *Sancti Gregorii Magni Homiliae in Hiezechibelem Prophetam*. CCSL 142. Turnhout.

Aird, W. M. (1992), 'The Making of a Medieval Miracle Collection: the *Liber de translationibus et miraculis sancti Cuthberti*', *Northern History* 28, 1-24.

Aird, W. M. (1994a), 'An Absent Friend: the career of Bishop William of St Calais' in *Anglo-Norman Durham 1093-1193*. eds. D. W. Rollason, M. Harvey and M. Prestwich. Woodbridge. 283-97.

Aird, W. M. (1994b), 'St Cuthbert, the Scots and the Normans', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 16, 1-20.

Aird, W. M. (1998), *St Cuthbert and the Normans: the Church of Durham, 1071-1153*. Studies in the History of Medieval Religion 14. Woodbridge.

Alexander, J. J. G. (1966), 'A Little-Known Gospel Book of the Later Eleventh Century from Exeter', *Burlington Magazine* 108, 8-16.

Alexander, J. J. G. (1970), *Norman Illumination at Mont St. Michel, 966-1100*. Oxford.

Alexander, J. J. G., P. McGurk, et al. (1986), *The York Gospels*. ed. N. Barker. Roxburghe Club. London.

Anstruther, R., ed. (1846), *Epistolae Herberti de Losinga*. Publications of the Caxton Society. Brussels.

Arngart, O. (1952), *The Leningrad Bede: an eighth-century manuscript of the Venerable Bede's Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum in the Public Library, Leningrad*. EEMF 2. Copenhagen.

Arngart, O., ed. (1978), *The Proverbs of Alfred: an emended text*. Scripta Minora Regiae Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis. Lund.

Arnold, T. (1890), *Memorials of St. Edmunds Abbey*. RS 96. 3 vols. London.

- Assmann, B., ed. (1889), *Angelsächsische Homilien und Heiligenleben*. Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa 3. Kassel.
- Atkins, I. (1940), 'The Church of Worcester from the Eighth to the Twelfth Century: part II', *Antiquaries Journal* 20, 1-38, 203-229.
- Atkins, I. and N. R. Ker, eds., (1944), *Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Wigorniensis made in 1622-23 by Patrick Young, librarian to King James I*. Cambridge.
- Avril, F. and P. D. Stirnemann (1987), *Manuscrits enluminés d'origine insulaire, VIIe-XXe siècle*. Paris.
- Backhouse, J., D. H. Turner, et al. (1984), *The Golden Age of Anglo-Saxon Art, 966-1066*. London.
- Bailey, R. N. (1978), *The Durham Cassiodorus*. Jarrow Lecture 1978. Jarrow.
- Bailey, R. N. and R. Handley (1983), 'Early English Manuscripts of Cassiodorus' *Expositio Psalmorum*', *Classical Philology* 78, 51-55.
- Baker, D. (1978), 'A Nursery of Saints': St Margaret of Scotland reconsidered' in *Medieval Women: dedicated and presented to Rosalind M. T. Hill on the occasion of her seventieth birthday*. ed. D. Baker. Studies in Church History, Subsidia 1. Oxford. 119-41.
- Baker, L. G. D. (1970), 'The Desert in the North', *Northern History* 5, 1-11.
- Baker, P. S., ed. (2000), *MS F. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: a collaborative edition* 8. eds. D. N. Dumville and S. Keynes. Cambridge.
- Barker, E. E. (1978), 'Two Lost Documents of King Æthelstan', *Anglo-Saxon England* 6, 137-43.
- Barker-Benfield, B. C. (1993), 'Not St Dunstan's Book?' *Notes and Queries* n. s. 40, 431-33.
- Barrow, G. W. S. (1994), 'The Kings of Scotland and Durham' in *Anglo-Norman Durham 1093-1193*. eds. D. W. Rollason, M. Harvey and M. Prestwich. Woodbridge. 311-23.
- Barrow, G. W. S., ed. (1999), *The Charters of King David I: the written acts of David I, King of Scots 1124-53, and of his son, Henry, Earl of Northumberland, 1139-52*. Woodbridge.
- Barrow, J. (2005), 'The Chronology of Forgery Production at Worcester from c. 1000 to the Early Twelfth Century' in *St Wulfstan and his World*. eds. J. S. Barrow and N. Brooks. Studies in Early Medieval Britain 4. Aldershot. 105-22.
- Bately, J. M. (1964), 'The Vatican Fragment of the Old English Orosius', *English Studies* 45, 224-30.
- Bately, J. M., ed. (1986), *MS A. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: a collaborative edition* 3. eds. D. N. Dumville and S. Keynes. Cambridge.

- Bates, D. (1975), 'The Character and Career of Odo of Bayeux', *Speculum* 50, 1-20.
- Bates, D. (1994), 'The Forged Charters of William the Conqueror and Bishop William of St Calais' in *Anglo-Norman Durham 1093-1193*. eds. D. W. Rollason, M. Harvey and M. Prestwich. Woodbridge. 111-124.
- Bates, D., ed. (1998), *Regesta regum Anglo-Normannorum: the Acta of William I (1066-1087)*. Oxford.
- Bates, D. (2005), '1066: does the date still matter?' *Historical Research* 78, 443-64.
- Bates, E. H., ed. (1899), *Two Cartularies of the Benedictine Abbeys of Muchelney and Athelney in the County of Somerset*. Somerset Record Society 14. London.
- Baxter, S. (2004), 'Archbishop Wulfstan and the Administration of God's Property' in *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York: proceedings of the second Alcuin conference*. ed. M. Townend. Studies in the Early Middle Ages 10. Turnhout. 162-205.
- Bell, D. N. (1987), 'The Books of Flaxley Abbey', *Analecta Cisterciensia* 43, 92-110.
- Bell, D. N. (1992), *The Libraries of the Cistercians, Gilbertines and Premonstratensians*. Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 3. London.
- Beneš, C. E. (1999-2000), 'The Appearance and Spread of the E-cedilla in Latin Bookhands', *Manuscripta* 43-44, 1-43.
- Bennett, J. A. W. and G. V. Smithers, eds. (1968), *Early Middle English Verse and Prose*. 2nd ed. Oxford.
- Berndt, R. (1969), 'The Linguistic Situation in England from the Norman Conquest to the Loss of Normandy (1066-1204)' in *Approaches to English Historical Linguistics: an anthology*. ed. R. Lass. New York. 369-91.
- Bethell, D. L. T. (1969), 'English Black Monks and Episcopal Elections in the 1120s', *English Historical Review*, 673-98.
- Bethell, D. L. T. (1970), 'Two Letters of Pope Paschal II to Scotland', *Scottish Historical Review* 49, 33-45.
- Bévenot, M. (1961), *The Tradition of Manuscripts: a study in the transmission of St. Cyprian's treatises*. Oxford.
- Biddle, M. (1977), 'Alban and the Anglo-Saxon Church' in *Cathedral and City: St Albans, ancient and modern*. ed. R. Runcie. London. 23-42.
- Biddle, M. and B. Kjølbye-Biddle (2001), 'The Origins of St Alban's Abbey: Romano-British cemetery and Anglo-Saxon monastery' in *Alban and St Albans: Roman and Medieval architecture, art and archaeology*. eds. M. Henig and P. Lindley. British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions 24. Leeds. 45-77.

- Birch, W. de G., ed. (1885), *Cartularium Saxonicum: a collection of charters relating to Anglo-Saxon history*. 3 vols. London.
- Bischoff, B. (1990), *Latin Palaeography: antiquity and the Middle Ages*. trans. D. Ó Cróinín and D. Ganz. Cambridge.
- Bischoff, B. (1994), *Manuscripts and Libraries in the Age of Charlemagne*. trans. M. M. Gorman. Cambridge Studies in Palaeography and Codicology 1. Cambridge.
- Bischoff, B. (1998), *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen)*. 2 vols. to date. Wiesbaden.
- Bishop, T. A. M. (1953), 'Notes on Cambridge Manuscripts: Part I', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 1, 432-441.
- Bishop, T. A. M. (1954), 'A Fragment in Northumbrian Uncial', *Scriptorium* 8, 111-2.
- Bishop, T. A. M. (1955), 'Notes on Cambridge Manuscripts: Parts II and III', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 2, 185-198.
- Bishop, T. A. M. (1957), 'Notes on Cambridge Manuscripts: Part IV: MSS. connected with St Augustine's Canterbury', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 2, 323-336.
- Bishop, T. A. M. (1963), 'Notes on Cambridge Manuscripts: Part VI: MSS. connected with St Augustine's Canterbury, continued', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 3, 412-423.
- Bishop, T. A. M. (1964), 'Notes on Cambridge Manuscripts: Part VII: Pelagius in Trinity College B. 10. 5', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 4, 70-77.
- Bishop, T. A. M. (1966), *Aethici Istrici Cosmographia: Vergilio Salisburgensi rectius adscripta: Codex Leidensis Scaligeranus 69. Umbrae codicum occidentaliū 10*. Amsterdam.
- Bishop, T. A. M. (1967), 'The Copenhagen Gospel Book', *Nordisk tidskrift för bok- och biblioteksväsen* 54, 33-41.
- Bishop, T. A. M. (1968), 'An Early Example of Insular-Caroline', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 4, 396-400.
- Bishop, T. A. M. (1971), *English Caroline Minuscule*. Oxford Palaeographical Handbooks. Oxford.
- Bishop, T. A. M. and P. Chaplais (1957), *Facsimiles of English Royal Writs to A. D. 1100: presented to Vivian Hunter Galbraith*. Oxford.
- Blair, J. (2005), 'Estate Memoranda of c. 1070 from the See of Dorchester-on-Thames', *English Historical Review* 116, 114-23.

- Blaise, A. (1954), *Dictionnaire Latin-Français des auteurs Chrétiens*. rev. Henri Chirat. Turnhout.
- Blake, E. O. (1962), *Liber Eliensis*. Camden Society 3rd Series 92. London.
- Blockley, M. (1982), 'Addenda and Corrigenda to N. R. Ker's 'A Supplementary Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon'', *Notes and Queries* 227, 1-3.
- Boehmer, H. (1902), *Die Fälschungen Erzbischof Lanfranks von Canterbury*. Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche 8.1. Leipzig.
- Boffey, J. and A. S. G. Edwards (2005), *A New Index of Middle English Verse*. London.
- Bolton, D. K. (1977), 'The Study of the *Consolation of Philosophy* in Anglo-Saxon England', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age* 44, 33-78.
- Bond, E. A., ed. (1866-1868), *Chronica Monasterii de Melsa. Auctore Thoma de Burton*. RS 43. 3 vols. London.
- Botfield, B., ed. (1838), *Catalogi veteres librorum Ecclesiae cathedralis Dunelmensis: catalogues of the library of Durham Cathedral, at various periods, from the Conquest to the Dissolution, including catalogues of the library of the abbey of Hulne, and of the MSS preserved in the library of Bishop Cosin, at Durham*. Publications of the Surtees Society 7. London.
- Bouquet, M., et al. (1738-1904), *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*. 24 vols. Paris.
- Branch, B. (1979), 'Inventories of the Library of Fécamp from the Eleventh and Twelfth Century', *Manuscripta* 23, 159-72.
- Brehe, S. K. (1990), 'Reassembling the *First Worcester Fragment*', *Speculum* 65, 521-36.
- Brooke, C. N. L. (1977), 'St Albans: the great abbey' in *Cathedral and City: St Albans, ancient and modern*. ed. R. Runcie. London. 43-70.
- Brooke, C. N. L. (1985), 'The Archdeacon and the Norman Conquest' in *Tradition and Change: essays in honour of Marjorie Chibnall*. eds. D. A. Greenway, C. J. Holdsworth and J. E. Sayers. Cambridge. 1-19.
- Brooks, N. (1984), *The Early History of the Church of Canterbury: Christ Church from 597 to 1066*. Studies in the Early History of Britain. Leicester.
- Broun, D. (2000), 'The Writing of Charters in Scotland and Ireland in the Twelfth Century' in *Charters and the Use of the Written Word in Medieval Society*. ed. K. Heidecker. Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy 5. Turnhout. 113-31.
- Brown, C., ed. (1932), *English Lyrics of the XIIIth Century*. Oxford.
- Brown, M. P. (1996), *The Book of Cerne: prayer, patronage and power in ninth-century England*. British Library Studies in Medieval Culture. London.

- Brown, M. P. (2003), *The Lindisfarne Gospels: society, spirituality and the scribe*. British Library Studies in Medieval Culture. London.
- Brown, M. P. (2007), 'The Lichfield Angel and the Manuscript Context: Lichfield as a centre of insular art', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 160, 8-19.
- Brown, T. J. (1969a), *The Durham Ritual: a southern English collectar of the tenth century with Northumbrian additions*. EEMF 16. Copenhagen.
- Brown, T. J. (1969b), *The Stonyhurst Gospel of Saint John*. Roxburghe Club. Oxford.
- Browne, A. C. (1988), 'Bishop William of St Carilef's Book Donations to Durham Cathedral Priory', *Scriptorium* 42, 140-55.
- Bruni, S., ed. (1997), *Alcuino De orthographia*. Firenze.
- Buck, C. D. (1899), 'Notes on Latin Orthography', *The Classical Review* 13, 116-9, 156-67.
- Buckalew, R. E. (1978), 'Leland's Transcript of Ælfric's *Glossary*', *Anglo-Saxon England* 7, 149-64.
- Budny, M. (1991), *Canterbury at Corpus: an exhibition of manuscripts from St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury to mark the enthronement of the 103rd Archbishop in April 1991*. Cambridge.
- Budny, M. (1992), 'St Dunstan's Classbook' and its Frontispiece: Dunstan's portrait and autograph' in *St Dunstan: his life, times and cult*. eds. N. Ramsay, M. Sparks and T. Tatton-Brown. Cambridge. 103-42.
- Budny, M. (1997), *Insular, Anglo-Saxon, and Early Anglo-Norman Manuscript Art at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge: an illustrated catalogue*. 2 vols. Kalamazoo, MI.
- Budny, M. (1999), 'The *Biblia Gregoriana*' in *St Augustine and the Conversion of England*. ed. R. Gameson. Stroud. 237-84.
- Burgess, G. S. (2002), 'The Anglo-Norman Version' in *The Voyage of Saint Brendan: representative versions of the legend in English translation with indexes of themes and motifs from the stories*. eds. W. R. J. Barron and G. S. Burgess. Exeter. 65-102.
- Burton, J. E., ed. (1988), *York 1070-1154*. English Episcopal Acta 5. Oxford.
- Butler, H. E. (1949), *The Chronicle of Jocelin of Brakelond Concerning the Acts of Samson, Abbot of the Monastery of St. Edmund*. Medieval Classics. London.
- Butler, M. S. (1981), 'An Edition of the Early Middle English Copy of Ælfric's 'Grammar' and 'Glossary' in Worcester Cathedral MS. F. 174.' Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, Pennsylvania State University.
- Cameron, A. F. (1974), 'Middle English in Old English Manuscripts' in *Chaucer and Middle English Studies in Honor of Rossell Hope Robbins*. ed. B. Rowland. London. 218-29.

- Cameron, M. L. (1983), 'The Sources of Medical Knowledge in Anglo-Saxon England', *Anglo-Saxon England* 11, 135-55.
- Cannon, C. (2004), *The Grounds of English Literature*. Oxford.
- Carley, J. P. (1987), 'Two Pre-Conquest Manuscripts from Glastonbury Abbey', *Anglo-Saxon England* 16, 197-212.
- Chambers, R. W. (1925), 'The Lost Literature of Medieval England', *The Library* 4th series 5, 293-321.
- Chambers, R. W. (1932), 'On the Continuity of English Prose from Alfred to More and his School' in *The Life and Death of Sr Thomas Moore, knight, sometymes lord high chancellor of England / written in the tyme of Queene Marie by Nicholas Harpsfield*, L. D. eds. E. V. Hitchcock and R. W. Chambers. EETS o. s. 186. London. xlv-clxxiv.
- Chambers, R. W., M. Förster, *et al.* (1933), *The Exeter Book of Old English Poetry*. London.
- Chaplais, P. (1973), 'The Anglo-Saxon Chancery: from the Diploma to the Writ' in *Prisca Munimenta: studies in archival and administrative history presented to Dr A. E. J. Hollaender*. ed. F. Ranger. London. 43-62.
- Chaplais, P. (1987), 'William of St Calais and the Domesday Survey' in *Domesday Studies: papers read at the Novocentenary Conference of the Royal Historical Society and Institute of British Geographers, Winchester 1986*. ed. J. C. Holt. Woodbridge. 65-77.
- Cheney, C. R. (1983), 'Service Books and Records: the case of the 'Domesday Monachorum'', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 56, 7-15.
- Chibnall, M., ed. (1956), *The Historia Pontificalis of John of Salisbury*. Nelson's Medieval Texts. London.
- Chibnall, M., ed. (1969-80), *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*. OMT. 6 vols. Oxford.
- Chibnall, M. (1999), *The Debate on the Norman Conquest*. Issues in Historiography. Manchester.
- Clanchy, M. T. (1993), *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066-1307*. 2nd ed. Oxford.
- Clark, C., ed. (1970), *The Peterborough Chronicle, 1070-1154*. 2nd ed. Oxford..
- Clark, C. (1976), 'People and Languages in Post-Conquest Canterbury', *Journal of Medieval History* 2, 1-33.
- Clayton, M. (1986), 'Assumptio Mariae: an eleventh-century Anglo-Latin poem from Abingdon', *Analecta Bollandiana* 104, 419-26.
- Clemons, P. (1997), *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: the first series: text*. EETS s. s. 17. London.

- Clemons, P. and N. E. Eliason (1966), *Ælfric's First Series of Catholic Homilies: British Museum, Royal 7 C. XII, folios 4-218*. EEMF 13. Copenhagen.
- Clover, H. and M. T. Gibson (1979), *The Letters of Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury*. OMT. Oxford.
- Colgrave, B., ed. (1940), *Two Lives of Saint Cuthbert: a life by an anonymous monk of Lindisfarne and Bede's prose life*. Cambridge.
- Colgrave, B. (1950), 'The Post-Bedan Miracles and Translations of St Cuthbert' in *Early Cultures of North-West Europe (H. M. Chadwick Memorial Lectures)*. eds. C. Fox and B. Dickins. Cambridge. 305-22.
- Colgrave, B. and R. A. B. Mynors (1969), *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*. OMT. Oxford.
- Collier, W. (1991), 'The Tremulous Worcester Scribe and his *Milieu*: a study of his annotation.' Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Sheffield.
- Collier, W. (1995), 'Englishness' and the Worcester Tremulous Hand', *Leeds Studies in English* n. s. 26, 35-47.
- Collier, W. (1997), 'A Thirteenth-Century User of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 79, 149-65.
- Collier, W. (2000), 'The Tremulous Worcester Hand and Gregory's *Pastoral Care*' in *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*. eds. M. Swan and E. Treharne. CSASE 30. Cambridge. 195-208.
- Conner, P. W. (1993), *Anglo-Saxon Exeter: a tenth-century cultural history*. Studies in Anglo-Saxon History 4. Woodbridge.
- Conner, P. W. (2000), 'Exeter's Relics, Exeter's Books' in *Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes in Memory of Lynne Grundy*. eds. J. Roberts and J. Nelson. London. 117-56.
- Constable, G. (1976), *Letters and Letter Collections*. Typologie des Sources du Moyen Âge Occidental 17. Turnhout.
- Cooper, T.-A. (2006), 'The Homilies of a Pragmatic Archbishop's Handbook in Context: Cotton Tiberius A. iii', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 28, 47-64.
- Corradini, E. (2005), 'Apud Lotharingos Altus et Doctus': Leofric of Exeter, 1050-1072.' *The Proceedings of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies Postgraduate Conference* (<http://arts.stage.manchester.ac.uk/mancass/assets/thefile,56762,en.pdf>).
- Cowan, I. B. and D. E. Eason (1976), *Medieval Religious Houses: Scotland*. 2nd ed. London.
- Cowdrey, H. E. J. (2003), *Lanfranc: scholar, monk, and archbishop*. Oxford.

- Crawford, S. J. (1922), *The Old English Version of the Heptateuch: Aelfric's Treatise on the Old and New Testament and his Preface to Genesis*. EETS o. s. 160. London.
- Crawford, S. J. (1923), 'The Late Old English Notes of MS. (British Museum) Cotton Claudius B. iv', *Anglia: Zeitschrift für Englische Philologie* 47, 124-135.
- Crawford, S. J. (1928), 'The Worcester Marks and Glosses of the Old English Manuscripts in the Bodleian, together with the Worcester version of the Nicene Creed', *Anglia: Zeitschrift für Englische Philologie* 52, 1-25.
- Crick, J. (2001), 'Offa, Aelfric and the Refoundation of St Albans' in *Alban and St Albans: Roman and medieval architecture, art and archaeology*. eds. M. Henig and P. Lindley. British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions 24. Leeds. 78-84.
- Crick, J., ed. (2007), *Charters of St Albans*. Anglo-Saxon Charters 12. Oxford.
- Cross, J. E. (1988), *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25: a Carolingian sermonary used by Anglo-Saxon preachers*. King's College London Medieval Studies 1. London.
- Cross, J. E. and J. M. Tunberg (1993), *The Copenhagen Wulfstan Collection*. EEMF 25. Copenhagen.
- Cunningham, M. P., ed. (1966), *Carmina Aurelii Prudentii Clementis*. CCSL 126. Turnhout.
- da Rold, O. (2006), 'English Manuscripts 1066 to 1220 and the Making of a Re-Source', *Literature Compass* 3, 750-766.
- Dance, R. (2004), 'Sound, Fury, and Signifiers; or Wulfstan's Language' in *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York: proceedings of the second Alcuin conference*. ed. M. Townend. Studies in the Early Middle Ages 10. Turnhout. 30-61.
- Darlington, R. R., ed. (1928), *The Vita Wulfstani of William of Malmesbury: to which are added the extant abridgments of this work and the miracles and translation of St. Wulfstan*. Camden Society, Third Series 40. London.
- Davies, J. R. (2003), *The Book of Llandaf and the Norman Church in Wales*. Studies in Celtic History 21. Woodbridge.
- Davis, G. R. C. (1958), *Medieval Cartularies of Great Britain: a short catalogue*. London.
- Davis, H. W. C. (1936), 'The Monks of St Edmund 1021-1148', *History* n. s. 40, 227-39.
- Davis, H. W. C., R. J. Whitwell, et al. (1913), *Regesta regum Anglo-Normannorum, 1066-1154*. 4 vols. Oxford.
- Davis, R. H. C. (1989), 'Bede after Bede' in *Studies in Medieval History Presented to R. Allen Brown*. eds. C. Harper-Bill, C. J. Holdsworth and J. L. Nelson. Woodbridge. 103-16.

- Dawtry, A. (1982), 'The Benedictine Revival in the North: the last bulwark of Anglo-Saxon monasticism', *Studies in Church History* 18, 87-98.
- De Bruyne, D. (1912), 'Le plus ancien catalogue des manuscrits de Notre-Dame de Paris', *Revue Bénédictine* 29, 481-5.
- de Hamel, C. (1984), *Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Booktrade*. Woodbridge.
- de Hartel, G., ed. (1894), *Sancti Meropii Paulini Nolani carmina*. CSEL 30. Vienna.
- de la Mare, A. C. (1982-85), 'A Probable Addition to the Bodleian's Holdings of Exeter Cathedral Manuscripts', *Bodleian Library Record* 11, 79-88.
- de Vogüé, A., ed. (1978-80), *Grégoire le Grand: Dialogues*. Sources Chrétiennes 251, 260, 265. 3 vols. Paris.
- Dean, R. J. (1999), *Anglo-Norman Literature: a guide to texts and manuscripts*. ANTS Occasional Publications Series 3. London.
- DeClercq, G. (2007), 'Introduction: *Codices Rescripti* in the Early Medieval West' in *Early Medieval Palimpsests*. ed. G. DeClercq. Bibliologia: elementa ad librorum studia pertinentia 26. Turnhout. 7-22.
- Denzinger, H., ed. (1991), *Kompendium der Glaubensbekenntnisse und kirchlichen Lehrentscheidungen*. 37th ed. Herder.
- Desportes, P. and H. Millet (1996), *Diocèse d'Amiens*. Fasti ecclesiae Gallicanae 1200-1500: 1. Turnhout.
- Dewick, E. S. and W. H. Frere, eds. (1914-1921), *The Leofric Collectar Compared with the Collectar of St Wulfstan*. HBS 45, 56. 2 vols. London.
- Dickins, B. (1940), 'The Late Addition to ASC 1066 C', *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society* Literary and Historical Section 5, 148-9.
- Dionisotti, A. C. (1982), 'Bede, Grammars and Greek', *Revue Bénédictine* 92, 111-41.
- Dobson, E. J. and F. L. Harrison (1979), *Medieval English Songs*. London.
- Dockray-Miller, M. (2005), 'The *Eadgîp* Erasure: a gloss on the Old English *Andreas*', *ANQ: a quarterly journal of short articles, notes, and reviews* 18, 3-7.
- Dodwell, C. R. (1954), *The Canterbury School of Illumination, 1066-1200*. Cambridge.
- Dodwell, C. R. (1973), 'Losses in Anglo-Saxon Art in the Middle Ages', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 56, 74-92.
- Dodwell, C. R. (1982), *Anglo-Saxon Art: a new perspective*. Manchester.

- Dodwell, C. R. and P. Clemoes (1974), *The Old English Illustrated Hexateuch (British Museum Cotton Claudius B. iv)*. EEMF 18. Copenhagen.
- Douglas, D. C. (1928), 'Fragments of an Anglo-Saxon Survey from Bury St Edmunds', *English Historical Review* 43, 376-83.
- Douglas, D. C., ed. (1932), *Feudal Documents from the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds*. Records of the Social and Economic History of England and Wales 8. London.
- Douglas, D. C. (1964), *William the Conqueror: the Norman impact upon England*. London.
- Drage, E. M. (1979), 'Bishop Leofric and the Exeter Cathedral Chapter, 1050-1072: a reassessment of the manuscript evidence.' Unpublished D. Phil Thesis, University of Oxford.
- Dronke, P. (1978), *The Medieval Lyric*. 2nd ed. London.
- Dugdale, W. (1817), *Monasticon anglicanum*. ed. J. Caley *et al.* 8 vols. London.
- Duggan, A., ed. (2000), *The Correspondence of Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1162-1170*. OMT. 2 vols. Oxford.
- Dumville, D. N. (1983), 'Some Aspects of Annalistic Writing at Canterbury in the Eleventh and Early Twelfth Centuries', *Peritia* 2, 23-57.
- Dumville, D. N. (1987), 'English Square Minuscule Script: the background and earliest phases', *Anglo-Saxon England* 16, 147-179.
- Dumville, D. N. (1991), 'On the Dating of Some Late Anglo-Saxon Liturgical Manuscripts', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 10, 40-57.
- Dumville, D. N. (1992), *Liturgy and the Ecclesiastical History of Late Anglo-Saxon England: four studies*. Studies in Anglo-Saxon History. Woodbridge.
- Dumville, D. N. (1993), *English Caroline Script and Monastic History: studies in Benedictinism, A.D. 950-1030*. Studies in Anglo-Saxon History. Woodbridge.
- Dumville, D. N. (1994), 'Anglo-Saxon Books: treasure in Norman hands?' *Anglo-Norman Studies* 16, 83-99.
- Earle, J. and C. Plummer, eds. (1952), *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*. Reissued with a bibliographical note by D. Whitelock. 2 vols. Oxford.
- Ebersperger, B. (1999), *Die angelsächsischen Handschriften in den Pariser Bibliotheken*. Anglistische Forschungen 261. Heidelberg.
- Edwards, A. S. G. (2003), 'The Middle English Manuscripts and Early Readers of *Ancrene Wisse*' in *A Companion to Ancrene Wisse*. ed. Y. Wada. Cambridge. 103-112.

- Emms, R. (1999), 'The Scribe of the Paris Psalter', *Anglo-Saxon England* 28, 179-83.
- Emms, R. (2006), 'Books and Writing in Seventh-Century Kent' in *Writing and Texts in Anglo-Saxon England*. ed. A. R. Rumble. Cambridge. 18-27.
- Evans, R. (1979), 'Worcester Glosses in an Old English Homily', *Notes and Queries* n. s. 26, 393-5.
- Farmer, H. (1957), 'The Vision of Orm', *Analecta Bollandiana* 75, 72-82.
- Farrer, W. and C. Clay, eds., (1914-1965), *Early Yorkshire Charters*. Yorkshire Archaeological Society. 12 vols. Edinburgh.
- Fassler, M. E. (1985), 'The Office of the Cantor in Early Western Monastic Rules and Customaries: a preliminary investigation', *Early Music History* 5, 29-51.
- Faulkner, M. J. (2005), 'The Use of Anglo-Saxon Books at Christ Church, Canterbury: c. 1066-1150.' Unpublished M. St. Thesis, University of Oxford.
- Fauoux, M. (1961), *Recueil des actes des Ducs de Normandie de 911 à 1066*. Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie 36. Caen.
- Fernie, E. (1986), 'The Effects of the Conquest on Norman Architectural Patronage', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 9, 71-85.
- Finberg, H. P. R. (1961), *The Early Charters of the West Midlands*. Studies in Early English History 2. Leicester.
- Fischer, A. (1996), 'The Vocabulary of Very Late Old English' in *Studies in English Language and Literature: 'doubt wisely': papers in honour of E. G. Stanley*. eds. M. J. Toswell and E. M. Tyler. London. 29-41.
- Fischer, A. (1997), 'The Hatton MS of the West Saxon Gospels: the preservation and transmission of Old English' in *The Preservation and Transmission of Anglo-Saxon Culture*. eds. P. E. Szarmach and J. T. Rosenthal. Studies in Medieval Culture 40. Kalamazoo, MI. 353-67.
- Flower, R. and A. H. Smith (1941), *The Parker Chronicle and Laws (Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 173): a facsimile*. EETS o.s. 208. London.
- Förster, M. (1930), 'Die Freilassungsurkunden des Bodmin-Evangeliars' in *A Grammatical Miscellany Offered to Otto Jespersen on his Seventieth Birthday*. eds. N. Bogholm, A. Brusendorff and C. A. Bodelsen. Levin & Munksgard. Copenhagen. 77-99.
- Foster, R. H. (1907), 'Turgot, Prior of Durham', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 63, 32-40.
- Fowler, J. T. (1898-1900), *Extracts from the Account Rolls of the Abbey of Durham: from the original MSS*. Surtees Society 99, 100, 103. Durham.

- Frank, R. and A. F. Cameron (1973), *A Plan for the Dictionary of Old English*. Toronto.
- Frankis, P. J. (1979), 'La3amon's English Sources' in J. R. R. Tolkien, *Scholar and Storyteller: essays in memoriam*. eds. M. Salu and R. T. Farrell. Ithaca, NY. 64-76.
- Frankis, P. J. (2000), 'Sidelights on post-Conquest Canterbury: towards a context for an ON runic charm', *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 44, 1-27.
- Frankis, P. J. (2002), 'Towards a Regional Context for Lawman's *Brut*: literary activity in the dioceses of Worcester and Hereford in the twelfth century' in *La3amon: Contexts, Language and Interpretation*. eds. R. Allen, L. Perry and J. Roberts. King's College London Medieval Studies 19. London. 53-78.
- Franzen, C. (1986), 'A Study of the Worcester 'Tremulous' Hand with Special Reference to the Glosses in Bodleian MSS Hatton 113, 114, and 116.' Unpublished D. Phil Thesis, University of Oxford.
- Franzen, C. (1991), *The Tremulous Hand of Worcester*. Oxford.
- Franzen, C. (1996), 'Late Copies of Anglo-Saxon Charters' in *Studies in English Language and Literature: 'doubt wisely': papers in honour of E. G. Stanley*. eds. M. J. Toswell and E. M. Tyler. London: Routledge. 42-70.
- Franzen, C. (2001a), 'The Cerne 'Trembling' Hand and the Tremulous Hand of Worcester', *Notes and Queries* n. s. 48, 374-5.
- Franzen, C. (2001b), 'On the Attribution of Copied Glosses in CCCC MS 41 to the 'Tremulous Hand' of Worcester', *Notes and Queries* n. s. 48, 373-4.
- Franzen, C. (2003), 'The Tremulous Hand of Worcester and the Nero Scribe of the *Ancrene Wisse*', *Medium Aevum* 72, 13-31.
- Franzen, C. (2006), 'On the Attribution of Additions in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Bodley 343 to the Tremulous Hand of Worcester', *ANQ: a quarterly journal of short articles, notes, and reviews* 19, 7-8.
- Freeman, E. A. (1877-1879), *The History of the Norman Conquest of England: its causes and its results*. 3rd ed. 6 vols. Oxford.
- Frere, W. H., ed. (1898-1901), *The Use of Sarum*. 2 vols. Cambridge.
- Friis-Jensen, K. and J. M. W. Willoughby (2001), *Peterborough Abbey*. Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 8. London.
- Galbraith, V. H. (1967), 'Notes on the Career of Samson, Bishop of Worcester (1096-1112)', *English Historical Review* 82, 86-101.
- Gameson, R. (1994), 'The Royal 1. B. vii Gospels and English Book Production in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries' in *The Early Medieval Bible: its production, decoration, and*

- use. ed. R. Gameson. Cambridge Studies in Palaeography and Codicology. Cambridge. 24-52.
- Gameson, R. (1995), *The Role of Art in the Late Anglo-Saxon Church*. Oxford Historical Monographs. Oxford.
- Gameson, R. (1996), 'The Origin of the Exeter Book of Old English Poetry', *Anglo-Saxon England* 25, 135-85.
- Gameson, R. (1997), 'The Gospels of Margaret of Scotland and the Literacy of an Eleventh-Century Queen' in *Women and the Book: assessing the visual evidence*. eds. L. Smith and J. H. M. Taylor. London. 148-71.
- Gameson, R. (1999), *The Manuscripts of Early Norman England (c.1066-1130)*. British Academy Postdoctoral Fellowship Monograph. Oxford.
- Gameson, R. (2001), *The Codex Aureus: an eighth-century gospel book, Stockholm, Kungliga Bibliotek, A. 135*. EEMF 28. 2 vols. Copenhagen.
- Gameson, R. (2002), 'The Colophon of the Eadwig Gospels', *Anglo-Saxon England* 31, 201-22.
- Ganz, D. (2006), 'Anglo-Saxon England' in *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland: volume I: to 1640*. eds. E. Leedham-Green and T. Webber. Cambridge. 91-108.
- Garmonsway, G. N. (1953), *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. Everyman's Library 624. London.
- Georgianna, L. (1998), 'Coming to Terms with the Norman Conquest: nationalism and English literary history', *REAL: Yearbook of Research in English and American Literature* 14, 33-53.
- Geuenich, D. (2004), 'A Survey of the Early Medieval Confraternity Books from the Continent' in *The Durham Liber Vitae and its Context*. eds. D. W. Rollason, A. J. Piper, M. Harvey and L. Rollason. Woodbridge. 141-7.
- Gibson, M. T. (1978), *Lanfranc of Bec*. Oxford.
- Gibson, M. T. (1989), 'The Twelfth-Century Glossed Bible', *Studia Patristica* 23, 232-44.
- Gibson, M. T. (1995), 'Normans and Angevins, 1070-1220' in *A History of Canterbury Cathedral*. eds. P. Collinson, N. Ramsey and M. Sparks. Oxford. 38-68.
- Gibson, M. T., T. A. Heslop, *et al.* (1992), *The Eadwine Psalter: text, image, and monastic culture in twelfth-century Canterbury*. Publications of the Modern Humanities Research Association 14. London.
- Gilchrist, J. T. (1988-1990), 'The Influence of the Monastic Forgeries Attributed to Pope Gregory I (JE no. 1951) and Boniface IV (JE no. 1996)' in *Fälschungen im Mittelalter:*

- internationaler Kongress der Monumenta Germaniae Historica, München, 16. - 19. September 1986*. Hannover. ii. 263-87.
- Gillingham, J. (1981), 'The Introduction of Knight Service into England', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 4, 53-64.
- Gleason, S. E. (1936), *An Ecclesiastical Barony of the Middle Ages: the bishopric of Bayeux, 1066-1204*. Harvard Historical Monographs 10. Cambridge, MA.
- Gneuss, H. (1972), 'The Origin of Standard Old English and Æthelwold's School at Winchester', *Anglo-Saxon England* 1, 63-83.
- Gneuss, H. (1985), 'Liturgical Books in Anglo-Saxon England and their Old English Terminology' in *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England: studies presented to Peter Clemoes on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*. Cambridge. 91-141.
- Gneuss, H. (1990), 'The Study of Language in Anglo-Saxon England', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 72, 3-32.
- Gneuss, H. (1994), 'A Grammarian's Greek-Latin Glossary in Anglo-Saxon England' in *From Anglo-Saxon to Early Middle English: studies presented to E. G. Stanley*. eds. M. Godden, D. Gray and T. Hoad. Oxford. 60-86.
- Gneuss, H. (1996), *Books and Libraries in Early England*. Aldershot.
- Gneuss, H. (1997), 'Origin and Provenance of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: The Case of Cotton Tiberius A. III' in *Of the Making of Books: medieval manuscripts, their scribes and readers: essays presented to M. B. Parkes* eds. P. R. Robinson and R. Zim. Aldershot. 13-48.
- Gneuss, H. (2001), *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: a list of manuscripts and manuscript fragments written or owned in England up to 1100*. Tempe, AZ.
- Gneuss, H. (2003), 'Addenda and Corrigenda to the Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts', *Anglo-Saxon England* 32, 293-305.
- Godden, M. (1979), *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: the second series: text*. EETS s. s. 5. London.
- Godman, P., ed. (1982), *Alcuin: the bishops, kings, and saints of York*. OMT. Oxford.
- Goulburn, E. M. and H. Symonds (1878), *The Life, Letters and Sermons of Bishop Herbert de Losinga*. 2 vols. Oxford.
- Graham, T. (1997), 'Robert Talbot's *Old Saxonice Bede*. Cambridge University Library, MS Kk. 3. 18 and the 'Alphabetum Norwagicum' of British Library, Cotton MSS, Domitian A. IX' in *Books and Collectors 1200-1700: essays presented to Andrew Watson*. eds. J. P. Carley and C. G. C. Tite. London. 295-316.

- Graham, T. (2003), 'King Cnut's Grant to Christ Church, Canterbury: a new reading of a damaged annal in two copies of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle' in *Unlocking the Wordboard: Anglo-Saxon studies in memory of Edward B. Irving, Jr.* eds. M. C. Amodio and K. O'Brien O'Keeffe. Toronto. 172-190.
- Gransden, A., ed. (1964), *The Chronicle of Bury St Edmunds, 1212-1301*. Nelson Medieval Texts. London.
- Gransden, A. (1973), ed. *The Customary of the Benedictine Abbey of Bury St. Edmunds in Suffolk*. HBS 119. London.
- Gransden, A. (1974), *Historical Writing in England*. 2 vols. London.
- Gransden, A. (1981), 'Baldwin, Abbot of Bury St Edmunds, 1065-1097', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 4, 65-76, 187-95.
- Gransden, A. (1998), 'Some Manuscripts in Cambridge from Bury St Edmunds Abbey: exhibition catalogue' in *Bury St Edmunds: medieval art, architecture, archaeology and economy*. ed. A. Gransden. The British Archeological Association Conference Transactions 20. Leeds. 228-85.
- Grant, R. J. S. (1996), 'A Copied "Tremulous" Gloss at Corpus', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 97, 279-83.
- Greatrex, J. (1997), *Biographical Register of the English Cathedral Priories in the Province of Canterbury, c. 1066-1540*. Oxford.
- Green, J. A. (1990), *English Sheriffs to 1154*. Public Record Office Handbooks 24. London.
- Green, W. M., ed. (1963), *Sancti Aureli Augustini Opera: De doctrina Christiana libri quattuor*. CSEL 80. Vienna.
- Greenfield, K. (1981), 'Changing Emphases in English Vernacular Homiletic Literature, 960-1225', *Journal of Medieval History* 7, 283-97.
- Greenway, D. A., ed. (1996), *Henry, Archdeacon of Huntingdon: Historia Anglorum*. OMT. Oxford.
- Gretsch, M. (1999), *The Intellectual Foundations of the English Benedictine Reform*. CSASE 25. Cambridge.
- Gretsch, M. (2001), 'Winchester Vocabulary and Standard Old English: the vernacular in late Anglo-Saxon England', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 83, 41-87.
- Grierson, P. (1940), 'Les livres de L'Abbé Seiwold de Bath', *Revue Bénédictine* 52, 96-116.

- Guimon, T. V. (2006), 'The Writing of Annals in Eleventh-Century England: palaeography and textual history' in *Writing and Texts in Anglo-Saxon England*. ed. A. R. Rumble. Cambridge. 137-45.
- Gullick, M. (1990), 'The Scribe of the Carilef Bible: a new look at some late-eleventh-century Durham Cathedral manuscripts' in *Medieval Book Production: assessing the evidence*. ed. L. L. Brownrigg. Los Altos Hills, CA. 61-83.
- Gullick, M. (1994), 'The Scribes of the Durham Cantor's Book (Durham, Dean and Chapter Library B. IV. 24) and the Durham Martyrology Scribe' in *Anglo-Norman Durham 1093-1193*. eds. D. W. Rollason, M. Harvey and M. Prestwich. Woodbridge. 93-124.
- Gullick, M. (1998), 'The Hand of Symeon of Durham: further observations on the Durham Martyrology scribe' in *Symeon of Durham: Historian of Durham and the North*. ed. D. W. Rollason. Stamford. 14-31.
- Gullick, M. (2001), 'The English-Owned Manuscripts of the *Collectio Lanfranci* (s. xi/xii)' in *The Legacy of M. R. James: papers from the 1995 Cambridge Symposium*. ed. L. Dennison. Donnington. 99-117.
- Gullick, M. (2004), 'The Make-Up of the Durham *Liber Vitae*' in *The Durham Liber Vitae and its Context*. eds. D. W. Rollason, A. J. Piper, M. Harvey and L. Rollason. Woodbridge. 17-42.
- Gullick, M. and R. W. Pfaff (2001), 'The Dublin Pontifical (TCD 98 [B. 3. 6]): St Anselm's?' *Scriptorium* 55, 284-94.
- Gwara, S., ed. (2001), *Aldelmi Malmesbiriensis Prosa de virginitate: cum glosa latina atque anglosaxonica*. CCSL 124. 2 vols. Turnhout.
- Hall, J., ed. (1920), *Selections from Early Middle English: 1130-1250*. 2 vols. Oxford.
- Hall, T. N. (2006), 'Latin Sermons and Lay Preaching: four Latin sermons from post-Reform Canterbury' in *The Power of Words: Anglo-Saxon studies presented to Donald G. Scragg on his seventieth birthday*. eds. H. Magennis and J. Wilcox. Morgantown, WV. 132-70.
- Halsall, M. (1969), 'Vercelli and the *Vercelli Book*', *PMLA* 84, 1545-50.
- Hamilton, N. E. S. A., ed. (1870), *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis monachii De gestis pontificum Anglorum libri quinque*. RS 52. London.
- Handley, R. (1974), 'British Museum MS. Cotton Vespasian D. xiv', *Notes and Queries* n. s. 21, 243-50.
- Hanna, R. (1999), 'Alliterative Poetry' in *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature*. ed. D. Wallace. Cambridge. 488-512.
- Hanna, R. (2006), '[Review of Cannon (2004)]', *Studies in the Age of Chaucer* 28, 281-4.

- Hardwick, C., ed. (1858), *Historia Monasterii S. Augustini Cantuariensis*. RS 8. London.
- Hardy, T. D. and C. T. Martin, eds., (1888-1889), *Lestorie des Engles solum la translacion Maistre Geffrei Gaimar*. RS 91. 2 vols. London.
- Harmer, F. E., ed. (1952), *Anglo-Saxon Writs*. Manchester.
- Harrison, J. (2004), 'The Mortuary Roll of Turgot of Durham (d. 1115)', *Scriptorium* 58, 67-83.
- Hart, C. R. (1957a), 'An Early Charter of Adam of Cockfield, 1100-1118', *English Historical Review* 72, 466-9.
- Hart, C. R. (1957b), *The Early Charters of Essex: the Norman period*. Department of English Local History Occasional Papers. Leicester.
- Hart, C. R. (1966), *Early Charters of Eastern England*. Studies in Early English History 5. Leicester.
- Hartzell, K. D. (1975), 'A St Albans Miscellany in New York', *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 10, 20-61.
- Hartzell, K. D. (2006), *Catalogue of Manuscripts Written or Owned in England up to 1200 Containing Music*. Woodbridge.
- Haskins, C. H. (1918), 'A Charter of Cnut for Fécamp', *English Historical Review* 33, 342-4.
- Hayward, P. A. (1998), 'Translation Narratives in Post-Conquest Hagiography and English Resistance to the Norman Conquest', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 21, 67-93.
- Hayward, P. A. (2004), 'Some Reflections on the Historical Value of the So-Called *Acta Lanfranci*', *Historical Research* 77, 141-160.
- Hearne, T., ed. (1723), *Hemingi Chartularium Ecclesiae Wigorniensis*. 2 vols. Oxford.
- Henderson, G. D. S. (1982), *Losses and Lacunae in Early Insular Art*. University of York Monograph Series 3. York.
- Henderson, G. D. S. (1990), 'Sortes biblicae in Twelfth-Century England: the list of episcopal prognostics in Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R. 7. 5' in *England in the Twelfth Century: proceedings of the 1988 Harlaxton Symposium*. ed. D. Williams. Woodbridge. 113-35.
- Hervey, F. (1925), *The Pinchbeck Register etc.* 2 vols. Brighton.
- Hesbert, J. (1954), *Les Manuscrits Musicaux de Jumièges*. Monumenta Musicae Sacrae 2. Macon.
- Heslop, T. A. (1984), 'Dunstanus Archiepiscopus' and Painting in Kent around 1120', *Burlington Magazine* 126, 195-204.

- Heslop, T. A. (1990), 'The Production of *de luxe* Manuscripts and the Patronage of King Cnut and Queen Emma', *Anglo-Saxon England* 19, 151-95.
- Heslop, T. A. (1995), 'The Canterbury Calendars and the Norman Conquest' in *Canterbury after the Conquest: churches, saints and scholars, 1066-1109*. eds. R. Eales and R. Sharpe. London. 53-85.
- Heslop, T. A. ([2007]), 'Manuscript Illumination at Worcester c. 1055-1065: the origins of the Pembroke Lectionary and the Caligula Troper' in *The Cambridge Illuminations: the conference papers*. ed. S. Panayotova. London. 65-75.
- Hill, B. (1977), 'The Twelfth-Century *Conduct of Life*, formerly the *Poema Morale* or *A Moral Ode*', *Leeds Studies in English* n. s. 9, 97-144.
- Hill, B. (2005a), 'The Writing of the Septenary Couplet', *Notes and Queries* n. s. 52, 296.
- Hill, J. (1985), 'Ælfric's Silent Days', *Leeds Studies in English* n. s. 16, 118-31.
- Hill, J. (2005b), 'Leofric of Exeter and the Practical Politics of Book Collecting' in *Imagining the Book*. eds. S. Kelly and J. J. Thompson. Medieval Texts and Cultures of Northern Europe. Turnhout. 77-98.
- Hill, J. (2006), 'Identifying "Texts" in Cotton Julius E. vii: medieval and modern perspectives' in *Beatus Vir: studies in early English and Norse manuscripts in memory of Phillip Pulsiano*. eds. A. N. Doane and K. Wolf. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 319. Tempe, AZ. 27-40.
- Hillgarth, J. N., ed. (1976), *Sancti Iuliani Toletanae sedis episcopi opera pars I*. CCSL 115. Turnhout.
- Hinde, J. H. (1868), *Symeonis Dunelmensis opera*. Surtees Society 51. Durham.
- Hinkle, W. M. (1970), 'The Gift of an Anglo-Saxon Gospel Book to the Abbey of Saint-Remi, Reims', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 33, 21-35.
- Hofstetter, W. (1988), 'Winchester and the Standardization of Old English Vocabulary', *Anglo-Saxon England* 17, 139-61.
- Hohler, C. ([1972]), 'The Red Book of Darley' in *Nordiskt Kollokvium II i Latinsk Liturgiforskning: 12-13 Maj 1972, Hässelby Slott*. Stockholm. 39-47.
- Hohler, C. E. (1978), 'Some Service Books of the Later Saxon Church' in *Tenth-Century Studies: essays in commemoration of the millennium of the Council of Winchester and the 'Regularis Concordia'*. ed. D. Parsons. London. 60-83.
- Holden, A. J., ed. (1984), *Le Roman de Waldef (Cod. Bodmer 168)*. Bibliotheca Bodmeriana: Textes 5. Cologny-Genève.

- Hollis, S., W. R. Barnes, et al. (2004), *Writing the Wilton Women: Goscelin's Legend of Edith and Liber confortatorius*. Medieval Women: texts and contexts. Turnhout.
- Holmes, U. T. (1964), 'The Anglo-Norman Rhymed Chronicle' in *Linguistic and Literary Studies in Honor of Helmut A. Hatzfeld*. ed. A. S. Crisafulli. Washington DC 231-6.
- Holmes, U. T. (1965), 'Norman Literature and Wace' in *Medieval Secular Literature: four essays*. ed. W. Matthews. UCLA Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies: Contributions 1. Berkeley. 46-67.
- Holt, R., ed. (1878), *The Ormulum with the notes and glossary of Dr R. M. White*. 2 vols. Oxford.
- Holtzmann, W. (1929-30), 'Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte Friedrich Barbarossas', *Neues Archiv für Deutsches Geschichtskunde* 48, 384-413.
- Holtzmann, W. (1930), *Papsturkunden in England*. 3 vols. Berlin.
- Howlett, D. (1996), *The English Origins of Old French Literature*. Dublin.
- Huemer, J., ed. (1891), *Gai Vetti Aquilini Iuueni evangeliorum libri quattuor*. CSEL 24. Vienna.
- Hughes, A., ed. (1958-60), *The Portiforium of Saint Wulstan (Corpus Christi College, Cambridge ms. 391)*. HBS 89, 90. 2 vols. London.
- Hughes, K. (1980), 'The Book of Deer (Cambridge, University Library, MS li. 6. 32)' in *Celtic Britain in the Early Middle Ages: studies in Scottish and Welsh sources*. ed. D. Dumville. Woodbridge. 22-37.
- Huneycutt, L. L. (1989), 'The Idea of a Perfect Princess: the *Life of St Margaret* in the reign of Mathilda II (1100-1118)', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 12, 81-97.
- Hunt, R. W. (1961), *Saint Dunstan's Classbook from Glastonbury: codex Biblioth. Bodleiensis Oxon. Auct. F. 4. 32. Umbræ codicum occidentaliū*. Amsterdam.
- Hunt, T. (1991), *Teaching and Learning Latin in Thirteenth-Century England*. 3 vols. Cambridge.
- Hunt, T. (2005), 'The *Life* of St Alexis, 475-1125' in *Christina of Markeyate: a twelfth-century holy woman*. eds. S. Fanous and H. Leyser. London. 217-228.
- Hurst, D., ed. (1960), *Beda Venerabilis Opera: pars II: opera exegetica 3*. CCSL 120. Turnhout.
- Irvine, M. (1994), *The Making of Textual Culture: 'grammatica' and literary theory, 350-1100*. Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 19. Cambridge.
- Irvine, S. E. (1987), 'A Critical Edition of Some Homilies in MS. Bodley 343.' Unpublished D. Phil Thesis, University of Oxford.
- Irvine, S. E., ed. (1993), *Old English Homilies from MS Bodley 343*. EETS o. s. 302. Oxford.

- Irvine, S. E., ed. (2004), *MS E. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: a collaborative edition* 7. eds. D. N. Dumville and S. Keynes. Cambridge.
- Jackson, H. J. (2001), *Marginalia: readers writing in books*. New Haven, CT.
- Jackson, P. (1992), 'The *Vitas Patrum* in Eleventh-Century Worcester' in *England in the Eleventh Century: proceedings of the 1990 Harlaxton Symposium*. ed. C. Hicks. Paul Watkins Medieval Studies 12. Stamford. 119-34.
- James, M. R. (1895), *On the Abbey of S. Edmund at Bury*. Cambridge Antiquarian Society Octavo Publications 28. Cambridge.
- James, M. R. (1903), *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover: the catalogues of the libraries of Christ Church Priory and St. Augustine's Abbey at Canterbury and of St. Martin's Priory at Dover*. Cambridge.
- James, M. R. (1905), *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Pembroke College, Cambridge*. Cambridge.
- James, M. R. (1907), *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity Hall*. Cambridge.
- James, M. R. (1926), 'Bury St Edmunds Manuscripts', *English Historical Review* 41, 251-60.
- James, M. R. (1935), 'The Manuscripts of Bede' in *Bede: his life, times, and writings*. ed. A. Hamilton Thomson. Oxford. 230-6.
- James, M. R. and C. Jenkins (1930), *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Lambeth Palace*. Cambridge.
- James, P. (1996), 'The Lichfield Gospels: the question of provenance', *Parergon* 13, 51-63.
- Jayatilaka, R. (2003), 'The Old English Benedictine Rule: writing for women and men', *Anglo-Saxon England* 32, 147-187.
- Jenkins, D. (1994), 'From Wales to Weltenberg? Some considerations on the origins of the use of sacred books for the preservation of secular records' in *Vom mittelalterlichen Recht zur neuzeitlichen Rechtswissenschaft: Bedingungen, Wege und Probleme der europäischen Rechtsgeschichte*. eds. N. Brieskorn, P. Mikat, D. Müller and D. Willoweit. Paderborn. 75-88.
- Jenkins, D. and M. E. Owen (1983), 'The Welsh Marginalia in the Lichfield Gospels: part I', *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* 5, 37-66.
- Jenkins, D. and M. E. Owen (1984), 'The Welsh Marginalia in the Lichfield Gospels: part II: the 'Surexit' memorandum', *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* 7, 91-120.
- Johnson-South, T., ed. (2002), *Historia de Sancto Cuthberto: a history of St Cuthbert and a record of his patrimony*. Anglo-Saxon Texts 3. Cambridge.

- Johnson, C. (1961), *Hugh the Chantor: The History of the Church of York, 1066-1127*. Nelson's Medieval Texts. London.
- Johnson, D. F. (2006), 'Who Read Gregory's Dialogues in Old English?' in *The Power of Words: Anglo-Saxon studies presented to Donald G. Scragg on his seventieth birthday*. eds. H. Magennis and J. Wilcox. Morgantown, WV. 171-204.
- Jones, C. W. and C. B. Kendall, eds. (1975), *Bedae venerabilis opera: opera didascalica*. CCSL 123A. Turnhout.
- Jullien, M.-H. and F. Perelman (1999), *Clavis des auteurs Latins du Moyen Age, territoire français 735-987, tome II: Alcuin*. Turnhout.
- Kauffmann, C. M. (1975), *Romanesque Manuscripts, 1066-1190*. Survey of Manuscripts Illuminated in the British Isles 3. London.
- Keefer, S. L. (1997), 'Another pre-Conquest Inscription in Durham Cathedral Library MS A. II. 17', *Durham Archaeological Journal* 13, 65.
- Keil, G. T. H. (1857-80), *Grammatici Latini*. 7 vols. Leipzig.
- Keller, W. (1900), *Die litterarischen Bestrebungen von Worcester in angelsächsischer Zeit*. Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der germanischen Völker. Strassburg.
- Kelly, S. E., ed. (1995), *Charters of St Augustine's Abbey Canterbury and Minster-in-Thamet*. Anglo-Saxon Charters 4. Oxford.
- Kelly, S. E., ed. (2000), *Charters of Abingdon Abbey*. Anglo-Saxon Charters 7, 8. 2 vols. Oxford.
- Kelly, S. E., ed. (2007), *Charters of Bath and Wells*. Anglo-Saxon Charters 13. Oxford.
- Kemble, J. M., ed. (1839), *Codex diplomaticus aevi Saxonici*. English Historical Society. 6 vols. London.
- Kendall, C. B. (1988 for 1984), 'Dry Bones in a Cathedral: the story of the theft of Bede's relics and the translation of Cuthbert into the Cathedral of Durham in 1104', *Mediaevalia* 10, 1-26.
- Kendrick, T. D., ed. (1956), *Evangeliorum quattuor Codex Lindisfarnensis*. 2 vols. Oltun.
- Ker, N. R. (1933a), '[Review of Chambers, Förster *et al.* (1933)]', *Medium Aevum* 2, 224-31.
- Ker, N. R. (1933b), 'A Study of the Additions and Alterations in MSS. Bodley 340 and 342.', Unpublished B. Litt Thesis, University of Oxford.
- Ker, N. R. (1937), 'The Date of the "Tremulous" Worcester Hand', *Leeds Studies in English* 6, 28-9.

- Ker, N. R. (1938), 'Membra Disiecta', *British Museum Quarterly* 12, 130-134.
- Ker, N. R. (1948), 'Hemming's Cartulary: a description of the two Worcester cartularies in Cotton Tiberius A. XIII' in *Studies in Medieval History Presented to Frederick Maurice Powicke*. eds. R. W. Hunt, W. A. Pantin and R. W. Southern. Oxford. 49-75.
- Ker, N. R. (1949), 'Old English Notes Signed "Coleman"', *Medium Aevum* 18, 29-31.
- Ker, N. R. (1956), *The Pastoral Care: King Alfred's Translation of St Gregory's Regula Pastoralis*. EEMF 6. Copenhagen.
- Ker, N. R. (1957), *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*. Oxford.
- Ker, N. R. (1959), 'Three Old English Texts in a Salisbury Pontifical, Cotton Tiberius C. i' in *The Anglo-Saxons: studies in some aspects of their history and culture presented to Bruce Dickins*. ed. P. Clemoes. London. 262-79.
- Ker, N. R. (1960), *English Manuscripts in the Century After the Norman Conquest*. Lyell lectures 1952-3. Oxford.
- Ker, N. R. (1971), 'The Handwriting of Archbishop Wulfstan' in *England Before the Conquest: studies in the primary sources presented to Dorothy Whitelock*. eds. P. Clemoes and K. Hughes. Cambridge. 315-31.
- Ker, N. R. (1976a), 'The Beginning of Salisbury Cathedral Library' in *Medieval Learning and Literature: essays presented to Richard William Hunt*. eds. J. J. G. Alexander and M. T. Gibson. Oxford. 23-49.
- Ker, N. R. (1976b), 'A Supplement to the *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*', *Anglo-Saxon England* 5, 121-31.
- Ker, N. R., E. A. Lowe, et al. (1944), 'A New Fragment of Arator in the Bodleian', *Speculum* 19, 351-9.
- Keynes, S. (1985), 'King Æthelstan's Books' in *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England: studies presented to Peter Clemoes on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*. eds. H. Gneuss and M. Lapidge. Cambridge. 143-201.
- Keynes, S. (1992), *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts and Other Items of Related Interest in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge*. Old English Newsletter Subsidia 18. Binghamton.
- Keynes, S. (1993a), 'A Lost Cartulary of St Albans Abbey', *Anglo-Saxon England* 22, 253-79.
- Keynes, S. (1993b), 'The Will of Wulf', *Old English Newsletter* 26, 16-21.
- Kibbee, D. A. (1991), *For to Speke Frenche Trewely: the French language in England, 1000-1600: its status, description and instruction*. Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science Series III, Studies in the History of the Language Sciences 60. Amsterdam.

- Kiff-Cooper, J. A. (1991), 'Classbooks or Works of Art? Some observations on the tenth-century manuscripts of Aldhelm's *De Laude Virginitatis*' in *Church and Chronicle in the Middle Ages: essays presented to John Wood*. eds. I. Wood and G. A. Loud. London. 15-26.
- Kissin, B. W. (1939), 'Lanfranc's Alleged Division of Lands Between Archbishop and Community', *English Historical Review* 54, 287-93.
- Kitson, P. R. (1997), 'When did Middle English Begin? Later than you think!' in *Studies in Middle English Linguistics*. ed. J. Fisiak. Trends in Linguistics: studies and monographs 103. Berlin. 221-69.
- Klukas, A. W. (1984), 'The Continuity of Anglo-Saxon Liturgical Traditions as Evident in the Architecture of Winchester, Ely and Canterbury Cathedrals' in *Les mutations socio-culturelles au tournant des XIe-XIIe siècles*. ed. R. Foreville. Spicilegium Beccense 2. Paris. 111-25.
- Knowles, D. (1940), *The Monastic Order in England: a history of its development from the times of St Dunstan to the Fourth Lateran Council, 943-1216*. Cambridge.
- Knowles, D. and C. N. L. Brooke, ed. (2002), *The Monastic Constitutions of Lanfranc*. OMT. Rev. ed. Oxford.
- Kornexl, L. (1993), *Die Regularis concordia und ihre altenglische Interlinearversion*. Münchener Universitätsschriften: philosophische Fakultät: Texte und Untersuchungen zur englischen Philologie 17. München.
- Kotzor, G., ed. (1981), *Das altenglische Martyrologium*. Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften: philosophisch-historische Klasse: Abhandlungen neue Folge 88/1. München.
- Kuhn, S. M. (1948), 'From Canterbury to Lichfield', *Speculum* 23, 561-629.
- Kuhn, S. M. (1957), 'Some Early Mercian Manuscripts', *Review of English Studies* 8, 355-70.
- Laing, M. (1993), *Catalogue of Sources for a Linguistic Atlas of Early Medieval English*. Cambridge.
- Laistner, M. L. W. and H. H. King (1943), *A Hand-List of Bede Manuscripts*. Ithaca, NY.
- Lapidge, M. (1972), 'Three Latin Poems from Æthelwold's School at Winchester', *Anglo-Saxon England* 1, 85-137.
- Lapidge, M. (1982a), 'Some Old English Sedulius Glosses from BN Lat. 8092', *Anglia: Zeitschrift für Englische Philologie* 100, 1-17.
- Lapidge, M. (1982b), 'The Study of Latin Texts in Late Anglo-Saxon England [1]: the evidence of the glosses' in *Latin and the Vernacular Languages in Early Medieval Britain*. ed. N. K. Brooks. Leicester. 99-140.

- Lapidge, M. (1985), 'Surviving Booklists from Anglo-Saxon England' in *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England: studies presented to Peter Clemoes on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*. eds. H. Gneuss and M. Lapidge. Cambridge. 33-89.
- Lapidge, M. (1986), 'Anglo-Latin Literature' in *A New Critical History of Old English Literature*. eds. S. B. Greenfield and D. G. Calder. New York. 5-37.
- Lapidge, M. (1991), *Anglo-Saxon Litanies of the Saints*. HBS 106. Woodbridge.
- Lapidge, M. (1996), 'Latin Learning in Ninth-Century England' in his *Anglo-Latin Literature 600-899*. London. 409-454.
- Lapidge, M. (2000), 'The Archetype of *Beowulf*', *Anglo-Saxon England* 29, 5-41.
- Lapidge, M. (2003), *The Cult of St Swithun*. Winchester Studies 4. ii. Oxford.
- Lapidge, M. (2006), *The Anglo-Saxon Library*. Oxford.
- Lapidge, M. and R. Sharpe (1985), *A Bibliography of Celtic-Latin Literature*. Royal Irish Academy Dictionary of Medieval Latin from Celtic Sources: ancillary publications 1. Dublin.
- Lawrie, A. C. (1905), *Early Scottish Charters Prior to A.D. 1153*. Glasgow.
- Leclercq, J. (1961), *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: a study of monastic culture*. trans. C. Misrahi. New York.
- Leclercq, J. and H. Rochais (1977), *Sancti Bernardi Epistolae II: corpus epistolarum 181-310; II: epistolae extra corpus 311-547*. Sancti Bernardi Opera Omnia 8. Rome.
- Legge, M. D. (1963), *Anglo-Norman Literature and its Background*. Oxford.
- Lendinara, P. (1987), 'The Third Book of the *Bella Parisiaca* by Abbo of Saint-Germain-des-Près', *Anglo-Saxon England* 15, 73-89.
- Lendinara, P. (2002), 'Was the Glossator a Teacher?' *Quaestio: selected proceedings of the Cambridge Colloquium in Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic* 3, 1-27.
- Lenker, U. (1999), 'The *West Saxon Gospels* and the Gospel Lectionary in Anglo-Saxon England: manuscript evidence and liturgical practice', *Anglo-Saxon England* 29, 141-78.
- Lerer, S. (1999), 'Old English and its Afterlife' in *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature*. ed. D. Wallace. Cambridge. 7-34.
- Lewis, C. P. (1990), 'The Earldom of Surrey and the Date of Domesday', *Historical Research* 63, 329-336.
- Lewis, C. P. (1994), 'The French in England before the Norman Conquest', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 17, 122-144.

- Liebermann, F. (1888), 'Ein Brief Innocenz' II an Heinrich I. von England', *Neues Archiv für Deutsches Geschichtskunde* 14, 616-7.
- Liebermann, F., ed. (1898-1916), *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*. 3 vols. Halle.
- Liuzzi, R. M., ed. (1994-2000), *The Old English Version of the Gospels*. EETS o. s. 304, 314. 2 vols. Oxford.
- Liuzzi, R. M. (2000), 'Scribal Habit: the evidence of the Old English Gospels' in *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*. eds. M. Swan and E. Treharne. CSASE 30. Cambridge. 143-65.
- Lloyd, L. J. (1972), 'Leofric as Bibliophile' in *Leofric of Exeter: essays in commemoration of the foundation of Exeter Cathedral Library in A. D. 1072*. Exeter. 32-42.
- Löfstedt, E. (1959), *Late Latin*. Institutet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning: Serie A Forelesninger 25. Oslo.
- Love, R. C. (1996), *Three Eleventh-Century Anglo-Latin Saints' Lives: Vita S. Birini, Vita et miracula S. Kenelmi and Vita S. Rummoldi*. OMT. Oxford.
- Lowe, E. A. (1960), *English Uncial*. Oxford.
- Lowe, E. A. (1964), 'Codices Rescripti: a list of the oldest Latin palimpsests with stray observations on their origin' in *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*. Studi e Testi 235. Città del Vaticano. v. 67-114.
- Lowe, E. A. (1972), *Codices Latini antiquiores: a palaeographical guide to Latin manuscripts prior to the ninth century*. 2nd ed. 12 vols. Oxford.
- Lowe, K. A. (1992), 'Two Thirteenth-Century Cartularies from Bury St Edmunds: a study in textual transmission', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 93, 293-301.
- Lowe, K. A. (1993), "As Fre as Thowt?" Some medieval copies and translations of Old English wills', *English Manuscript Studies* 4, 1-23.
- Lowe, K. A. (2008), 'Post-Conquest Bilingual Composition in Memoranda from Bury St Edmunds', *Review of English Studies* n. s. 59, 52-66.
- Luard, H. R., ed. (1864), *Annales monastici*. RS 36. 5 vols. London.
- Macdonald, D. J. (1931), 'Eadmer and the Canterbury Privileges', *Journal of Theological Studies* 32, 39-55.
- Macray, W. D., ed. (1886), *Chronicon abbatiae Ramesiensis*. RS 83. London.
- Madoz, J. (1938), *Le symbole du XI^e Concile de Tolède: ses sources, sa date, sa valeur*. Spicilegium sacrum Louvaniense: études et documents 19. Louvain.

- Magennis, H. (1996), 'St Mary of Egypt and Ælfric: unlikely bedfellows in Cotton Julius E. vii?' in *The Legend of Mary of Egypt in Medieval Insular Hagiography*. eds. E. Poppe and B. Ross. Dublin. 99-112.
- Magennis, H., ed. (2002), *The Old English Life of St Mary of Egypt*. Exeter.
- Magennis, H. (2005), 'Ælfric's *Lives of the Saints* and Cotton Julius E. vii: adaptation, appropriation and the disappearing book' in *Imagining the Book*. eds. S. Kelly and J. J. Thompson. Medieval Texts and Cultures of Northern Europe. Turnhout. 99-109.
- Magennis, H. and M. Clayton (1994), *The Old English Lives of St Margaret*. CSASE 9. Cambridge.
- Mall, E., ed. (1873), *Li Cumpoz Philipe de Thaün*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Malone, K. (1930), 'When Did Middle English Begin?' *Language* 6, 110-117.
- Marsden, R. (1994), 'The Old Testament in Late Anglo-Saxon England: preliminary observations on the textual evidence' in *The Early Medieval Bible: Its Production, Decoration, and Use*. ed. R. Gameson. Cambridge Studies in Palaeography and Codicology. Cambridge. 101-24.
- Marsden, R. (1995), *The Text of the Old Testament in Anglo-Saxon England*. CSASE 15. Cambridge.
- Marsden, R. (1998a), 'Ask What I am Called': the Anglo-Saxons and their bibles' in *The Bible as Book: the manuscript tradition*. eds. J. L. Sharpe and K. van Kampen. London. 145-76.
- Marsden, R. (1998b), 'Manus Bedae: Bede's contribution to Ceolfrith's bibles', *Anglo-Saxon England* 27, 65-85.
- Marsden, R. (2005), 'Latin in the Ascendant: the interlinear gloss of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud misc. 509' in *Latin Learning and English Lore: studies in Anglo-Saxon literature for Michael Lapidge*. eds. K. O'Brien O'Keeffe and A. Orchard. Toronto. ii. 132-52.
- Mason, E. (1990), *St. Wulfstan of Worcester, c. 1008-1095*. Oxford.
- Mazzuconi, D. (1982), 'La diffusione dell'Expositio Missae <<Primum in ordine>> et l'Expositio orationis dominicae cosiddetta milanese', *Ricerche storiche sulla Chiesa Ambrosiana* 11, 208-45.
- McGurk, P., R. R. Darlington, et al. (1995-), *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*. OMT. 2 vols. to date. Oxford.
- McGurk, P., D. N. Dumville, et al. (1983), *An Eleventh-Century Anglo-Saxon Illustrated Miscellany*. EEMF 21. Copenhagen.

- McGurk, P. and J. Rosenthal (1995), 'The Anglo-Saxon Gospelbooks of Judith, countess of Flanders: their text, make-up and function', *Anglo-Saxon England* 24, 251-308.
- McIntyre, E. A. (1978), 'Early-Twelfth-Century Worcester Cathedral Priory with Special Reference to the Manuscripts Written There.' Unpublished D. Phil Thesis, University of Oxford.
- McKee, H. A. (1997), 'St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury: book-production in the tenth and eleventh centuries.' Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, University of Cambridge.
- McLachan, E. P. (1986), *The Scriptorium of Bury St. Edmunds in the Twelfth Century*. Outstanding Theses from the Courtauld Institute of Art. New York.
- Menzer, M. J. (2004), 'Multilingual Glosses, Bilingual Text: English, Anglo-Norman and Latin in three manuscripts of Ælfric's Grammar' in *Old English Literature in its Manuscript Context*. ed. J. T. Lionarons. Medieval European Studies 5. Morgantown, WV. 95-119.
- Merrilees, B. (1981), 'The Anglo-Norman *Voyage of St Brendan*: precocious or unique? A commentary on recent work', *Parergon* 31, 21-28.
- Merritt, H. D. (1934), 'Old English Entries in a Manuscript at Bern', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 33, 343-51.
- Merritt, H. D. (1945), *Old English Glosses*. Modern Language Association of America: General Series 16. London.
- Merritt, H. D. (1961), 'Old English Glosses, Mostly Drypoint', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 60, 441-50.
- Meyvaert, P. (1961), 'The Bede 'Signature' in the Leningrad Colophon', *Revue Bénédictine* 71, 274-86.
- Miller, W. J. and H. E. Butler, eds. (1986), *The Letters of John of Salisbury*. ed. C. N. L. Brooke. OMT. 2 vols. Oxford.
- Millett, B. (1983), 'Hali Meððbad, Sawles Warde and the Continuity of English Prose' in *Five Hundred Years of Words and Sounds*. eds. D. Gray and E. G. Stanley. Cambridge. 100-108.
- Moffat, D. (1985), 'The Recovery of Worcester Cathedral MS. F. 174', *Notes and Queries* 230, 300-2.
- Moffat, D., ed. (1987), *The Soul's Address to the Body: the Worcester fragments*. Medieval Texts and Studies. East Lansing, MI.
- Mölk, U. (1978), 'La *Chanson de saint Alexis* et la culte du saint en France aux XI^e et XII^e siècles', *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 21, 339-55.

- Morin, G., ed. (1942), *Sancti Caesarii Arelatensis opera varia*. Maretoli.
- Morrison, S. (1984), 'Orm's English Sources', *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 221, 54-64.
- Morrison, S. (1995), 'A Reminiscence of Wulfstan in the Twelfth Century', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 96, 229-34.
- Mossé, F. (1955), 'Another Lost Manuscript of the Old English *Orosius*?' *English Studies* 36, 199-203.
- Muir, B. J., ed. (1994), *The Exeter Anthology of Old English Poetry: an edition of Exeter Dean and Chapter MS 3501*. Exeter Medieval English Texts and Studies. 2 vols. Exeter.
- Muir, B. J. and A. J. Turner, eds. (1998), *Vita Sancti Wilfridi Auctore Edmero: The Life of Saint Wilfrid by Edmer*. Exeter.
- Munk Olsen, B. (1982), *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XIe et XIIe siècles*. Paris.
- Musset, L. (1974), 'Rouen et l'Angleterre vers l'an mil: du nouveau sur le satiriste Garnier et l'école littéraire de Rouen au temps de Richard II', *Annales de Normandie* 24, 287-90.
- Musset, L. (1977), 'Les apports anglais en Normandie de Rollon à Guillaume le Conquérant' in *Les liens entre l'Angleterre médiévale et la France de l'Ouest: actes du colloque de Poitiers*. Publications de l'association des médiévistes anglicistes de l'enseignement supérieur 4. Poitiers. 59-82.
- Mynors, R. A. B., ed. (1937), *Cassiodori Senatoris Institutiones*. Oxford.
- Mynors, R. A. B. (1939), *Durham Cathedral Manuscripts to the End of the Twelfth century*. Oxford.
- Mynors, R. A. B. (1956), 'The Stonyhurst Gospel: (a) textual description and history of the manuscript' in *The Relics of St Cuthbert*. ed. C. F. Battiscombe. Oxford. 356-62.
- Mynors, R. A. B., R. M. Thomson, et al. (1993), *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Hereford Cathedral Library*. Cambridge.
- Napier, A. S. (1883), *Wulfstan: Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien nebst Untersuchungen über ihre Echtheit*. Sammlung englischer Denkmäler in kritischen Ausgaben 4. Berlin.
- Nauta, L., ed. (1999), *Guillelmi de Conchis: glosae super Boetium*. CCCM 158. Turnhout.
- Needham, G. (1958), 'Additions and Alterations in Cotton MS. Julius E. vii', *Review of English Studies* n. s. 9, 160-4.
- Nortier, G. (1966), *Les bibliothèques médiévales des abbayes Bénédictines de Normandie*. Caen.
- O'Brien, B. (1995), 'Forgery and Literacy in Early Common Law', *Albion* 27, 1-18.

- O'Brien O'Keeffe, K. (1998), 'Reading the C-text: the afterlives of London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i' in *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts and their Heritage*. eds. P. Pulsiano and E. Treharne. Aldershot. 137-60.
- O'Donovan, M. A., ed. (1988), *Charters of Sherborne*. Anglo-Saxon Charters 3. Oxford.
- O'Neill, P. P. (1986), 'A Lost Old English Charter Rubric: the evidence from the Regius Psalter', *Notes and Queries* 231, 292-4.
- O'Neill, P. P. (1991), 'Latin Learning at Winchester in the Early Eleventh Century: the evidence of the Lambeth Psalter', *Anglo-Saxon England* 20, 143-66.
- O'Sullivan, S., ed. (2004), *Early Medieval Glosses on Prudentius's Psychomachia: the Weitz tradition*. Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 31. Leiden.
- Offler, H. S. (1946-53), 'William of St Calais, First Norman Bishop of Durham', *Transactions of the Architectural and Archaeological Society of Durham and Northumbria* 10, 258-79.
- Offler, H. S. (1951), 'The Tractate *De iniusta vexacione Willelmi episcopi primi*', *English Historical Review* 66, 321-41.
- Offler, H. S. (1968), *Durham Episcopal Charters, 1071-1152*. Surtees Society 179. Gateshead.
- Offler, H. S. (1971), 'Ranulf Flambard as Bishop of Durham', *Durham University Journal* 64, 14-25.
- Ohlgren, T. H. (1992), *Anglo-Saxon Textual Illustration*. Kalamazoo, MI.
- Oliver, G. (1861), *Lives of the Bishops of Exeter: and a history of the cathedral, with an illustrative appendix*. Exeter.
- Orchard, A. (2005), 'Parallel Lives: Wulfstan, William, Coleman and Christ' in *St Wulfstan and his World*. eds. J. S. Barrow and N. Brooks. Studies in Early Medieval Britain 4. Aldershot: Ashgate. 39-57.
- Orme, N. (2006), *Medieval Schools: from Roman Britain to Renaissance England*. New Haven, CT.
- Ortenberg, V. (1992), *The English Church and the Continent in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries: cultural, spiritual, and artistic exchange*. Oxford.
- Otter, M. (1999), '1066: the moment of transition in two narratives of the Norman Conquest', *Speculum* 74, 565-86.
- Pächt, O. and J. J. G. Alexander (1966), *Illuminated Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, Oxford*. 3 vols. Oxford.
- Pächt, O., C. R. Dodwell, et al. (1960), *The St. Albans Psalter*. Studies of the Warburg Institute 25. London.

- Page, R. I. (1987), 'Yet Another Note on Alfred's *Æstel*', *Leeds Studies in English* n. s. 18, 9-18.
- Parkes, M. B. (1982), *The Scriptorium of Wearmouth-Jarrow*. Jarrow Lecture. Jarrow.
- Parkes, M. B. (1983), 'On the Presumed Date and Possible Origin of the Manuscript of the Ormmulum: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 1' in *Five Hundred Years of Words and Sounds: a Festschrift for Eric Dobson*. eds. E. G. Stanley and D. Gray. Woodbridge. 115-127.
- Parkes, M. B. (1985), 'The Date of the Oxford Manuscript of La Chanson de Roland: Bodleian Library, MS Digby 23', *Medioevo romanzo* 10, 161-175.
- Parkes, M. B. (1994), 'Latin Autograph Manuscripts: orthography and punctuation' in *Gli autografi medievali: problemi paleografici e filologici*. eds. P. Chiesa and L. Pinelli. Spoleto. 23-36.
- Pelteret, D. A. E. (1990), *Catalogue of English Post-Conquest Vernacular Documents*. Woodbridge.
- Pelteret, D. A. E. (1997), 'The Preservation of Anglo-Saxon Culture after 1066: Glastonbury, Wales and the Normans' in *The Preservation and Transmission of Anglo-Saxon Culture*. eds. P. E. Szarmach and J. T. Rosenthal. Studies in Medieval Culture 40. Kalamazoo, MI. 177-209.
- Pfaff, R. W. (1992a), 'Eadui Basan: Scriptorium Princeps?' in *England in the Eleventh Century: proceedings of the 1990 Harlaxton Symposium*. ed. C. Hicks. Paul Watkins Medieval Studies 12. Stamford. 267-83.
- Pfaff, R. W. (1992b), 'Lanfranc's Supposed Purge of the Anglo-Saxon Calendar' in *Warriors and Churchmen in the High Middle Ages: essays presented to Karl Leyser*. ed. T. Reuter. London. 95-108.
- Philpott, M. (1994), 'The *De iniusta uexacione Willelmi episcopi primi* and Canon Law in Anglo-Norman Durham' in *Anglo-Norman Durham 1093-1193*. eds. D. W. Rollason, M. Harvey and M. Prestwich. Woodbridge. 125-37.
- Pickens, R. T. (1970), 'The Literary Activity of Philippe de Thaün', *Romance Notes* 12, 1-5.
- Piper, A. J. (1978), 'The Libraries of the Monks of Durham' in *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts, and Libraries: essays presented to N. R. Ker*. eds. M. B. Parkes and A. G. Watson. London. 213-49.
- Piper, A. J. (1998), 'The Early Lists and Obits of the Durham Monks' in *Symeon of Durham: historian of Durham and the North*. ed. D. W. Rollason. Stamford. 161-201.
- Piper, A. J. (2004), 'The Names of the Durham Monks' in *The Durham Liber Vitae and its Context*. eds. D. W. Rollason, A. J. Piper, M. Harvey and L. Rollason. Regions and Regionalism in History. Woodbridge. 117-25.

- Plummer, C., ed. (1896), *Venerabilis Baedae Historiam ecclesiasticam gentis Anglorum; Historiam abbatum; Epistolam ad Egbertum; una cum Historia abbatum auctore anonymo*. 2 vols. Oxford.
- Pollard, G. (1962), 'The Construction of English Twelfth-Century Bindings', *The Library* 5th series 17, 1-22.
- Pollard, G. (1975), 'Some Anglo-Saxon Bookbindings', *Book Collector* 24, 130-59.
- Pope, J. C. (1967), *Homilies of Ælfric: a supplementary collection*. EETS o. s. 259, 260. 2 vols. Oxford.
- Porée, le Chanoine (1923), 'Le Pontifical D'Egbert, archevêque d'York, conservé à la Bibliothèque Nationale', *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belle Lettres*, 415-24.
- Porter, D. W. (1994), 'The Latin Syllabus in Anglo-Saxon Monastic Schools', *Neophilologus* 78, 463-482.
- Porter, D. W. (1999), 'The Earliest Texts with French and English', *Anglo-Saxon England* 28, 87-110.
- Porter, D. W. (2005), 'Another French Word from an Anglo-Saxon Manuscript', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 106, 23-25.
- Powicke, F. M. and C. R. Cheney, eds. (1964), *Councils and Synods with Other Documents Relating to the English Church II: A. D. 1205-1313*. 2 vols. Oxford.
- Prestwich, J. O. (1994), 'The Career of Ranulf Flambard' in *Anglo-Norman Durham 1093-1193*. eds. D. W. Rollason, M. Harvey and M. Prestwich. Woodbridge. 1-16.
- Pulsiano, P. (1994), 'Old English *Nomina Ventorum*', *Studia Neophilologica* 66, 15-26.
- Pulsiano, P. (1996), *Glossed Texts, Aldhelmiana, Psalms*. Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile 4. Binghamton, NY.
- Pulsiano, P. (2002), 'Jaunts, Jottings and Jetsam in Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts', *Florilegium* 19, 189-197.
- Pulsiano, P. (2007), 'Jaunts, Jottings and Jetsam in Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts' in *Space, Text and Margin in Medieval Manuscripts*. eds. S. L. Keefer and R. H. Bremmer, Jr. Mediaevalia Groningana New Series 10. Leuven. 119-33.
- Pulsiano, P. and J. McGowan (1994), 'Four Unedited Prayers in London, British Library Cotton Tiberius A. iii', *Mediaeval Studies* 56, 189-216.
- Ramackers, J., ed. (1937), *Papsturkunden in Frankreich*. Neue Folge, 2. Band: Normandie. Berlin.

- Ramsay, J. (2002), 'A Possible "Tremulous Hand" Addition to *The Grave* in MS Bodley 343', *Notes and Queries* n. s. 49, 178-80.
- Raw, B. C. (1984), 'The Construction of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11', *Anglo-Saxon England* 13, 187-207.
- Raw, B. C. (1999), 'The Office of the Trinity in the Crowland Psalter (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce 296)', *Anglo-Saxon England* 28, 185-200.
- Reynolds, L. D., ed. (1983), *Texts and Transmission: a survey of the Latin classics*. Oxford.
- Richards, M. P. (1988), *Texts and their Traditions in the Medieval Library of Rochester Cathedral Priory*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 78.3. Philadelphia, PA.
- Ridyard, S. J. (1986), 'Condigna Veneratio: post-Conquest attitudes to the saints of the Anglo-Saxons', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 9, 179-206.
- Rigg, A. G. (1991), 'Henry of Huntingdon's Metrical Experiments', *Journal of Medieval Latin* 1, 60-72.
- Rigg, A. G. (1996), 'Orthography and Punctuation' in *Medieval Latin: an introduction and bibliographical guide*. eds. F. A. C. Mantello and A. G. Rigg. Washington DC. 77-82.
- Riley, H. T. (1867), *Gesta abbatum monasterii Sancti Albani: a Thoma Walsingham, regnante Ricardo Secundo, ejusdem ecclesiae praecentore, compilata*. RS 28. 3 vols. London.
- Roberts, J. (2006), 'Aldred Signs Off From Glossing the Lindisfarne Gospels' in *Writing and Texts in Anglo-Saxon England*. ed. A. R. Rumble. Cambridge. 28-43.
- Robertson, A. J., ed. (1956), *Anglo-Saxon Charters*. Cambridge.
- Robinson, P. R. (1988), *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c.737-1600 in Cambridge Libraries*. Cambridge.
- Rogers, N. (1992), 'The Waltham Abbey Relic-List' in *England in the Eleventh Century: proceedings of the 1990 Harlaxton Symposium*. ed. C. Hicks. Paul Watkins Medieval Studies 12. Stamford. 157-81.
- Rollason, D. W. (1989), *Saints and Relics in Anglo-Saxon England*. Oxford.
- Rollason, D. W. (2004), *The Durham Liber vitae and its Context*. Regions and regionalism in history 1. Woodbridge.
- Rollason, D. W. and L. Rollason, eds., (2007), *The Durham Liber Vitae: London, British Library, MS Cotton Domitian A. vii*. 3 vols. London.
- Rose-Troup, F. (1931), 'The Ancient Monastery of St Mary and St Peter at Exeter', *Transactions of the Devonshire Association* 63, 179-220.

- Rose-Troup, F. (1937), 'Exeter Manumissions and Quittances of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries', *Transactions of the Devonshire Association* 69, 417-445.
- Rouse, R. H. and M. A. Rouse (1991), *Registrum Anglie de libris doctorum et auctorem veterum*. Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 2. London.
- Rud, T. (1825), *Codicum manuscriptorum ecclesiae cathedralis Dunelmensis catalogus classicus*. Durham.
- Ruff, C. (1998), 'Misunderstood Rhetorico-Syntactical Glosses in Two Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts', *Notes and Queries* n. s. 45, 163-66.
- Rumble, A. R. (2002), 'Interpretationes in Latinum: some twelfth-century translations of Anglo-Saxon charters' in *Early Medieval English Texts and Interpretations: studies presented to Donald G. Scragg*. eds. E. Treharne and S. Rosser. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 252. Tempe, AZ. 101-17.
- Rushforth, R. (2001), 'The Prodigal Fragment: Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 734/782a', *Anglo-Saxon England* 30, 137-44.
- Rushforth, R. (2002), 'The Eleventh- and Early Twelfth-Century Manuscripts of Bury St Edmunds Abbey.' Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, University of Cambridge.
- Rushforth, R. (2007), *St Margaret's Gospel-Book: the favourite book of an eleventh-century Queen of Scots*. Treasures from the Bodleian Library. Oxford.
- Salter, E. (1988), 'An Obsession with the Continent' in her *English and International: studies in the literature, art and patronage of medieval England*. eds. D. Pearsall and N. Zeeman. Cambridge. 1-100.
- Sampson, G. (1941), *The Concise History of English Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sauer, H. (1997), 'Knowledge of Old English in the Middle English period?' in *Language History and Linguistic Modelling: a Festschrift for Jacek Fisiak on his 60th birthday*. eds. R. Hickey and S. Puppel. Berlin. i. 791-814.
- Sayers, J. E. and L. Watkiss, eds. (2003), *Thomas of Marlborough: history of the Abbey of Evesham*. OMT. Oxford.
- Schipper, W. (1987), 'A Worksheet of the Worcester 'Tremulous' Glossator', *Anglia: Zeitschrift für Englische Philologie* 105, 28-49.
- Schriber, C. P. (1992), *The Dilemma of Arnulf of Lisieux: new ideas versus old ideals*. Bloomington, IN.
- Schulten, S. (1956), 'Die Buchmalerei des 11. Jahrhunderts im Kloster St. Vaast in Arras', *Münchner Jahrbuch der bildenen Kunst* 3. Folge 7, 49-90.
- Scragg, D. G. (1992), *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts*. EETS o. s. 300. Oxford.

- Scragg, D. G., ed. (2005), *The Old English Life of Mary of Egypt*. Old English Newsletter Subsidia 33. Kalamazoo, MI.
- Sharpe, R. (1995), 'The Setting of St Augustine's Translation, 1091' in *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest: churches, saints and scholars, 1066-1109*. eds. R. Eales and R. Sharpe. London. 1-13.
- Sharpe, R. (2006), 'The Medieval Librarian' in *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland: volume I: to 1640*. eds. E. Leedham-Green and T. Webber. Cambridge. 218-41.
- Sharpe, R., J. P. Carley, et al. (1996), *English Benedictine Libraries: the shorter catalogues*. Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 4. London.
- Shields, H., ed. (1979), *Le livre de sibile by Philippe de Thaon*. ANTS 37. London.
- Shields, H. (1993), 'More Poems by Philippe de Thaon?' in *Anglo-Norman Anniversary Essays*. ed. I. Short. ANTS Occasional Publications Series no. 2. London. 337-359.
- Short, I., ed. (1984), *Philippe de Thaon Comput (MS BL Cotton Nero A. v)*. ANTS Plain Texts Series 2. London.
- Short, I. (1992), 'Patrons and Polyglots: French literature in twelfth-century England', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 14, 229-49.
- Short, I. (1994), 'Gaimar's Epilogue and Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Liber vetustissimus*', *Speculum* 69, 324-43.
- Sidwell, K. (1995), *Reading Medieval Latin*. Cambridge.
- Sisam, C. (1976), *The Vercelli Book: a late-tenth-century manuscript containing prose and verse: Vercelli Biblioteca Capitolare CXVII*. EEMF 19. Copenhagen.
- Sisam, K. (1931), 'MSS. Bodley 340 and 342: Ælfric's Catholic Homilies', *Review of English Studies* 7, 7-22.
- Sisam, K. (1953a), 'Marginalia in the Vercelli Book' in his *Studies in the History of Old English Literature*. Oxford. 109-118.
- Sisam, K. (1953b), 'The Publication of Alfred's *Pastoral Care*' in his *Studies in the History of Old English Literature*. Oxford. 140-7.
- Slights, W. W. E. (1989), 'The Edifying Margins of English Renaissance Books', *Renaissance Quarterly* 42, 682-716.
- Smalley, B. (1983), *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*. 3rd ed. Oxford.
- Smith, M. F. (1994), 'Archbishop Stigand and the Eye of the Needle', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 16, 199-219.

- Sneddon, C. R. (2001), 'Brendan the Navigator: a twelfth-century view' in *The North Sea World in the Middle Ages: studies in the cultural history of North-Western Europe*. eds. T. R. Liszka and L. E. M. Walker. Dublin. 210-229.
- Somerville, R., ed. (1982), *Scotia pontificia: papal letters to Scotland before the pontificate of Innocent III*. Oxford.
- Southern, R. W. (1958), 'The Canterbury Forgeries', *English Historical Review* 73, 193-226.
- Southern, R. W., ed. (1962), *The Life of St Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, by Eadmer*. Nelson's Medieval Texts. London.
- Southern, R. W. (1963), *Saint Anselm and his Biographer: a study of monastic life and thought, 1059 - c. 1130*. Birkbeck lectures 1959. Cambridge.
- Southern, R. W. (1970), 'Ranulf Flambard' in his *Medieval Humanism and Other Studies*. Oxford. 183-205.
- Spannagel, A., ed. (1974), *Smaragdi Abbatis Expositio in Regulam S. Benedicti*. CCM 8. Siegburg.
- Spear, D. S. (2006), *The Personnel of the Norman Cathedrals during the Ducal Period, 911-1204*. London.
- Spiegel, H., ed. (1987), *Marie de France: Fables*. Toronto.
- Stanley, E. G. (1983), 'Early Middle English Oc, "but, and"' in *Five Hundred Years of Words and Sounds: a Festschrift for Eric Dobson*. eds. E. G. Stanley and D. Gray. Cambridge. 144-50.
- Stanley, E. G. (2002), 'Palaeographical and Textual Deep Waters: [a] for [u] and [u] for [a], [d] for [ð] and [ð] for [d] in Old English', *ANQ: a quarterly journal of short articles, notes, and reviews* 15, 64-72.
- Stanton, R. (2002), *The Culture of Translation in Anglo-Saxon England*. Cambridge.
- Stemmler, T. (1974), 'Textologische Probleme mittelenglischen Dichtung', *Mannheimer Berichte aus Forschung und Lehre an der Universität Mannheim* 8, 245-8.
- Stemmler, T. (1977), 'Über die Schwierigkeit englische Lyrik des Mittelalters zu edieren', *Mannheimer Berichte aus Forschung und Lehre an der Universität Mannheim* 15, 409-13.
- Stenton, D. M. (1965), *English Justice Between the Norman Conquest and the Great Charter 1066-1215*. London.
- Stenton, F. M. (1918), 'The Supremacy of the Mercian Kings', *English Historical Review* 33, 433-52.
- Stettiner, R. (1895), *Die illustrierten Prudentiushandschriften*. 2 vols. Berlin.

- Stoneman, W. P. (1984), 'The Latin and Old English Notes in the Old English Illustrated Hexaeteuch (BL Cotton Claudius B. iv)', *Old English Newsletter* 17, A-37.
- Stoneman, W. P. (1987), 'Another Old English Note Signed "Coleman"', *Medium Aevum* 56, 78-82.
- Stoneman, W. P. (1999), *Dover Priory*. Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 5. London.
- Storms, G., ed. (1948), *Anglo-Saxon Magic*. The Hague.
- Story, J. E. (1993), 'The Archaeology of Early Medieval Manuscripts: Durham Cathedral Library Ms. A. II. 16, an eighth-century Northumbrian Gospel Book', *Durham Archaeological Journal* 9, 19-26.
- Stubbs, W., ed. (1874), *Memorials of St Dunstan*. RS 63. London.
- Styles, D. (1941-2), 'The Early History of Alcester Abbey', *Transactions of the Birmingham Archaeological Society* 64, 20-38.
- Swan, M. (2005), 'Imagining a Readership for Post-Conquest Old English Manuscripts' in *Imagining the Book*. eds. S. Kelly and J. J. Thompson. Medieval Texts and Cultures of Northern Europe. Turnhout. 145-57.
- Swan, M. (2006), 'Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 198 and the Blickling Manuscript', *Leeds Studies in English* n. s. 37, 89-100.
- Swan, M. (2007a), 'Mobile Libraries: Old English manuscript production in Worcester and the West Midlands, 1090-1215' in *Essays in Manuscript Geography: vernacular Manuscripts of the English West Midlands from the Conquest to the Sixteenth Century*. ed. W. Scase. Medieval Texts and Cultures of Northern Europe 10. Turnhout. 29-42.
- Swan, M. (2007b), 'Preaching Past the Conquest: Lambeth Palace 487 and Cotton Vespasian A. XXII' in *The Old English Homily: precedent, practice and appropriation*. ed. A. J. Kleist. Studies in the Early Middle Ages 17. Turnhout. 403-23.
- Swan, M. and E. M. Treharne (2000), *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*. CSASE 30. Cambridge.
- Swanton, M. J., ed. (1996), *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. London.
- Talbot, C. H. (1954), *The Anglo-Saxon Missionaries in Germany*. London.
- Tatton-Brown, T. (1984), 'The Towns of Kent' in *Anglo-Saxon Towns in Southern England*. ed. J. Haslam. Chichester. 1-36.
- Taylor, P. (1995), 'The Early St Albans Endowment and its Chroniclers', *Historical Research* 68, 119-42.

- Taylor, S., ed. (1983), *MS B. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: a collaborative edition* 4. eds. D. N. Dumville and S. Keynes. Cambridge.
- Temple, E. (1976), *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts, 900-1066*. Survey of Manuscripts Illuminated in the British Isles 2. London.
- Thomas, H. M. (2003), *The English and the Normans: ethnic hostility, assimilation, and identity 1066-c. 1220*. Oxford.
- Thompson, A. H. (1923), *Liber vitae ecclesiae Dunelmensis: a collotype facsimile of the original manuscript, with introductory essays and notes*. Surtees Society 136. Durham.
- Thomson, H. J., ed. (1949-1953), *Prudentius*. Loeb Classical Library 387, 398. 2 vols. London.
- Thomson, R. M. (1971), 'Early Romanesque Book-Illustration in England: the dates of the Pierpont Morgan 'Vitae Sancti Edmundi' and the Bury Bible', *Viator* 2, 211-25.
- Thomson, R. M. (1972), 'A Twelfth-Century Letter from Bury St Edmunds Abbey', *Revue Bénédictine* 82, 87-97.
- Thomson, R. M. (1977), 'Twelfth-Century Documents from Bury St Edmunds Abbey', *English Historical Review* 92, 806-19.
- Thomson, R. M. (1980), *The Archives of the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds*. Suffolk Records Society 21. Woodbridge.
- Thomson, R. M. (1982a), 'Identifiable Books from the Pre-Conquest Library of Malmesbury Abbey', *Anglo-Saxon England* 10, 1-19.
- Thomson, R. M. (1982b), *Manuscripts from St. Albans Abbey, 1066-1235*. 2 vols. Woodbridge.
- Thomson, R. M. (1986), 'The Norman Conquest and English Libraries' in *The Role of the Book in Medieval Culture*. ed. P. Ganz. Bibliologia: Elementa ad Librorum Studia Pertinentia 4. Turnhout. ii. 27-40.
- Thomson, R. M. (2001), *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval Manuscripts in Worcester Cathedral Library*. With a contribution on the bindings by Michael Gullick. Cambridge.
- Thomson, R. M. (2003), *William of Malmesbury*. Rev. ed. Ipswich.
- Thomson, R. M. (2006a), *Books and Learning in Twelfth-Century England: the ending of 'Alter Orbis'*. Walkern.
- Thomson, R. M. (2006b), 'The Use of the Vernacular in Manuscripts from Worcester Cathedral Priory', *Transactions of the Worcestershire Archaeological Society* 3rd ser., 20, 113-9.

- Thorpe, J., ed. (1769), *Registrum Roffense: or, a collection of antient records, charters, and instruments of divers kinds, necessary for illustrating the ecclesiastical history and antiquities of the diocese and cathedral church of Rochester*. London.
- Torkar, R. (1971), 'Zu den Vorlagen der ae. Handschrift Cotton Julius E. VII.' *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 72, 711-5.
- Townsend, D. (1991), 'Anglo-Latin Hagiography and the Norman Conquest', *Exemplaria* 3, 385-433.
- Traxel, O. M. (2004), *Language Change, Writing and Textual Interference in Post-Conquest Old English Manuscripts: the evidence of Cambridge, University Library, li. 1. 33*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Treharne, E. (1998), 'The Dates and Origins of Three Twelfth-Century Old English Manuscripts' in *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts and their Heritage*. eds. P. Pulsiano and E. Treharne. Aldershot. 227-253.
- Treharne, E. (2001), 'English in the Post-Conquest Period' in *The Blackwell Companion to Anglo-Saxon Literature*. eds. P. Pulsiano and E. Treharne. Oxford. 403-14.
- Treharne, E. (2003a), 'The Form and Function of the Old English *Dicts of Cato*', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 102, 465-485.
- Treharne, E. (2003b), 'Producing a Library in Late Anglo-Saxon England: Exeter 1050-1072', *Review of English Studies* 54, 155-172.
- Treharne, E. (2006a), 'Categorization, Periodization, and the Silence of (the) English in the Twelfth Century', *New Medieval Literatures* 8, 247-73.
- Treharne, E. (2006b), 'The Life and Times of Old English Homilies for the First Sunday in Lent' in *The Power of Words: Anglo-Saxon studies presented to Donald G. Scragg on his seventieth birthday*. eds. H. Magennis and J. Wilcox. Morgantown, WV. 205-240.
- Treharne, E. (2006c), 'Reading from the Margins: the uses of Old English homiletic manuscripts in the post-Conquest period' in *Beatus Vir: studies in early English and Norse manuscripts in memory of Phillip Pulsiano*. eds. A. N. Doane and K. Wolf. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 319. Tempe, AZ. 329-58.
- Treharne, E. (2007), 'Bishops and their Texts in the Later Eleventh Century: Worcester and Exeter' in *Essays in Manuscript Geography: vernacular manuscripts of the English West Midlands from the Conquest to the Sixteenth Century*. ed. W. Scase. Medieval Texts and Cultures of Northern Europe 10. Turnhout. 13-28.
- Treharne, E. (forthcoming), 'Making their Presence Felt: readers of Ælfric, c. 1050-1350'.
- van Caenegem, R. C., ed. (1990), *English Lawsuits from William I to Richard I*. Publications of the Selden Society 106-107. 2 vols. London.

- van Houts, E. M. C., ed. (1992-1995), *The Gesta Normannorum Ducum of William of Jumièges, Orderic Vitalis, and Robert of Torigni*. OMT. 2 vols. Oxford.
- van Liere, F. (2005), 'The OE Hexateuch and its Readership: the glosses of Cotton Claudius B. IV', *Old English Newsletter* 38, 77.
- Verey, C. D. (1999), 'Lindisfarne or Rath Maelsigi? The evidence of the texts' in *Northumbria's Golden Age*. eds. J. Hawkes and S. Mills. Stroud. 327-335.
- Verey, C. D., T. J. Brown, et al. (1980), *The Durham Gospels: together with fragments of a Gospel Book in uncial; Durham, Cathedral Library, MS A. II. 17*. EEMF 20. Copenhagen.
- Veziñ, J. (1986), 'Les relations entre Saint-Denis et d'autres scriptoria' in *The Role of the Book in Medieval Culture*. ed. P. Ganz. Elementa ad Librorum Studia Pertinentia 3. Turnhout. i. 17-39.
- Wahlgren-Smith, L. (2005), 'On the Composition of Hebert Losinga's Letter Collection', *Classica et Mediaevalia* 55, 229-46.
- Wallberg, E., ed. (1900), *Le Bestiaire de Philippe de Thain*. Lund.
- Warner, R. D. N. (1917), *Early English Homilies from the Twelfth Century MS Vesp. D. XIV*. EETS o. s. 152. London.
- Waters, E. G. R., ed. (1928), *The Anglo-Norman Voyage of St. Brendan by Benedeit*. Oxford.
- Watkiss, L. and M. Chibnall, eds., (1994), *The Waltham Chronicle: an account of the discovery of our holy cross at Montacute and its conveyance to Waltham*. OMT. Oxford.
- Wats, W. (1640), *Matthaei Paris monachi Albanensis Angli, Historia Major. huic primum editioni accesserunt, duorum Offarum Merciorum Regum; & viginti trium abbatum S. Albani vitae, una cum Libro Additamentorum per eundem Authorem*. London.
- Watson, A. G. (1979), *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts, c. 700-1600, in the Department of Manuscripts, the British Library*. 2 vols. London.
- Watson, A. G. (1984), *Catalogue of Dated and Datable manuscripts c. 435-1600 in Oxford Libraries*. 2 vols. Oxford.
- Webber, T. (1992), *Scribes and Scholars at Salisbury Cathedral, c. 1075 – c. 1125*. Oxford Historical Monographs. Oxford.
- Webber, T. (1995), 'Script and Manuscript Production at Christ Church, Canterbury, after the Norman Conquest' in *Canterbury after the Conquest: churches, saints and scholars, 1066-1109*. eds. R. Eales and R. Sharpe. London. 145-158.
- Webber, T. (1996), 'The Diffusion of Augustine's *Confessions* in England during the Eleventh- and Twelfth-Centuries' in *The Cloister and the World: essays in medieval history in honour of Barbara Harvey*. eds. J. Blair and B. Golding. Oxford. 29-45.

- Webber, T. (1997), 'The Patristic Content of English Book Collections in the Eleventh Century: towards a continental perspective' in *Of the Making of Books: medieval manuscripts, their scribes and readers: essays presented to M. B. Parkees*. eds. P. R. Robinson and R. Zim. Aldershot. 191-205.
- Webber, T. (1998), 'The Provision of Books for Bury St Edmunds Abbey in the 11th and 12th Centuries' in *Bury St Edmunds: medieval art, architecture, archaeology and economy*. ed. A. Gransden. The British Archeological Association Conference Transactions 20. Leeds. 186-93.
- Webber, T. (2006), 'Monastic and Cathedral Book Collections in the Late Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries' in *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland: volume I: to 1640*. eds. E. Leedham-Green and T. Webber. Cambridge. 109-25.
- Webber, T. and A. G. Watson (1998), *The Libraries of the Augustinian Canons*. Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 6. London.
- Weinberg, C. (1994), 'The Latin Marginal Glosses in the Caligula Manuscript of La3amon's *Brut*' in *The Text and Tradition of La3amon's Brut*. ed. F. Le Saux. Arthurian Studies 33. Cambridge. 103-120.
- Weinberg, C. (1995), 'By a Noble Church on the Bank of the Severn': a regional view of La3amon's *Brut*', *Leeds Studies in English* n. s. 26, 49-62.
- Westgard, J. A. (2006), 'Evidence for the Presence of M-Type Manuscripts of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* in Northern England after c. 800', *Revue Bénédictine* 116, 310-5.
- Whitelock, D., ed. (1930), *Anglo-Saxon Wills*. Cambridge Studies in English Legal History. Cambridge.
- Whitelock, D. (1954), *The Peterborough Chronicle (the Bodleian Manuscript Laud misc. 636)*. EEMF 4. Copenhagen.
- Wieland, G. R. (1983), *The Latin Glosses on Arator and Prudentius in Cambridge University Library, MS Gg. 5. 35*. Toronto.
- Wieland, G. R. (1998), 'Interpreting the Interpretation: the polysemy of the Latin gloss', *Journal of Medieval Latin* 8, 59-71.
- Wieland, G. R. and A. G. Rigg (1975), 'A Canterbury Classbook of the mid-eleventh century (the 'Cambridge Songs' manuscript)', *Anglo-Saxon England* 4, 113-30.
- Wilkins, N. (1993), *Catalogue des manuscrits français de la bibliothèque Parker (Parker Library), Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*. Cambridge.
- Willetts, P. J. (1966), 'A Reconstructed Astronomical Manuscript from the Library of Christ Church, Canterbury', *British Museum Quarterly* 30, 22-29.
- Williams, A. (1997), 'The Spoliation of Worcester', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 19, 383-408.

- Williams, L. F. R. (1917), *History of the Abbey of St Alban*. London.
- Willis, J., ed. (1983), *Martianus Capella*. Leipzig.
- Wilson, H. A., ed. (1896), *The Missal of Robert of Jumièges*. HBS 11. London.
- Wilson, R. M., ed. (1938), *Samles Warde: an early Middle English homily edited from the Bodley, Royal and Cotton MSS*. Kendal.
- Wilson, R. M. (1941), 'Some Lost Saints' Lives in Old and Middle English', *Modern Language Review* 36, 161-72.
- Wilson, R. M. (1952), *The Lost Literature of Medieval England*. Methuen Old English Library. London.
- Winterbottom, M. (2003), 'The Language of William of Malmesbury' in *Rhetoric and Renewal in the Latin West 1100-1540: essays in honour of John O. Ward*. eds. C. J. Mews, C. J. Nederman and R. M. Thomson. Disputatio 2. Turnhout. 129-47.
- Winterbottom, M. (2005), 'Faricius of Arezzo's Life of St Aldhelm' in *Latin Learning and English Lore: studies in Anglo-Saxon literature for Michael Lapidge*. eds. K. O'Brien O'Keefe and A. Orchard. Toronto. i. 109-31.
- Winterbottom, M. and R. M. Thomson, eds., (2002), *William of Malmesbury, Saints' Lives: lives of SS. Wulfstan, Dunstan, Patrick, Benignus and Indract*. OMT. Oxford.
- Winterbottom, M. and R. M. Thomson, eds., (2007), *William of Malmesbury, Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*. OMT. 2 vols. Oxford.
- Withers, B. C. (2007), *The Illustrated Old English Hexateuch, Cotton Claudius B. iv: the frontier of seeing and reading in Anglo-Saxon England*. London.
- Wogan-Browne, J. (2001), *Saints' Lives and Women's Literary Culture c. 1150-1300: virginity and its authorizations*. Oxford.
- Wormald, F., ed. (1934), *English Kalendars before A. D. 1100*. HBS 72. London.
- Wormald, F. (1944), 'The Survival of Anglo-Saxon Illumination after the Norman Conquest', *Publications of the British Academy* 30, 127-145.
- Wormald, F. (1945), 'Decorated Initials in English Manuscripts from AD 900-1100', *Archaeologia* 91, 107-35.
- Wormald, F., ed. (1946), *English Benedictine Kalendars after c. 1100*. HBS 81. London.
- Wormald, F. (1952), *English Drawings of the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries*. London.
- Wormald, F. (1957), 'The Sherborne "Chartulary"' in *Fritz Saxl 1890-1948: a volume of memorial essays from his friends in England*. ed. D. J. Gordon. London.

- Wormald, F. (1965), 'A Fragment of a Tenth-Century English Gospel Lectionary' in *Calligraphy and Palaeography: essays presented to Alfred Fairbank on his 70th birthday*. ed. A. S. Osley. London. 43-46.
- Wormald, P. (1978), 'Æthelred the Lawmaker' in *Ethelred the Unready: papers from the millenary conference*. ed. D. Hill. BAR British Series 59. Oxford. 47-80.
- Wormald, P. (1999), 'Archbishop Wulfstan and the Holiness of Society' in *Legal Culture in the Early Medieval West: law as text, image and experience*. London. 225-251.
- Wright, C. E. (1938), 'Two Ælfric Fragments', *Medium Aevum* 7, 50-55.
- Wright, D. H. (1961), 'Some Notes on English Uncial', *Traditio* 17, 441-56.
- Wright, D. H. and A. Campbell (1967), *The Vespasian Psalter: British Museum Cotton Vespasian A. I*. EEMF 14. Copenhagen.
- Wright, R. (1981), 'Late Latin and Early Romance: Alcuin's *De orthographia*' in *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar: third volume, 1981*. ed. F. Cairns. ARCA Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs. Liverpool. 343-61.
- Wright, T. (1846), *Biographia Britannica Literaria: Anglo-Norman Period*. London.
- Yerkes, D. (1978), 'The Medieval Provenance of Corpus Christi College, MS 322', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 7, 245-47.
- Yerkes, D. (1986), 'The Translation of Gregory's *Dialogues* and its Revision: textual history, provenance, authorship' in *Studies in Earlier Old English Prose: sixteen original contributions*. ed. P. E. Szarmach. Albany, NY. 335-343.
- Zupitza, J. (1878), 'Das Nicaeische Symbolum in englischer Aufzeichnung des 12. Jhds.' *Anglia: Zeitschrift für Englische Philologie* 1, 286-7.
- Zupitza, J. (1966), *Aelfrics Grammatik und Glossar: Text und Varianten*. 2nd ed. Berlin.

INDEX OF MANUSCRIPTS

A

Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, 17110E	156
Alençon, Bibliothèque Municipale, 14, fols. 91-113	69
Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale, 732 (684)	67
Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale, 1029 (812)	67
Avranches, Bibliothèque Municipale, 101	78

B

Bern, Burgerbibliothek, 49	92
Bern, Burgerbibliothek, 671	154
Bloomington, Indiana University, Lilly Library, Add. 1000	<i>See</i> London, British Library, Harley 5915, fols. 8, 9
Boulogne, Bibliothèque Municipale, 46	56
Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, 1650 (1520)	124, 125
Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, 7965-73 (3723)	24

C

Cambridge, Clare College, 30	73-4, 77, 144-5, 146
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 9	98, 142
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 12	146
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 23, pt. 1	43, 120-1, 126-7
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41	51
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 111, pp. 7, 8, 55, 56	<i>See</i> Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 140
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 135, fols. 101, 102	166
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 140	152, 162
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 146	98
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 162, pp. 139-60	<i>See</i> Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 178, pp. 1-270
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 173, fols. 1-56	99-103
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 178, pp. 1-270	140-1, 146
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 178, pp. 287-457	143
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 183	166
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 184	57
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 187	57
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 190	47, 51
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 191	15, 143
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 196	15, 47
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 197B	186
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 198	146
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 201, pp. 179-272	51
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 206	23, 39-40
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 221	81-3
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 265	140, 141
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 285, fols. 75-131	124
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 286	159, 186-7
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 302	12
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 303	12, 13, 141
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 322	144-5
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 326	124, 125
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 367, pt. 2, fols. 1, 2, 7-10	12
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 367, pt. 2, fols. 3-6, 11-29	12
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 367, pt. 2, fols. 45-52	169
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 371	83, 85

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 383	12
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 391	97, 98, 146, 187
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 399	39, 78
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 411	96, 188-9
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 422	32, 59-60, 62, 98
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 448, fols. 87-103	176
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 449, fols. 42-96	107
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 557	146
Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, 45-1980	163
Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, 144/194	151
Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, 153/203	34
Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, 820/810(h)	34
Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, 820/810(k)	34
Cambridge, Jesus College, 15 (Q. A. 15)	35
Cambridge, Jesus College, 64 (Q. G. 16)	119
Cambridge, Magdalene College, Pepys 2981 (18)	<i>See</i> Durham, Cathedral Library, A. II. 16
Cambridge, Pembroke College, 25	161, 167-8
Cambridge, Pembroke College, 81	56
Cambridge, Pembroke College, 83	40-1, 170-1
Cambridge, Pembroke College, 84	119
Cambridge, Pembroke College, 88	12, 75, 171
Cambridge, Pembroke College, 301	163
Cambridge, Pembroke College, 302	155
Cambridge, Pembroke College, 312C, nos. 1 and 2	67
Cambridge, Queen's College, Horne 74	<i>See</i> London, British Library, Additional 61735
Cambridge, St John's College, 59 (C. 9)	60-1
Cambridge, St John's College, 73 (C. 23)	161
Cambridge, St John's College, 101 (D. 26)	37, 44-5
Cambridge, St John's College, 164 (F. 27)	35
Cambridge, St John's College, 209 (H. 6)	33
Cambridge, St John's College, 254 (S. 6)	91
Cambridge, St John's College, 267 (Aa. 5. 1), fol. 67	33
Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 1. 17 (16)	97
Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 2. 36 (79)	77
Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 3. 9 (88)	97
Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 3. 25 (104)	56
Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 4. 27 (141)	176
Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 10. 4 (215)	163
Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 10. 5 (216)	184
Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 11. 2 (241)	51
Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 14. 52 (335)	12
Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 15. 34 (369)	132-4
Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 16. 44 (405)	55, 66, 100
Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 5. 22 (717), fols. 72-158	59
Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 7. 5 (743)	90-1
Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 9. 17 (819), fols. 1-48	12, 107, 109
Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 15. 32 (945)	12
Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 17. 1 (987)	12, 17
Cambridge, Trinity College, O. 2. 30 (1134)	45-6
Cambridge, Trinity College, O. 2. 31 (1135)	126
Cambridge, Trinity College, O. 2. 51 (1155)	122-4
Cambridge, Trinity Hall, 24	31
Cambridge, University Library, Add. 3330	<i>See</i> New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, 401
Cambridge, University Library, Add. 4406 (74)	10
Cambridge, University Library, Add. 6220 (14)	10
Cambridge, University Library, Ee. 2. 4	32
Cambridge, University Library, Ff. 1. 23	10

Cambridge, University Library, Ff. 3. 29, fols. 13-162	56
Cambridge, University Library, Ff. 5. 27	33
Cambridge, University Library, Gg. 3. 28	134-5
Cambridge, University Library, Gg. 5. 35	113, 114, 124
Cambridge, University Library, Hh. 1. 10	51, 107, 108-10
Cambridge, University Library, Ii. 1. 33	12, 15
Cambridge, University Library, Ii. 2. 4	51
Cambridge, University Library, Ii. 2. 11	51, 144
Cambridge, University Library, Ii. 3. 12, fols. 62-133	119
Cambridge, University Library, Ii. 6. 32	154
Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 1. 24	155
Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 3. 18	140, 142, 145, 146
Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 3. 21	115-9
Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 5. 16	89
Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 5. 34	151
Canterbury, Cathedral Library and Archives, Add. 20	143
Canterbury, Cathedral Library and Archives, Add. 32	77
Columbia, University of Missouri, Ellis Library, Fragmenta Manuscripta F. M. 2	82
Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliothek, Gamle Kongelige Sammling 1595 4°	129

D

Dublin, Trinity College, 98 (B. 3. 6)	96
Dublin, Trinity College, 174 (B. 4. 3)	12
Dublin, Trinity College, 371 (D. 1. 26)	35, 54
Dublin, Trinity College, 492 (E. 2. 23)	90
Durham, Cathedral Library, A. II. 4	36
Durham, Cathedral Library, A. II. 16	183
Durham, Cathedral Library, A. II. 17, fols. 2-102	181
Durham, Cathedral Library, A. II. 17, fols. 103-111	182
Durham, Cathedral Library, A. IV. 16, fols. 66-109	36
Durham, Cathedral Library, A. IV. 19	182
Durham, Cathedral Library, B. II. 8	36
Durham, Cathedral Library, B. II. 11	120
Durham, Cathedral Library, B. II. 14, fols. 7-200	193
Durham, Cathedral Library, B. II. 30	184
Durham, Cathedral Library, B. III. 32	107, 112
Durham, Cathedral Library, B. IV. 6, fols. 1-94	56
Durham, Cathedral Library, B. IV. 7	36
Durham, Cathedral Library, B. IV. 13	36
Durham, Cathedral Library, B. IV. 24	194
Durham, Cathedral Library, C. IV. 10	119, 120
Durham, University Library, Cosin V. II. 6	190, 192, 193

E

El Escorial, Real Biblioteca, E. II. 1	62-3
Exeter, Cathedral Library, 3501, fols. 0-7	<i>See</i> Cambridge, University Library, Ii. 2. 11
Exeter, Cathedral Library, 3501, fols. 8-130	51, 52

F

Fulda, Hessische Landesbibliothek, Aa. 21	52
---	----

G

Glasgow, University Library, Hunterian 431 (V. 5. 1)	2, 146
--	--------

H

Haarlem, Stadsbibliotheek, 188 F 53	<i>See</i> Cambridge, Pembroke College, 312C, nos 1 and 2
Hannover, Kestner-Museum, W. M. XXIa, 36	68
Hereford, Cathedral Library, O. III. 2	56
Hereford, Cathedral Library, P. V. I, fols. 29-152	90
Hereford, Cathedral Library, P. VI. 2	56
Hertford, Hertfordshire Record Office, Gorehambury X. D. 4. B + X. D. 4. C	26, 28

K

Kassel, Gesamthochschulbibliothek, 4° Ms. theol. 2	89
--	----

L

Lawrence, University of Kansas, Kenneth Spencer Research Library, Pryce C2:1	<i>See</i> Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 557
Lawrence, University of Kansas, Kenneth Spencer Research Library, Pryce C2:2	<i>See</i> Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 115
Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Scaliger 69	54, 68
Lichfield, Cathedral Library, 1	153-4
Lichfield, Chapter Muniment, O. 1	154
Lincoln, Cathedral Library, 182 (C. 2. 8)	59
Lincoln, Cathedral Library, 184 (C. 1. 13), fol. 1	<i>See</i> Lincoln, Cathedral Library, 182 (C. 2. 8)
London, British Library, Additional 9381	159
London, British Library, Additional 21084	57
London, British Library, Additional 21213	31
London, British Library, Additional 23944	41, 55-6
London, British Library, Additional 34652, fol. 2	<i>See</i> London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi
London, British Library, Additional 34652, fol. 3	143
London, British Library, Additional 34890	176
London, British Library, Additional 37777	23, 103, 156, 182
London, British Library, Additional 38651, fols. 57 and 58	129
London, British Library, Additional 40000, fols. 1-12	189
London, British Library, Additional 40165A	34, 35, 58
London, British Library, Additional 40165B	34
London, British Library, Additional 45025	<i>See</i> London, British Library, Additional 37777
London, British Library, Additional 46204	103, 156
London, British Library, Additional 46487	156
London, British Library, Additional 50483K	<i>See</i> New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, 401
London, British Library, Additional 61735	170, 171
London, British Library, Additional 71687	<i>See</i> New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, 401
London, British Library, Arundel 155	97-8
London, British Library, Cotton Appendix 56, fols. 1-4	175-6
London, British Library, Cotton Augustus ii. 3	153
London, British Library, Cotton Augustus ii. 36	100
London, British Library, Cotton Caligula A. xv, fols. 120-153	<i>See</i> London, British Library, Egerton 3314, fols. 9-72
London, British Library, Cotton Claudius A. iii, fols. 2-7, 9*	<i>See</i> London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. ii
London, British Library, Cotton Claudius A. iii, fol. 8	158-9
London, British Library, Cotton Claudius A. iii, fols. 31-86, 106-50	129
London, British Library, Cotton Claudius B. iv	1, 47
London, British Library, Cotton Claudius D. iii, fols. 55-140	12, 143
London, British Library, Cotton Cleopatra A. iii	32, 38
London, British Library, Cotton Cleopatra A. iii*	32
London, British Library, Cotton Cleopatra B. xiii	51
London, British Library, Cotton Cleopatra C. viii	121-2, 127

- London, British Library, Cotton Domitian i, fols. 2-55 168-9
 London, British Library, Cotton Domitian v, fols. 2-14 54
 London, British Library, Cotton Domitian vii 2, 189-98
 London, British Library, Cotton Domitian viii, fols. 30-70 12, 99-101
 London, British Library, Cotton Domitian ix, fols. 2-7 88, 124
 London, British Library, Cotton Domitian ix, fol. 9 13
 London, British Library, Cotton Domitian ix, fol. 10 *See* Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 3. 18
 London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. ix 12
 London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. x, fols. 3-101 107, 110-1
 London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. x, fols. 102-151 12
 London, British Library, Cotton Faustina B. iii, fols. 158-198 102
 London, British Library, Cotton Faustina B. vi, fols. 95, 98-100 *See* London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. ii
 London, British Library, Cotton Julius A. ii, fols. 10-133 107, 111-2
 London, British Library, Cotton Julius A. ii, fols. 136-144 12
 London, British Library, Cotton Julius A. vi 98
 London, British Library, Cotton Julius A. x, fols. 44-175 137-8
 London, British Library, Cotton Julius E. vii 129, 130, 135-7
 London, British Library, Cotton Nero D. i 24
 London, British Library, Cotton Nero D. ii, fols. 238-41 *See* London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. v, vol. 1, fols. 2-73 and 77-88
 London, British Library, Cotton Nero D. iv 178-80, 189, 198
 London, British Library, Cotton Nero E. i, vol. 1 98, 142
 London, British Library, Cotton Nero E. i, vol. 2, fols. 1-155 *See* London, British Library, Cotton Nero E. i, vol. 1
 London, British Library, Cotton Nero E. i, vol. 2, fols. 166-80 *See* Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 9
 London, British Library, Cotton Nero E. i, vol. 2, fols. 181-4 *See* London, British Library, Additional 46204
 London, British Library, Cotton Otho A. xiii, fols. '202-216' 12
 London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. x, fols. 29, 30 146
 London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. x, fols. 55, 58, 63 *See* London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi
 London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi 64
 London, British Library, Cotton Otho C. i, vol. 2 47, 140, 142, 146
 London, British Library, Cotton Otho C. v *See* Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 197B
 London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. ii 157-9
 London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. iii, fols. 2-173 43-4, 87-8
 London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. iii, fols. 174-7 *See* London, British Library, Cotton Faustina B. iii, fols. 158-98
 London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. iii, fol. 178 *See* London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi, fols. 1-35
 London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi, fols. 1-35 99, 102
 London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. xiii, fols. 1-118 103-5, 129
 London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. xiii, fols. 119-200 103-4
 London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. xiv 90
 London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. xv, fol. 174 61
 London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i, fols. 112-64 99
 London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. v, vol. 1, fols. 2-73, 77-88 62
 London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. v, vol. 1, fols. 74 and 76 *See* Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 1. 24
 London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. v, vol. 1, fol. 75 155, 162
 London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius C. i, fols. 43-203 59, 98
 London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius C. ii 89, 92
 London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius D. iv, vol. 2, fols. 158-66 *See* Winchester, Cathedral Library, 1
 London, British Library, Cotton Titus A. iv 143
 London, British Library, Cotton Titus D. xvi, fols. 1-36 22, 120
 London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian A. i 96, 153, 186-7
 London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian A. xiv, fols. 7-10 107
 London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian A. xiv, fols. 114-79 129

London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian A. xxii, fols. 60-129	65-6
London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian B. x, fols. 31-124	54
London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D. xii	98
London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D. xiv	12, 13
London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D. xxi, fols. 18-40	<i>See</i> Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud misc. 509
London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian E. iv, fols. 203-10	<i>See</i> London, British Library, Cotton Appendix 56, fols. 1-4
London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius A. xv, fols. 4-93	12, 13
London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius A. xix	32
London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius C. iii, fols. 11-85	202
London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius C. viii, fols. 85-90	<i>See</i> Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 10. 5 (216)
London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius D. xvii, fols. 4-92	145-6
London, British Library, Egerton 874	32, 54
London, British Library, Egerton 3314, fols. 9-72	12, 13, 99-102
London, British Library, Harley 55, fols. 1-4	75, 129
London, British Library, Harley 55, fols. 5-13	12
London, British Library, Harley 76	159-62
London, British Library, Harley 107	107, 112
London, British Library, Harley 208	38
London, British Library, Harley 491, fols. 3-46	36
London, British Library, Harley 491, flyleaves	196
London, British Library, Harley 585	202
London, British Library, Harley 863	96-7
London, British Library, Harley 865	26, 28
London, British Library, Harley 2110, fols. 4* and 5*	35, 62, 63
London, British Library, Harley 2965	154
London, British Library, Harley 3080	56
London, British Library, Harley 3271	107
London, British Library, Harley 3376	147
London, British Library, Harley 3680	90
London, British Library, Harley 3766	185
London, British Library, Harley 3826	81-2
London, British Library, Harley 3969	82-3
London, British Library, Harley 4092, fols. 1-38	120
London, British Library, Harley 4092, fols. 87-158	119
London, British Library, Harley 4688	57
London, British Library, Harley 5915, fols. 8, 9	107
London, British Library, Harley 6258B	12, 13
London, British Library, Loan 11	163
London, British Library, Loan 74	180-1, 198
London, British Library, Loan 81	<i>See</i> London, British Library, Additional 37777
London, British Library, Royal 1 A. xiv	12, 57
London, British Library, Royal 1 B. vii	154-5
London, British Library, Royal 1 B. xi	156
London, British Library, Royal 1 D. iii	63, 65-6
London, British Library, Royal 1 D. ix	155
London, British Library, Royal 1 E. vii + viii	97
London, British Library, Royal 2 B. v	38, 87-8
London, British Library, Royal 4 A. xiv	38-9
London, British Library, Royal 5 B. vii	56
London, British Library, Royal 5 B. xii	169, 175
London, British Library, Royal 5 B. xiv	56
London, British Library, Royal 5 E. xi	33, 44, 124
London, British Library, Royal 5 E. xvi	38, 57
London, British Library, Royal 5 F. iii	124
London, British Library, Royal 6 A. vi	124, 125
London, British Library, Royal 6 B. vii	124, 125

London, British Library, Royal 7 C. iv	74-5
London, British Library, Royal 7 C. xii, fols. 2 and 3	<i>See</i> Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 197B
London, British Library, Royal 7 C. xii, fols. 4-218	128, 130-1
London, British Library, Royal 7 D. xxiv, fols. 82-168	124, 125
London, British Library, Royal 8 B. iv, fols. 102-12	119
London, British Library, Royal 8 D. xiii, fols. 2-83	147
London, British Library, Royal 12 C. xxiii	124
London, British Library, Royal 12 G. xii, fols. 2-9	107
London, British Library, Royal 13 B. v	57
London, British Library, Royal 13 C. v	88
London, British Library, Royal 13. D. vi + vii	28
London, British Library, Royal 15 A. xvi	124
London, British Library, Royal 15 B. xxii	107
London, British Library, Royal 17 A. xxvii	207
London, British Library, Sloane 1044, fol. 2	<i>See</i> Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 1. 24
London, British Library, Stowe 944	189
London, College of Arms, Arundel 30	31
London, Lambeth Palace Library, 149, fols. 1-139	57
London, Lambeth Palace Library, 170	61
London, Lambeth Palace Library, 197	61
London, Lambeth Palace Library, 200	62, 63-4, 124
London, Lambeth Palace Library, 204	77
London, Lambeth Palace Library, 237	75
London, Lambeth Palace Library, 377	61, 73
London, Lambeth Palace Library, 427	60, 61, 97
London, Lambeth Palace Library, 487	12
London, Lambeth Palace Library, 489	51
London, Lambeth Palace Library, 1213	101

M

Maidstone, Kent County Archives, U1121 M2B	119
Miskolc, Lévy József Library, s. n	124
Monte Cassino, Archivio della Badia 437 + 439	52
Münster in Westfalen, Universitätsbibliothek, Fragmenten-kapsel 1 no. 2	77

N

New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, 401	124
New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, 401A	<i>See</i> New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, 401
New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, 926	23-6
New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 708	52
New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 709	52
New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 736	166
New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 776	59
New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 826	67

O

Oslo and London, Schøyen Collection, 197	<i>See</i> New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, 401
Oxford, All Soul's College, 38, fols. I-VI and i-vi	<i>See</i> London, British Library, Royal 12 G. xii, fols. 2-9
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Add. C. 181	41, 56
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Arch A. f. 131 (ptd. bk.)	<i>See</i> New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, 401
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct D. 2. 16	51, 162
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct D. infra 2. 9	37, 44
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct F. 1. 15	51, 52
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct F. 3. 6	51, 52

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct F. 4. 32	188
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barlow 25	213
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barlow 35	74, 107
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 49	124
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 86	44
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 97	124, 125-6
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 126	35
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 134	41, 56
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 145	41, 55
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 163	91-2
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 180	12, 119
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 223	173-4
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 230	77
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 297	168
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 314	34-5
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 319	37-8, 57, 74
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 340 + 342	128-9, 131, 134, 141
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343	12
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 381	33-4
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 391	56
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 394, fols. 1-84	37-8, 51, 52, 151
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 426, fols. 1-118	72-3
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 441	58
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 577	124
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 579	51, 52, 163
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 708	51, 52
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 718	51, 52, 169-70
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 730	37
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 815	56
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 819	36-7, 57
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 849	51, 52
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 865, fols. 97-112	143
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 23	11
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 101	93-5
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 146	124, 125, 126
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 175	36
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 211	90, 93-5
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce 296	60, 61, 62
Oxford, Bodleian Library, e Mus. 66	34
Oxford, Bodleian Library, e Mus. 93	<i>See Hereford, Cathedral Library, P. V. I, fols. 29-152</i>
Oxford, Bodleian Library, e Mus. 115	90, 93-5
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Gough liturg. 17	91
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 20	75-6, 129, 139, 146
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 23	44, 172-3
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 30	32, 54
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 38	12
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 42	129, 187-8
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 43	92-4
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 48, fol. 77	35
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 76	146
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 93	174-5
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 113 + 114	141, 142, 146
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 115	46, 146
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 116	12, 146
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Holkham misc. 7	93-4
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11	202
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121	142, 146

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Lat. bib. b. 2 (P)	34
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Lat. bib. d. 10	162-3
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Lat. liturg. f. 5	196
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Lat. th. c. 3	<i>See</i> Cambridge, University Library, Ee. 2. 4
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Lat. th. d. 24, fols. 1 and 2	<i>See</i> New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, 401
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Lat. th. d. 33	35
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc 482	146
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud misc. 509	143-4
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud misc. 636	12, 13, 91, 99, 200
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson C. 697	42-3, 124
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner 3	77-87, 169
Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 197	143, 161, 163-6, 167-8
Oxford, Magdalen College, lat. 19	119
Oxford, Magdalen College, lat. 105	90
Oxford, Magdalen College, lat. 172	83
Oxford, St John's College, 28	62, 64
Oxford, St John's College, 154	107
Oxford, St John's College, Ss. 7. 2	<i>See</i> Oxford, Bodleian Library, Lat th. d. 33

P

Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, 903, fols. 1-52	<i>See</i> Paris, Bibliothèque Saint-Geneviève, 2410
Paris, BNF, anglais 67	107
Paris, BNF, lat. 943	69, 70
Paris, BNF, lat. 1917A	56
Paris, BNF, lat. 4210	68
Paris, BNF, lat. 5506, pt. i	83
Paris, BNF, lat. 5506, pt. ii	<i>See</i> Paris, BNF, lat. 5506, pt. i
Paris, BNF, lat. 8092	10
Paris, BNF, lat. 8824	68
Paris, BNF, lat. 10575	69
Paris, BNF, lat. 10913	<i>See</i> Paris, BNF, lat. 5506, pt. i
Paris, BNF, lat. 14782	68, 162-3
Paris, BNF, nouv. acq. lat. 586	10
Paris, Bibliothèque Saint-Geneviève, 2410	124
Philadelphia, Free Library, John Frederick Lewis Collection, ET 121	<i>See</i> New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, 401

Q

Quimper, Bibliothèque Municipale, 16	156
--------------------------------------	-----

R

Rheims, Bibliothèque Municipale, 9	52
Rochester, Cathedral Library, A. 3. 5 (Strood, Rochester-upon-Medway Studies Centre, DRc/R1), fols. 1-118	12, 48, 160
Rome, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 12	161, 167-8
Rome, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 497	30
Rome, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 946, fols. 72-6	69
Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale, A. 27 (368)	69
Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale, A. 44 (231)	97
Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale, A. 337 (506)	77
Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale, A. 357 (507)	78
Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale, I. 49 (524)	17
Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale, U. 107 (1385)	69
Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale, Y. 6 (274)	8

Rouen, Bibliothèque Publique, 1177	90
Rouen, Bibliothèque Publique, 1343	90

S

St Petersburg (Leningrad), Russian National Library, Q. v. I. 18	89, 182, 184
Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 6	56
Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 38	124
Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 65	56
Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 88	57
Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 96	77
Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 128, fols. 5-116	57
Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 138	56
Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 150	2, 97
Sonderhausen, Schlossbibliothek, Br 1	<i>See</i> Cambridge, Pembroke College, 312C, nos. 1 and 2
Stockholm, Kungliga Bibliotek, A. 135	53
Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, Theol. et Philos. Qu 628	77

V

Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare, CXVII	53, 75, 211
--	-------------

W

Wells, Cathedral Library, 7	143
Winchester, Cathedral Library, 1	88-9
Worcester, Cathedral Library, F. 48	141, 142
Worcester, Cathedral Library, F. 174	12, 146-7, 148
Worcester, Cathedral Library, Q. 21	141
Worcester, Cathedral Library, Q. 28	57
Wroclaw (Breslau), Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, Akc. 1955/2 and 1969/430	77

Y

York, Minster Library, Add. 1	129, 169
-------------------------------	----------

INDEX OF PRE-CONQUEST DOCUMENTS

S52	104
S72	14
S74	14
S89	153
S98	14
S118	23, 105
S142	104
S223	14
S325	14
S333	14
S342	14
S349	160
S385	14
S398	158
S451	14-5
S455	152-3
S813	15
S914	157
S949	4
S959	100
S980	159-62
S981	153
S982	4
S985	155
S1032	15
S1047	157
S1054	15
S1062	15
S1090	157
S1198	159
S1222	157
S1229	157
S1389	157
S1455	159
S1478	153
S1488	22
S1501	153
S1521	153
S1532	22
S1659	192
S1660	192
S1661	192

INDEX OF POST-CONQUEST DOCUMENTS

Bates no. 39	159-62
Bates no. 40	159-62
Bates no. 66	100
Bates no. 68	29
Bates no. 71	100
Bates no. 225	159-62
Bates no. 226	160
Bates no. 249	29

INDEX OF PAPAL DOCUMENTS

J-W 1996	174-5
J-W 1998	158
J-W 2007	158
J-W 2021	158
J-W 2095	158
J-W 2132	158
J-W 2133	158
J-W 2243	158
J-W 2510	158
J-W 3506	158
J-W 4692	159
J-W 5637	175
J-W 5911	175, 176
J-W 5955	158
J-W 6073	176
J-W 6074	176
J-W 6152	176