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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.
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<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>occ.</td>
<td>occurs (as a witness etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>Old English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMT</td>
<td>Oxford Medieval Texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Rolls Series.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. a.</td>
<td><em>sub anno</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>Cambridge, Trinity College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCH</td>
<td><em>Victoria County History</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

\a/ a expanded from abbreviation

\a/ a interlined

\a/ a entered in rasura, or by alteration of existing letter form

[..] a letter that cannot be read

<,> a letter implied, but not indicated by an abbreviation (e.g. \flam\ = \flam<ma>)

| a line break in the manuscript, or two interpretamenta are on separate lines.

Thus, \despicabil\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 pentrials, 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), 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, 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, and had been the subject of no published papers. I was also struck that the ongoing use of pre-Conquest manuscripts had seldom occasioned comment or study. 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, which was subsequently filled out and slightly expanded by Angus Cameron. 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 Clemoes 1974.
2 English notes printed Crawford 1922, 419-22; Crawford 1923, with linguistic commentary.
3 Dodwell and Clemoes 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 Liere 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. Finally, a posthumously published article by Phillip Pulsiano discussed sketches, scribbles and other marginalia in a variety of manuscripts. An exhaustive study seemed necessary, which would include as many manuscripts, vernacular and Latin, as I could feasibly examine. 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, 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’. 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

---

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,\textsuperscript{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’.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{15} Describing book production as ‘an entirely harmless activity’,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{17} Moreover, though the Normans did overhaul the fabric of almost every pre-Conquest foundation, the replacement buildings they erected were characterised by the heterogenity of their stylistic influences, chief among which was ‘Anglo-Saxon tradition’.\textsuperscript{18} Anglo-Latin hagiography also became more heterogenous with the arrival of men familiar with different literary conventions and styles.\textsuperscript{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;\textsuperscript{20} insular calendars were simply tidied up and modernised. It has even been suggested that the architecture of the rebuilt

\textsuperscript{13} Ker 1960, 7.
\textsuperscript{14} Thomson 1986, 27.
\textsuperscript{15} For another survey of this scholarship, see Thomas 2003, 367-76.
\textsuperscript{16} Wormald 1944, 133. See also Alexander 1966.
\textsuperscript{17} Dodwell 1982, 216-34.
\textsuperscript{18} Fernie 1986, 77.
\textsuperscript{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.
\textsuperscript{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. 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. 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, 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, and Norman monasteries had owned land in England since at least 1017, when King Cnut gave an estate at Ramnesleah in Sussex to the monks of Fécamp. There had been diplomatic intercourse between England and Normandy since at least the reign of Edgar. 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.
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. 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’.

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’.
33 For discussion of this possibility, see Lapidge 1996.
comprehensive booklists. 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. Moreover, the itemisation of five books given by Æthelstan to Durham in the *Historia sancti Cuthberti* is not really a booklist *per se*, while other lists contain mainly liturgical books and others are only tenuously localised. 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 case with which Leofric acquired the collection he presented to Exeter). For this reason, it is probably better to speak of ‘book collections’ rather than ‘libraries’ when discussing the Anglo-Saxon period. Michael Lapidge concluded:  

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, 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*; Juvencus, *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.\textsuperscript{41} Surviving books and booklists have enabled a preliminary assessment of the holdings of the abbeys,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{43}

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{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).
\bibitem{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.
\bibitem{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.
\end{thebibliography}
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:

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

Most of these books contained patristic texts. These were lacking in both English and Continental collections before the middle of the eleventh century. 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. 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 evangelium Iohannis* and *Sermones*, Bede’s *De tabernaculo*, Gregory’s *In Ezechielem* and *Moralia in Iob*, Jerome, *Epistolae*; and Paul the Deacon’s *Homiliarium*. 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.


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 Canterburry in his *Liber Confortatorium* (1080x1082). Goscelin specifically recommends the commentaries of Jerome, Augustine and Gregory, the *Life of St Anthony*, Augustine’s *Confessiones* and *De ciuitate Dei*, the histories of Eusebius, Cassiodorus and Orosius, and Boethius’s *De consolatione 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 Éyroul (1050-1057). According to Orderic, Theirry 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. 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.

**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. These examples are exceptional; the other French glosses in pre-Conquest manuscripts date from the twelfth century. 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. 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

---

48 Best illustrated in Ker 1960, pls. 2-3; Thomson 2006a, fig. 2.
49 For example, fragments such as Cambridge, University Library, Add. 4406 (Priscian, *Institutiones Grammaticae*, s. xi<sup>med.-xi</sup>2) and Cambridge, University Library, Add. 6220 (Augustine, *De trinitate*, s. xi<sup>2</sup>) 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<sup>2/4</sup>, England, prov. France s. xi<sup>2</sup>) 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. x<sup>2</sup> or xi<sup>2</sup>), 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 Gretsch 1999, 403-23.
51 See below 126-7.
household, and later a bestiary, dedicated to Adeliza between 1121 and 1135. Modern scholars have attributed four other works to Philippe: two alphabetic lapidiaries, a set of sybilline prophecies and a debate between the body and soul. The royal patronage and elite audience of these works is very notable, 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’. Since the earliest surviving copy of the Chanson de Roland is English, 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.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. It can only ever have been a spoken vernacular in a very narrow coterie.

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.
56 For Adeliza of Louvain (c. 1103-1151) as a patron, see Holmes 1964; Holmes 1965, 50-52.
58 Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 23 (s. xii or xii2/4); see Parkes 1985.
59 Most thoroughly explored by Howlett 1996.
60 Hunt 1991, i. 12.
Post-Conquest copies of Old English texts have only recently begun to receive due attention.\(^\text{62}\) Their value as evidence for the role of English after the Norman Conquest is potentially huge, but the manuscripts resist easy analysis.\(^\text{63}\) Most do not carry any indication of their provenance, and it has proven very difficult to make convincing arguments to localise their production.\(^\text{64}\) 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

\(^\text{62}\) 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, li. 1. 33 (s. xii) [Homilies]; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 302 (s. xi/xii) [Homilies]; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 303 (s. xii) [Homilies]; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 367, pt. 2, fols. 1, 2, 7-10 (s. xii) [Ælfric, \textit{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. xiii) [Homilies]; Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 9. 17 (819), fols. 1-48 (s. xi/xii) [Ælfric, \textit{Grammar} etc.]; Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 17. 1 (987) (s. xii\textsuperscript{med}) [Psalter]; London, British Library, Cotton Caligula A. xv, fols. 142-153 (s. xi/xii) [Ælfric, \textit{De temporibus}]; London, British Library, Cotton Claudius D. iii, fols. 55-140 (s. xiii\textsuperscript{med}) [OE Benedicent Rule]; London, British Library, Cotton Domitan viii, fols. 30-70 (s. xi/xii) [\textit{ASC} F]; London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. ix (s. xii\textsuperscript{med}) [Homilies]; London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. x, fols. 102-131 (s. xii) [OE Benedicent Rule etc.]; London, British Library, Cotton Julius A. ii, fols. 136-144 (s. xiii\textsuperscript{med}) [OE \textit{Dictes} etc.]; *London, British Library, Cotton Otho A. xii, fols. ‘202-216’ (s. xii\textsuperscript{med}) [Homilies]; London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D. xiv (s. xi/xii) [Homilies]; London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius A. xv, fols. 4-93 (s. xii\textsuperscript{med}) [\textit{Valloques} etc.]; London, British Library, Harley 55, fols. 5-13 (s. xiii\textsuperscript{med}) [Laws]; London, British Library, Harley 6258B (s. xii/xiii) [Medica]; London, British Library, Royal 1 A. xiv (s. xii\textsuperscript{med}) [OE Gospels]; London, Lambeth Palace Library, 487 (s. xiii\textsuperscript{med}) [Homilies]; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 180 (s. xi/xii) [OE \textit{Boethius}]; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343 (s. xii\textsuperscript{med}) [Homilies]; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 38 (s. xii\textsuperscript{med}) [OE Gospels]; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 116 (s. xii\textsuperscript{med}) [Homilies]; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud misc. 636 (s. xii\textsuperscript{med}) [\textit{ASC} F]; Rochester, Cathedral Library, A. 3. 5 (Strood, Rochester-upon-Medway Studies Centre, DRe/R1), fols. 1-118 (s. xii\textsuperscript{med}) [Laws]; Worcester, Cathedral Library, F. 174 (s. xiii\textsuperscript{med}) [Ælfric, \textit{Grammar} etc.].

\(^\text{63}\) 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 dó þu me wret þas VII uers 7 send me’, p. 35, referring to computistical verses. Dublin, Trinity College, 174 (B. 4. 3) (saints’ lives, s. xi\textsuperscript{med}, Salisbury) has a s. xi/xii vernacular ex libris ‘(of searbyrig ic eom’, fol. i\textsuperscript{v}). Cambridge, Pembroke College, 88 (Laidcenn, \textit{Egloga}, s. x\textsuperscript{v}, France or England, prov. Cant StA s. x\textsuperscript{v}, prov. Bury) has a vernacular scrubble 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).

\(^\text{64}\) Traxel’s arguments about the origin of Cambridge, University Library, li. 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 Domitan 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 CCCC 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.

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, Medehamsted, 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 Æthelfræd 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. This evidence must be set alongside library catalogues which occasionally described particular Old English manuscripts as old, worthless and incomprehensible. Several Old English manuscripts even have inscriptions to this effect. 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. Indeed, one manuscript in the inventory was considered useless except for its Old English gloss. 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 inutilis*: 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 incognitum’: 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. xi½, 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. 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*. Post-Conquest hagiographers also drew on vernacular texts. William of Malmesbury’s *Vita Wulfstani* admits to translating an Old English original by Coleman. Osbern and William of Malmesbury both claim to use an English life in their *Vitae Dunstani*. The *Gesta Herewardi* purports to draw on a vernacular text by Leofric, Hereward’s father. 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. 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, 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. These examples could easily be multiplied. At the very least, this

---

81 Blake 1962, xxvii-xl ii. 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 nita*, 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, ll. 9-19: ed. Spiegel 1987, 256-9. 88 Holden 1984, ll. 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
trophe implies that English vernacular literature was held in high regard after 1066. A full study seems a desideratum.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.

\textit{Oswaldi} by Reginald of Durham and Aelfred of Rievaulx’s \textit{Vita sancti Niniani}. For these examples, see Wilson 1941; Wilson 1952, 92-113.

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

\textsuperscript{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 \textit{barbari}, because they used an unfamiliar language, see Cowdrey 2003, 178.

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

\textsuperscript{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. xi\(^2\)’ 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, Gneuss for pre-Conquest Latin books, and Gameson for post-Conquest books, 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’, 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 preceptors 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 Cynobyrig (which probably consisted of a hide at Flamstead (Herts.) and five hides at Walingeaster, 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. xii) knew the Christian Latin poets Sedulius, Arator and Prosper: Thomson 1982b, i. 10.
book collection may also have contained older manuscripts, 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. 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:

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):

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 magnum praecelarum 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, 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. xi') 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. It reflects the needs of the community both before and after the Conquest. 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. St Albans had been subject to the bishop of Dorchester before the Conquest, and he had to confirm bequests to the abbey. 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. 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. 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). It is possible the scribe was a monk of Canterbury or Bec recently transferred to St Albans.

---

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. iv), 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 (Lacl.).

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


16 The *Gesta* emphasises the importance of Paul’s working relationship with his uncle. Paul became abbot ‘procurante dicto Archiepiscopo Lanfranco’ (*G.A.S.A. 52*), the abbey was rebuilt ‘Lanfranco efficaciter juvante’ (*G.A.S.A. 54*), Wallingford Priory was founded ‘consilio Lanfranci archiepiscopi’ (*G.A.S.A. 56*), while books were produced ‘Lanfranco exemplaria ministrante’ (*G.A.S.A. 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 (*G.A.S.A. 52*), and Lanfranc may even have composed them with St Albans in mind: Knowles and Brooke 2002, xxxiii-v.


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, as are the Gorehambury fragments, which come from a large monastic lectionary which covered the temporale and the sanctorale. 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. Anglo-Saxon transepts remain a striking feature of the abbey church, ‘a very rare and extraordinary sight in a Norman building’. The Norman abbey was not built over the late Anglo-Saxon burial ground. 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 Kjolbye-Biddle 2001, 73.
24 See the map in Biddle and Kjolbye-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 Hatfield, quæ cessit ei in sortem distributionis; et assignavit, sic volente Abbate Paulo, scripturarum amatore, ad volumina ecclesiae facienda. Erat autem miles ille litteratus, diligens auditor et amator Scripturarum. Ad quod officium additæ sunt quædam decime 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, ecclesiae necessaria; solaque civilitate, qua affluerebat, contulit præfato militi Roberto, ad cappellam suam in curia de Hathfield, 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 praeeleitos 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 (*sortium distributionis*). In accordance with the wishes of Abbot Paul, who was a lover of the scriptures (*scripturarum amator*), 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 Hathfield*) […] After he had generously given the aforementioned knight the books first produced (*primo paratum*), he caused to be written selected (*praeeleitos*) 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. 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).
The death of Leofstan. His death, probably shortly before the Conquest, 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). 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. William I confirmed to St Albans privileges as they were held by Archbishop Stigand. 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. 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, 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.
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. 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. 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. 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.
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.\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{38} A second example is a scruffy thirteenth-century collection of school texts, which was entirely copied on palimpsested vellum.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{40} By contrast, the last quire (a ten) appears to be formed from palimpsested leaves of a more recent manuscript, written in textura.\textsuperscript{41} Finally, palimpsested leaves from a copy of Virgil’s \textit{Æneid} in Phase II Square Minuscule,\textsuperscript{42} along with a single palimpsested leaf of a twelfth-century gradual\textsuperscript{43} 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.\textsuperscript{44} By contrast, there is no evidence of post-Conquest scribes dismembering, palimpsesting and rewriting Anglo-Saxon manuscripts.

\textsuperscript{37} Cambridge, Trinity Hall, 24, fols. 70-112. Fols. 78-83 are the palimpsest leaves.
\textsuperscript{38} James 1907, 39-41. See also Lowe 1972, no. 1680.
\textsuperscript{39} London, British Library, Additional 21213. The manuscript may have been at Fünfkirchen in Hungary by the fourteenth century; see Lowe 1972, no. 169.
\textsuperscript{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.
\textsuperscript{41} The underlying script is most legible on fol. 27r, but it is not possible to decipher more than a few words.
\textsuperscript{42} London, College of Arms, Arundel 30, fols. 5-10 and 208. See Dumville 1987, 144; Rushforth 2002, 191-2.
\textsuperscript{43} Arundel 30, fol. 2: Hartzell 2006, no. 196 (p. 339).
\textsuperscript{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-
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\(^{45}\) 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-69r 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. xi\(^2\)) and an ink drawing of a man’s head (s. xii\(^{med}\)). Fols. 67r/5-14, 67r 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 dissenstone 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, Ec. 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 (‘[peccator]es esdemus ille prs 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. viii\(^2\) copy of Augustine, *De consentio 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 Lausiacae*, 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), and a leaf containing lore concerning the psalms in a contemporary hand (fol. ii). 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 Botulph and a tract on fasting by Ambrose. 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. 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
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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.
52 The text on the leaf is split into four sections: ‘de dictis originis’, ‘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
\textit{Vita S. Gregorii} by the turn of the eleventh century.\footnote{Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 381. The bible fragment has now been reclassified as Lat. bib. b. 2 (P). For Elmham, see below 186-7.}

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.\footnote{London, British Library, Additional 40165B. The fragments are now kept as Additional 40165A.} 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 \textit{Historia Apostolica}.\footnote{Oxford, Bodleian Library, e Mus. 66. For the script of the Bede, see Bishop 1953, 438; Dodwell 1954, 123.} Unfortunately the fragments which left the offsets do not survive,\footnote{Ker, Lowe et al. 1944.} and the boards, though contemporary, appear to have been reversed in the fourteenth century,\footnote{Pächt and Alexander 1966, iii, no. 87.} 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.\footnote{Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, 153/203; the fragments are now 820/810(h) and 820/810(k).} 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
copy of Gregory’s *Homiliae xl in evangelia* 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.

\[^{62}\] Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 126, fols. ii, iii, 60, 61. Mention should also be made of the fragments of a s. xi\[^{2}\] 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 Eastry’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. 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. Symeon copied books and wrote charters, sometimes copying a work in its entirety, but often merely writing an example passage for another scribe to follow. 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. Symeon introduced supply leaves into two manuscripts, one of which was pre-Conquest. He also made additions to manuscripts, some of which had belonged to the Community of St
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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.
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*. 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. 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 spiriitu superbiae 7 de eius natura’ (fol. 1v) before the beginning of the text proper, in black protogothic minuscule. 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. Both manuscripts were definitely at Exeter in 1506, and probably there in 1327, though only one copy is mentioned in Leofric’s
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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. x?), fol. 97v (‘QUOD OCTAUUM CERTAMEN ADVERSUS SPIRITUM SUPERBIAE SIT. ET DE NATURA EIIUS’) and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 730 (Buildwas, s. xii?), fol. 56va (‘Incipit de superbia liber duodecimus. Quod octauum certamen aduersus spirtum superbie sit.’ et de natura eius’).
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 nefaria”, valued at 2s: Oliver 1861, 303. ‘Judei 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.
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). The task of identifying and titling texts in pre-Conquest manuscripts went on well beyond the twelfth century.

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. 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. Nonetheless, the first recto has the title ‘Incipit Tractatus Sancti Ieronimi Presbyteri in Libro Psalmorum’ in red display script of the type practised at Worcester during the late eleventh century. 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(unt)s\us est, fol. 1r/19; de mort(ali)\e\ libera\it, fol. 2r/6 etc). However, it has been suggested Bodley 319 was the exemplar for London, British Library, Royal 5 E. xvi (Salisbury, s. xi9): Webber 1992, 68.
81 e.g. the thirteenth-century ‘Incipit Epistola 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 ‘Glsgariu[ns]\ cu[m]\ int[ro]p[er]\ tatio[ne]\ anglice […]’ 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 uesitantis [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.
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]). 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. A twelfth-century hand rubricated the preface and the capitula to Book I in black protogothic minuscule. 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.
95 ‘Incipit epistola accae episcopii ad bedam prebiteram de postulanda expositione in lucam;’ (fol. [i]); ‘Explicit epistola accae episcopii ad bedam prebiteram; item epistola bedae prebiteri | ad accam episcopum | de responsione;’ (fol. 2r); ‘Explicit epistola bedae; Incipiunt | capitula libri primi;’ (fol. 4r). He let the original rubrics ‘PRÆFATIO’ (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: ‘INCIPIIT EXPOSITIO\n\nbedae/ 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.\textsuperscript{96} Similarly, the original rubrication of a ninth-century continental manuscript of Augustine’s \textit{De nuptiis et concupiscientia} and \textit{Contra Iulianum} was overhauled during the first half of the twelfth century,\textsuperscript{97} but only after it had been used as an exemplar.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{ordinatio} of such books. For example, post-Conquest readers often found that pre-Conquest copies of Prudentius’s \textit{Psychomachia} did not contain the textual apparatus they expected, especially the running captions. Early copies of

\textsuperscript{96} Fols. 210-28 (‘hi sunt ... amen’): Hurst 1960, vi. 185-2460.

\textsuperscript{97} London, British Library, Additional 23944: ‘EPISTOLA AURELII AUGUSTINI AD VALERIUM COMITEM’ (fol. 1r, added); ‘EXPLICIT EPISTOLA’ (fol. 1v, original); ‘INCIPIIT 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 IULIANUM HERETICUM QUI EXCERPTA DE LIBRIS IULIANI PELAGIANI HERETICI QAE 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 \textit{in rasura}); ‘ITEM EPSTOLA AURELII AUGUSTINI AD CLAUDIANUM EPISCOPUM’ (fol. 36r, added \textit{in rasura}); ‘EXPLICIT EPISTOLA’ (fol. 36r, added in margin via \textit{signe de renvoi}); ‘AURELII AUGUSTINI LIBER .I. INCIPIIT CONTRA IULIANUM PELAGIANUM HERETICUM’ (fol. 36r, added in margin); ‘EXPLICIT LIBER .I. INCIPIIT LIBER .II.’ (fol. 53r, original); ‘EXPLICIT LIBER SECUNDUS . INCIPIIT LIBER TERTIUS’ (fol. 68v, partly \textit{in rasura}); ‘EXPLICIT LIBER III. INCIPIIT LIBER IIII’ (fol. 87v, original); ‘EXPLICIT LIBER IIII SANCTI AGUSTINI EPISCOPI CONTRA IULIANUM HERESIS PELAGIANI DEFENSOREM. INCIPIIT CONTRA EUNDEM LIBER .V.’ (fol. 111r, original); ‘EXPLICIT LIBER QUINTUS. INCIPIIT LIBER SEXTUS’ (fol. 131r, original); ‘EXPLICIT LIBER SEXTUS QUI ET ULTIMUS. BEATI AURELII AUGUSTINI.’ | CONTRA IULIANUM . PELAGIANUM HERETICUM’ (fol. 157r, on supply quire).

\textsuperscript{98} This is evident from a collation of the rubrics with Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 145 (s. xi\textsuperscript{5}) [B\textsubscript{1}]; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 134 (Rochester, not after 1123) [B\textsubscript{2}], and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Add. C. 181 (Bury, s. xi\textsuperscript{6}) [B\textsubscript{3}]. Like Additional 23944, B\textsubscript{2} did not originally have rubrics for the prefatory epistle to \textit{De nuptiis} (fol. 1\textsubscript{e}), the opening of Book II of \textit{De nuptiis} (fol. 12\textsubscript{v}) and for the prefatory epistle (fol. 30\textsubscript{v}) and beginning of the \textit{Contra Iulianum} (fol. 31\textsubscript{r}), but these were evidently added before it was the (indirect) exemplar for B\textsubscript{2} and B\textsubscript{3}, because these reproduce the inserted rubrics. The added rubrics in Additional 23944 are different to those added to B\textsubscript{1}, 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. 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), and Aldhelm’s Carmen de virginitate (fols. 17r-64r). The manuscript contains a few glosses in the hand identified as that of Dunstan (e. g. fol. 17r), suggesting it was at Glastonbury by the mid-tenth century. It was at Bury later in the medieval period. 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), 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.
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 –nr 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 uietam and in aluo for in alum [47] and fidelium pectorem for pectorem fidelium [52]. Only the first reading is recorded in the apparatus of Cunningham 1966.
to supplement the brief pre-existing rubrics. He used red minuscules for the captions, and created a red initial for the line to which the rubric referred. 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. 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. The manuscript has been characterised as primarily ‘a type of reference book, preserving texts of interest to the community’. 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). 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 invocatio. Incipit expostitio’ (l. 21); ‘Mala libidinis pactitia enumerare’ (l. 90); ‘Patientia duictis uiitiiis <...>’ (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 Psychomachie 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 uitorum auaritia nigro lacte nutrit’ as ‘her seo galnyssse tytrode hir cyn on hire sylfre’ (fol. 24v, before l. 464), ‘auaritia stupefacta fatsescit’ as ‘her se iytsere’ (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.


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]. The second, which measures 35x197mm and reads ‘Aldelmus. De laude Virginitatis’, was previously attached to the spine. The style is comparable with the titles along the spines of a number of manuscripts in twelfth-century bindings. Another example, a copy of Cassian, De institutis coenobiorum [CPL 513], comes from Exeter. A scrap now attached to fol. iii, bearing the title ‘D[E] [INSTI]TU[RI]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. 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

---

100 London, British Library, Royal 5 E. xi (s. x/xi, OE glosses s. xi, xiii; all Canterbury CC). It is also noteworthy that the capitula are now preceded by a full-page drawing, entitled ‘SANCTI AELDELMUS 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.
101 Phillip Pulsiano suggests the first is from another manuscript, though does not give reasons: Pulsiano 1996, 51.
102 e.g. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 86 (‘EXAMERON’), and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 23 (‘INCIPI [... IOH…E | IN COLL[…IIONIBUS PAT[…]]’). See Pollard 1962, esp. 17-8 and pls. I and II.
103 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.
104 Cambridge, St John’s College, 101 (D. 26), fols. 1-14; see above 37.
hagiographical texts was added at the beginning of the manuscript.\textsuperscript{115} It has been suggested that the \textit{vitae}, which begin with a life of Sergius and Bacchus [BHL 7602], were produced at a dependency of Angers,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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), fol. 129-172, a mid-tenth-century copy of the Rule of St Benedict, produced at St Augustine’s Abbey in Canterbury.\textsuperscript{118} It is now bound with copies of Pseudo-Augustine, \textit{De unitate sancte trinitatis}, Isidore, \textit{De fide catholica} and various other texts in a hand of the turn of the eleventh century (fol. 1-72), which belonged to the Augustinian canons of Southwark in the sixteenth century;\textsuperscript{119} and a mid-twelfth-century copy of Eadmer’s \textit{Vita et miracula S. Dunstani} (fol. 73-128).\textsuperscript{120} The couplet ‘Ascuta fili retinendo in te senili; | Iugiter ascuta . retine bona . desere stulta;’ was added in red ink on fol. 129r in a hand very similar to the hand which copied the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{115} ‘Ista continetur in hoc volumine| de spíritu superbia | passio sanctrorum sergii 7 Bachi quod est nonus octoberis | Vita gregorii nazazeni . quod vii kl martii celebratur | uita beatissimi Remigii fruncorum apostoli | uita \langle sanctorum \rangle mauriti præbiteri | liber uersificatus de sancho felice martyre’ ([iii]).
\item \textsuperscript{116} Bishop 1957, 331.
\item \textsuperscript{117} It may be significant that only the lives of Sergius and Bacchus and Gregory Nazaneni 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 Nazaneni for 26 March.
\item \textsuperscript{118} Bishop 1957, 324-6. Four Latin homilies were added at the end of the manuscript at the turn of the tenth century (fol. 169v-172). These are now edited Hall 2006.
\item \textsuperscript{119} ‘Liber beate Marie Overy’ (fol. 1r).
\item \textsuperscript{120} Misidentified by James, and the (seventeenth-century) author of the table of contents (fol. [iii]), as the work of Osbern.
\end{itemize}
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. 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, and a short homiletic excerpt, 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; and two further quires, bound at the end of the book (fols. 148-55), containing prognostics in a mid-twelfth-century hand. 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.

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 gode ege soðes suwian ac licie | swa hit licige. sóð ic wylle secgan gemel se | þe wylle. For þam se bydel þe forsweð | his hlafordes gewill boda. a he him mag | 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.
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, Christ Church, and Durham all list groups of *libri anglici*, while catalogues from St Augustine’s, Bury, Exeter, Glastonbury, Leominster, Peterborough, and Rochester all list

---


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-twelth-century catalogue has a section headed ‘libri anglici’, which includes ‘Omeliaria vetera duo. Unum novum’; ‘Elfledes boe’; ‘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.


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’; 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, preci 2s’ (p. 308); a ‘Penitentiale 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 appreciatur, que nullius valoris reputantur’ (p. 309).


133 The catalogue compiled in 1247/8 includes ‘Item [sic] Penthattecum Moysi et Iosue et Iudicium’ duo anglica. utustna et inutila. ‘supra’; ‘Liber Orosii a ii’ Latina lingua, b tercius in anglica utusti set leg<biblat>’; ‘Liber de diversi sermonibus anglicis’; ‘Item sermones angliscil’; ‘Passionale sanctorum anglicae scriptum’; ‘Item
individual vernacular books among the Latin manuscripts.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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.

\textsuperscript{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.
\textsuperscript{135} The late-eleventh-century list includes ‘vitae sanctorum anglicae’ and ‘Elfredi regis liber anglicus’: Friis-Jensen and Willoughby 2001, BP2.48, BP2.59.
\textsuperscript{136} The catalogue of the library (1122/3) in the \textit{Textus Roffensis} includes a cancelled ‘Pastoralis anglicus in .i. volumine’ 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 (Wright 1940, i. 1. 4). 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, Paul of Caen at St Albans, and William of St Carilef, Bishop of Durham, 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. 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.
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. 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. 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. Moreover, only four surviving manuscripts have been identified in the inventory which were not written at Exeter and do not have an ex libris. 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).
10 Cambridge, University Library, Li. 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, Li. 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:\(^\text{12}\) 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.\(^\text{13}\) 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,\(^\text{14}\) 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.\(^\text{15}\) (Some Anglo-Saxon manuscripts had reached Normandy in this way before the Conquest).\(^\text{16}\)

\(^{12}\) 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, Archivo della Badia 437 + 439; New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 708; and New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 709: see McGurk and Rosenthal 1995.

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 (\(V/A\) 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), was copied from a manuscript produced in Northern France during the second half of the ninth century. The late medieval provenance of the exemplar was St Augustine’s, Canterbury, 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]. It was the direct exemplar of a Worcester manuscript from the turn of the tenth century, 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). Newly-produced texts could also be disseminated programmatically from particular centres.

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 sanch augustini cantuariensi’ (fol. 1r); ‘Dii III Gr III | augustinus super apocalypsin cum ] liber sanch augustini cantuariensis’ (fol. 2r); James 1903, no. 345 (p. 222).
24 Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Scaliger 69: Bishop 1966, xvi. The initial on fol. 1r was added s. xii
26 ‘D iii Gr. xiii’ (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 Casa 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. 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, 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. 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. 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.
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.\textsuperscript{32} Two copies (from Rochester and Hereford) derive from the corrected manuscript via an intermediary.\textsuperscript{33} A mid-twelfth-century Bury copy derives from the Rochester manuscript,\textsuperscript{34} and two Salisbury copies derive independently from the ninth-century continental exemplar.\textsuperscript{35} The ninth-century continental manuscript was itself rubricated and corrected during the twelfth century,\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{38} and Augustine’s \textit{Confessions}.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{Institutiones} depends on a ninth-century continental manuscript,\textsuperscript{40} which may have been in England in the mid-eleventh century, as Old English scribbles attest (fol. 30v, 31r, 57r).\textsuperscript{41} It was the

\textsuperscript{32} Ker notes that ‘it is tempting to suppose that one of the two copies of \textit{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.

\textsuperscript{33} Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 134 (s. xii\textsuperscript{1}, Rochester) and Hereford, Cathedral Library, P. VI. 2 (s. xiii\textsuperscript{1}, Hereford).

\textsuperscript{34} Oxford, Bodleian Library, Add. C. 181.

\textsuperscript{35} Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 138 (s. xi\textsuperscript{3}); Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 65 (s. xiii\textsuperscript{3}).

\textsuperscript{36} See above 41.

\textsuperscript{37} Sharpe, Carley et al. 1996, B11.

\textsuperscript{38} Cambridge, Pembroke College, 81 (S. France, s. ix\textsuperscript{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, fol. 13-162 (Cant CC, s. xii\textsuperscript{1}) [incomplete] and London, British Library, Royal 5 B. vii (Rochester, s. xii\textsuperscript{1}).

\textsuperscript{39} Webber 1996. She shows that four copies from the South-West of England – London, British Library, Harley 3080 (s. xi\textsuperscript{3}, West Country?); London, British Library, Royal 5 B. xiv (s. xii\textsuperscript{1}, Gloucester, later prov. Bath); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 815 (s. xi\textsuperscript{3}, Exeter); and Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 6 (s. xi\textsuperscript{2}, 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. xii\textsuperscript{1}) – derive from an exemplar related to Boulogne, Bibliothèque Municipale, 46, from Saint-Bertin.

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

\textsuperscript{41} Mynors, Thomson et al. 1993, 18.
exemplar for copies from Salisbury and St Augustine’s, and seems to have moved from house to house to be copied, coming to rest at Hereford before the mid-twelfth century.

The exemplar for the insular transmission of Eusebius’s *Historia ecclesiastica* may also have been in England before 1066. 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. 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, before it acted as exemplar to a new copy, to which was appended Bede’s letter to Egbert, presumably from a different exemplar. Symeon copied the first six leaves himself, probably to guide the other scribes in copying the unfamiliar script of the exemplar. 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. xii). 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.
45 Worcester, Cathedral Library, Q. 28 (France, s. ix?). For the suggestion, see Thomson 2001, 135. This manuscript has a major lacuna which is also found in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 184 (s. xii, Rochester); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 187 (s. xi/xii, Cant CC); London, British Library, Royal 13 B. v (s. xii*, St Albans); and London, British Library, Additional 21084 (s. xii?). 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. xii, prov. SW England s. xii*, prov. Exeter), exemplar to Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 128, fols. 5-116 (s. xii*, Salisbury); and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 319 (s. xii, prov. SW England, prov. Exeter), exemplar to London, British Library, Royal 5 E. xvi (s. xii*, 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. xii*, 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.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{52} The circulation of pre-Conquest exemplars almost certainly became more frequent as Norman precentors became more

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

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

\textsuperscript{52} Note Matthew Paris’s comment that Lanfranc supplied Paul of Caen with exemplars (\textit{GG.A.A.} 58).
familiar with the pre-Conquest books in their charge, though definitive evidence is as yet lacking.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{54} came from Sherborne to Salisbury when the see was transferred between 1089 and 1091.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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’.

\textsuperscript{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. xi\textsuperscript{1} or xi\textit{med}, Germany): Webber 1992, 75-6.

\textsuperscript{55} Permission was granted in 1075: Webber 1992, 1-4.

\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{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’,\textsuperscript{57} ‘The Southampton Psalter’,\textsuperscript{58} and ‘The Lambeth Psalter’.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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

\begin{itemize}
  \item[57] Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 422.
  \item[58] Cambridge, St John’s College, 59 (C. 9).
  \item[59] London, Lambeth Palace Library, 427.
  \item[60] Robinson 1988, no. 165.
  \item[61] Hohler [1972], 40; Budny 1997, i. 648.
  \item[63] Stoneman 1999, BM1. 18.
\end{itemize}
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. 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.

The inscription ‘R. Lanthonie’ (preceded by ‘Xcem’ 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.

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. It was in England in the mid-tenth century when three Old English glosses were added (fols. 14r, 18r, 39v), 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. 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) SUIS 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.


66 Webber and Watson 1998, A16. Webber suggests the manuscript may be A16.45 (‘Psalterium Willemi de Werdon. Glosatum. in uno volumine mediocr’) 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.


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 consolatione philosophiae* at Horton, a notable illustrated miscellany at Battle, a collection of Ælfric’s homilies at Castle Acre, an Aldhelm at Waltham, and a *Cura Pastoralis* and Old English Bede at Southwick. 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. 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, was given to Horton in Dorset by one Ælfgyth. 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 ‘moranus canonicus de kemereder’, is at the top of fol. i: James and Jenkins 1930, 519. There are some twelfth-century corrections, e.g. fols. 10r/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.


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

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

74 Oxford, St John’s College, 28 (s. xmed, prob. Cant StA, prov. Abingdon).

75 McGurk, Dumville et al. 1983, 104.

76 Bishop 1971, xxv.

77 ‘þas boc syllþ ælfgyþ into horetune’ (fol. 1r).
Horton, as the gender of the donor may suggest;\(^\text{78}\) 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.\(^\text{79}\) 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.\(^\text{80}\) 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.\(^\text{81}\) 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.\(^\text{82}\) A very fine, largely unglossed, copy of Aldhelm’s prose *De virginitate* which had found its way to Waltham by the fourteenth century may have arrived during the Anglo-Norman period,\(^\text{83}\) when there was considerable interest in his saintliness and possible relationship with the West-Saxon royal line.\(^\text{84}\) 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).


\(^{81}\) 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 almaroli canoniciorum’ (fol. 66v) and ‘Aldelmus de virginitate doctrinarii 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 (fol. 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. 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. 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.

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. 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. xmed. xii, 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.
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). However, this inscription is not contemporary and the thirteenth-century Rochester Register puts the ‘gift’ in a rather different light. Here we learn that a monk called Radulf removed ‘textus evangeliorum argento et lapidibus preciosi ornatos’ from Goda’s former manor of Lambeth to Rochester along with other ornaments. 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 Roffensiis per Godemi comitissam. III.’. The ‘III’ may suggest that Goda gave two or more other gospel books.
91 Cotton Vespasian A. xxii, fol. 85r: Thorpe 1769, 119. Radulf (fl. s. xii\sup{1-2}) was formerly custos of the manor of Lambeth: Greatrex 1997, 628 [II Ralph].
Anselm.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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:\textsuperscript{94}

\begin{quote}
Ecce, ut audio, nihil est tutum in domo vestra \textit{sic.} Norwich Cathedral Priory sed intestinis latrociniis sancta ecclesia coinquinatur. Perditis libros, sciphos, coopertoria, et omnia nisi ea quae vestrorum utilitati furum necessaria non sunt.
\end{quote}

Similarly, William of Malmesbury narrates a miracle which ensued when the brother of one of the Worcester monks stole a book (\textit{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 \textit{Liber Eliensis} claims that Archbishop Stigand appointed an Ecgfrith as abbot of St Albans, who subsequently decamped to Ely with most of the house’s treasures (\textit{thesauris ecclesiae illius}, \textit{LE} ii. 103), a bounty which may have included some books. Sæwold, who appears to have become abbot of Bath around 1065, and resigned

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{92}{Cotton Vespasian A. xxii, fol. 89r: Thorpe 1769, 121.}

\footnotetext{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 librurm 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.}

\footnotetext{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’.}
\end{footnotes}
after the arrival of the Normans, 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. Though at least one of the books was produced at Saint-Vaast itself during the second quarter of the eleventh century, some of the books contain English hands and were presumably produced in England; 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. 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’, 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).
98 Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale, 1029 (812) (s. xes and xi coni); New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 826 (s. vii 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 Eastry’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,
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. xi\(^1\), 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-xi\(^1\), Sherborne): Dumville 1994, no. 22. The manuscript contains a list of books headed ‘Hic continentur numerus duinorum 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 Stirmann 1987, no. 16.

\(^{111}\) Paris, BNF, lat. 10575 (s. xmed 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. xi\(^3\)): 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\(^3/4\) or xi\(^2/2\), 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\(^3\), 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. 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. 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, 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.
117 Dumville 1994, 95.
seem to have travelled with comparative ease between different religious communities, not to mention individuals.\textsuperscript{118} We can infer there was a considerable trade in books, fuelled, in part, by light-fingered brethren 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.

\textsuperscript{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.
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. 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. The existence of three transcriptions of the same display capitals suggests
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 (fol. 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.


\(^7\) Ker dated the hand s. xii\(^a\), which seems convincing, despite Buckalew’s attempt to redate it s. xii\(^b\): 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 claustro christi cantuariæ’, fol. 1r). Among other scribbles, an endleaf contains a couplet from the Poema Morale (fol. 106v): Hill 2005a.
words ð 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, 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 Laidecenn’s Egloga de moralibus in Job, which was at St Augustine’s by the end of the tenth century, and subsequently reached Bury. There are many scribbles on the front flyleaf (fol. i’), 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. 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’. A further inscription, ‘writ þus oððe þine hyde forlet’ suggests the penalties for completing such copying exercises inaccurately could be severe. The use of English is suggestive. 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.

---

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. xii\(^1\)) 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 encore 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. xi\(^2\) or s. xi\(^3/4\)); Canterbury, Cathedral Library and Archives, Add. 32 [f] (s. xi\(^a\)); London, Lambeth Palace Library, 204 (Canterbury CC?, s. xi\(^1\), prov. Ely); Münster in Westfalen, Universitätsbibliothek, Fragmenten-kapsel 1 no. 2 [f] (s. viii\(^2\)); Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale, A. 337 (506) [part] (Canterbury CC?, s. x\(^b\)); Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 96 [f] (Continent or England, s. x, prov. Salisbury); Stuttgart, Württemburgische Landesbibliothek, Theol. et Philos. Qu 628 [f] (s. vii/viii, Northumbria or Continent); and Wroclaw (Breslau), Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, Akc. 1955/2 and 1969/430 [f] (Northumbria, s. viii\(^1\) or viii\(^\text{med}\)).

\(^{21}\) Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 2. 36 (79), fols. 122-245 (Canterbury CC, s. xii\(^a\)).
Normandy at this time. 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. 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. In Tanner 3, we find ortus written for bortus (fol. 46r/23) and babundanter (fol. 59r/22) and babun\dantia (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 bortus (‘garden’) and the past participle ortus (‘risen’), but in the second case, where there is no noun *babundantia 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-Evroul and copies are attested in early library catalogues from Fécamp and Bec: Nortier 1966, [211].

23 e. g. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 399: co\(\text{i/o/n}\)/\(\text{a}t\)ionis (fol. 1v/17); mic\(\text{h/e/i}\) (fols. 6v/13, 8v/9); co\(\text{h/o/n}\)/\(\text{e}n\)/\(\text{a}t\) (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. spera = sphaera ‘sphere’). (b) has \(\varepsilon\) added to it (e. g. michi = mibi ‘to me’). (c) is omitted or inserted: (i) at the beginning of words, e. g. ac = CL bac ‘this’ (abl. s. f), bortus = ortus ‘having arisen’ (p. p. of orior); (ii) in the middle of words, e. g. aduc = adhuc ‘up to now’, perhennii = 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/omnibus (fol. 57r/3) (to prevent a hasty eye mistaking it for omnibus, ‘all’); and ex(b)ort\e (fol. 61v/6) (to prevent confusion with ex hort\e).

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

\begin{quote}
Quo responso percepio.´ | ad \h/oram conuiator conticiuit (fol. 52v/23-4)  
Du(a)c quaedam | san[a]j[.]moniales f\a/emiae, nobiliori genere ex\h/or\a/e (fol. 61v/6)
\end{quote}

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.\footnote{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.}

In Tanner 3, we find eccentric corrections like abac\b/uc (i. e. Habbakuk) (fol. 61r/8) and corusc\b/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.\footnote{abundantia (fol. 39r/5); exortatione (fol. 58r/12); exortandis (fol. 58r/14). For this mark, see Bischoff 1990, 87.} However, other examples suggest orthographical concerns were the guiding principle. In Book II, the scribe wrote nibi 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
overwhelming impression is that nihil and michi were ‘Norman’ spellings; nihil was uncomfortable to one post-Conquest reader, who corrected it. 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 Traditionsprache whose orthography, modelled on the inconsistent practice of ancient texts but swayed by the variations of Late Latin, controlled its pronunciation. 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 michi; Eadmer always (or almost always) michi. 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. 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. 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). 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. 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.

---


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, fol. 1-24 contains Alcuin and Bede (perh. Canterbury StA (or Brittany?), s. x¹ or xmed or xii); see Bishop 1955, 187-9; Budny 1997, no. 15 (i. 205-9) and pls. 160-1 (fol. 1r, 14v). Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 221, fol. 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 *bara* 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 *babundanter* 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

---

\(^{34}\) ‘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:

- *adsersit* (fol. 40r/10); *asserit* (fol. 56r/24); *assoris* (fol. 60r/2); *asseris* (fol. 68v/10): ‘adsero’, protect, defend.
- *adsistere* (fol. 51r/21); *adsis|tere* (fol. 63v/15); *adsistere* (fol. 63v/15); *adsistens* (fol. 73r/15): ‘adsisto’, stand by, defend.

---

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, xxiv.
⁴² Oxford, Magdalen College, lat. 172: Hamilton 1870. Hamilton appears to have reproduced the orthography of the manuscript, either expanding *e-caudata* as [ae] 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 [ae], 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 *adsto* 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. 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, and Alcuin even recommended *ass*- spellings in words like *asspiro* and *aspicio*. 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*-. 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:  

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

45 Buck 1899, 157.
46 ‘Assuere et assummentum 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(t)s* were found in the section from Orderic; Eadmer used *associatur* once.
49 On *e*-caudata, see Beneš 1999-2000.
-æ- for CL. ææ: enulare (fol. 47v/18); etc.

-æ- for CL. -æ: depræbensa (fol. 36v/24); taenobris (fol. 48r/5); laenare (fol. 50v/17); exellerte (fol. 51v/6); exemin(a)e (fol. 61v/5); etc.

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

-æ for CL. -æ: 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* (fol. 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 [æ], but did not always know when a digraph was etymologically correct (for example, *ceca* for *caeca*) and produced analogical spellings like *faecunditate*. 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.

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 (fol. 65r/21, 65r/22, 66v/13, 67r/2).

---

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.
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 incolonis, 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).

\(^{54}\) corriscei (fol. 54v/22); \(\text{neq}\)lim (fol. 61r/16); inca\(\text{e}\)sum (fol. 61r/24); tot\(\text{e}\)reret (fol. 61v/17); ca\(\text{e}\)reptus (fol. 72v/25).

\(^{55}\) Originally with [i] for [e]: despectis (fol. 37v/23); excedere (fol. 42v/15); collegit (fol. 43v/4); despectum (fol. 49v/14); intelligi (fol. 50v/21) etc. Originally with [e] for [i]: intelligi (fol. 42v/11); dgasterum (fol. 51v/16); d\(\text{e}\)igitis (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\(\text{med}\).
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 century\textsuperscript{59} 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).\textsuperscript{60} Most of the corrections seem to be in the hand of the scribe who added a short account of fasting days (fol. 196v),\textsuperscript{61} whose script Ker dates to the first half of the eleventh century.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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 Reinfred and Ælfwig, monks of Evesham, to attempt to restore monasticism in the North.\textsuperscript{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’,\textsuperscript{64} and the same words are found as a twelfth-century running title, added to a copy of later Gloucester provenance.\textsuperscript{65} A late-twelfth-century reader of a pre-Conquest copy of Aldhelm’s \textit{Epistola ad Heahfridum} added a request on the blank first leaf: ‘mitte nobis historia bede de gestis anglorum’.\textsuperscript{66} Bede’s text had become a history of the English. The text was also copied with increasing frequency during the twelfth century,\textsuperscript{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 \textit{Historia

\textsuperscript{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.
\textsuperscript{60} Pulsiano and McGowan 1994, 192. The prayer is edited 212-6.
\textsuperscript{61} This text is also found in Cotton Tiberius A. iii (fol. 44r).
\textsuperscript{62} Ker 1957, 320.
\textsuperscript{63} Baker 1970; Dawtry 1982.
\textsuperscript{64} Browne 1988, 155.
\textsuperscript{65} London, British Library, Royal 13 C. v, fols. 128v-129r (‘YSTORIA ANGLORUM’).
\textsuperscript{66} London, British Library, Cotton Domitian ix, fols. 2-7 (fol. 2r).
\textsuperscript{67} Davis 1989, 105.
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). These redactions are distinguished by six main features:

1. The prayer *Praeterea omnes ... iuveniam* 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 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, while early manuscripts of the *c*-text remained in England, or were sent to Germany with Anglo-Saxon missionaries. 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 *c2*-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’. Manuscripts of the English *textus receptus* themselves fall into two groups, the ‘Digby Group’, and what I will call,

---

69 Colgrave and Mynors 1969, xxxix-lxi.
70 Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 5. 16 (‘The Moore Bede’), probably datable soon after 737; St Petersburg, Russian National Library, Q. v. l. 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, 4º Ms. theol. 2 (prov. Fulda by s. viii?); London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius C. ii.
72 Colgrave and Mynors 1969, xliii, iv.
for convenience, the ‘Harley Group’. 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, and though this has recently been challenged, 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. Partially conflate manuscripts may even have been circulating in England before the Conquest. 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. xii, Battle); Oxford, Magdalen College, lat. 105 (s. xii); and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 211 (s. xii2, Waltham). The twelfth-century members of the ‘Harley Group’ are London, British Library, Harley 3680 (s. xi, Rochester); Oxford, Bodleian Library, e Museo 115 (s. xi2); and Dublin, Trinity College, 492 (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, Wearmouth-Jarrow).

75 Westgard 2006.

76 Two Norman manuscripts are known to me: Rouen, Bibliothèque Publique, 1177, fols. 173-275v (s. xiii, Jumièges) and Rouen, Bibliothèque Publique, 1343, fols. 34-121 (s. xiii, Saint-Évremond), 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 [xii. *m*- and *c*-texts]’: Westgard 2006, 315.
leaves should be inserted.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{79} The supply of part of v. 21 (fols. 235-7)\textsuperscript{80} and the end of the text (fols. 246-249r)\textsuperscript{81} may belong to a second phase, since these leaves are in a different hand and the letter sequences were not used.\textsuperscript{82} Subsequently, an account of the wanderings of St Cuthbert’s community (fol. 249rv),\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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 \textit{Historia}. There is plentiful evidence that the manuscript was at Peterborough in the later middle ages,\textsuperscript{85} and it has been suggested that it contains an initial by the artist responsible for initials in the ‘Peterborough Chronicle’ (fol. 1r).\textsuperscript{86} The original, early-eleventh-century part contains Bede’s \textit{Historia} (fols. 2-209r), Æthelwulf’s \textit{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 \textit{Historia}, pretending to be part of the text proper (fol.

\textsuperscript{78} ‘c’ (fol. 45v), ‘d’ (fol. 46r); ‘e’ (fol. 81v), ‘f’ (fol. 82r), ‘g’ (fol. 150v), ‘h’ (fol. 151r).
\textsuperscript{79} The first leaf of Q1, which may once have contained a table of contents to Book I, is missing.
\textsuperscript{80} ‘inueniri qui mensis … seruitutis intonsis in’: Colgrave and Mynors 1969, 542/8-546/29.
\textsuperscript{81} From ‘sexcentesimo quadragesimo eadbaldus’ to end: Colgrave and Mynors 1969, 564/5-570/23.
\textsuperscript{82} Fols. 246-9r probably replaced a lost final quire; fols. 246-51 may have replaced three damaged leaves.
\textsuperscript{83} The text on the wanderings of the Community of St Cuthbert also accompanies Bede’s \textit{Historia} in a fifteenth-century manuscript, Cambridge, St John’s College, 254 (S. 6).
\textsuperscript{84} Printed and discussed Henderson 1990.
\textsuperscript{85} ‘Anno domini m ccc lix obiit frater S[…]
\textsuperscript{86} Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud misc. 636. The resemblance was first noted by E. W. B. Nicholson (\textit{apud SC} 1003), and is repeated by Whitelock 1954, 14; Colgrave and Mynors 1969, li.
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 ε-text. 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*. The original text of Hatton 43 was originally very close to that of the oldest complete manuscript of the ε-text, but it contains numerous twelfth-century interventions. These include alterations to the spelling of personal names, place names and Latin words; changes to abbreviations, script and word division, punctuation, and the

---

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 ε. 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.  
91 \`u/uigheard\`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, V\W\’s. 16. 5).  
92 bri\(t\)ia\`n/iam (324/6 = fol. 103r/3); berc\(i\)ngens\`i/ (324/20 = fol. 103r/15); nordan\`ym\b\(r\)orum (324/32 = fol. 103r/1) etc.  
93 provinci\`a/e (324/12 = fol. 103r/7); immune altered from inmune (326/26 = fol. 104r/1); rec(\(p\))pertum (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\`\(r\)/\(r\)/\(er\)/\(et\)/ bidu\(a\)/ (394/20 = fol. 122r/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\`\(a\)/\(\_\)/\(n\)/\(\_\)/anno (352/3 = fol. 111r/20); pr\(a\)edi\(s\)/\(\_\)/\(x\)/\(\_\)/\(erit\) (392/29 = fol. 122r/9-10).
treatment of numerals;\textsuperscript{98} but, most interestingly, corrections which bring it closer into line with the \textit{m}-text. Plummer argued these corrections fathered the ‘Harley Group’,\textsuperscript{99} though Mynors took the view that they were made to bring Hatton 43 into conformity with a pre-existing recension.\textsuperscript{100} My examination of the text of Book IV only emphasises the complexity of the situation. Hatton 43 did originally contain a very pure \textit{c2}-text. Book IV agreed with the \textit{c}-text against the \textit{m}-text 108 times; and on 24 occasions, it agreed specifically with the \textit{c2}-text.\textsuperscript{101} It disagreed with the \textit{c}-text on only four occasions:

\begin{quote}
pia \ldots provisione against \textit{c}-text pia (360/10 = fol. 113v/18-9)  
aduenrunt against \textit{c}-text uenerunt (366/23 = fol. 116r/1)  
ordre against \textit{c}-text et orde (416/19 = fol. 129r/22)  
remitens against \textit{c}-text paenitens (436/35 = fol. 135v/23)
\end{quote}

Most of the textual corrections to Book IV emend obvious errors, such as the omission of \textit{quae ibidem erant facultates cum agris et hominibus donauit, omnes} by haplography (374/32-3 = fol. 118r/26), but thirty-nine correct a \textit{c}-reading to an \textit{m}-reading, and eight correct a \textit{c2}-reading to an \textit{m}-reading. The correctors thus corrected about one-third of the \textit{c}-readings, and one-third of the \textit{c2}-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 \textit{c}- and \textit{m}-texts, and replaced it with a reading found in the English \textit{textus receptus}.\textsuperscript{102} On eleven

\textsuperscript{98} e. g. Vt defuncto defuncto \\ a/uigheard\ns/ ad suspiciendum episcopatum | romam sit misus \./ sed illo ibidem defuncto theodorus archi\/-| episcopus ordinatus \./ et cum hadriano abbat sit britis\n\n\textsuperscript{99} e. g. \textsuperscript{6}dclxvii. \textsuperscript{6}sescentesimo sexagesimo octauo/ sub die .vii.\textsuperscript{6} / (330/17 = fol. 105r/7).
\textsuperscript{100} Colgrave and Mynors 1969, lvii.
\textsuperscript{101} These figures have been obtained by comparing the text of Hatton 43 with the variants recorded in the \textit{apparatus criticus} of the edition of Colgrave and Mynors; I have not attempted to check \textit{c}-text or \textit{m}-text readings for myself.
\textsuperscript{102} My ‘Digby Group’ readings are based on Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 211 (Plummer’s O\textsubscript{3}) and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 101 (Plummer’s O\textsubscript{11}), while my ‘Harley Group’ readings are based on Oxford, Bodleian Library, e Mus. 115 (Plummer’s O\textsubscript{2}) and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Holkham misc. 7 (which Plummer did not know, and I have christened O\textsubscript{22}).
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’:

\(\text{\textquoteright} cui/\text{magis}\) for ‘cuius magis’ (328/26 = fol. 104v/12) [O; O₂₂; cu; O₆; O₁₁; 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) [O; O₂₂; ac stragica; O₆; ac tragica].

**(ac) defunctus est corpusque** for ‘ac defunctus est corpusque’ (390/15 = fol. 121r/18) [O; O₂₂; ac defunctus est corpusque].

**perductus iussus est** rearranged to *iussus perductus est* for ‘perductus iussus est’ (416/26 = fol. 129v/3) [O; O; O₂₂; perductus iussus est].

**(autem)** for ‘autem’ (438/31 = fol. 136v/3) [O; O; O₂₂; autem].

\(\text{\textquoteright} cuthbertus/\text{repetiit}\) for ‘repetiit’ (438/31 = fol. 136v/3) [O; O; O₂₂; 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. 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. 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. 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 Benedictus domino and Ita missa est at the front of the manuscript (fols. ii’-iii”), 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 1.18-21; John 1.1-14, 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’. London, British Library, Harley 863, produced at Exeter during the episcopate of Leofric, was also supplemented after the

---

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.\textsuperscript{108} Somewhat earlier, a scribe read through the psalter and added one or two variant readings from different textual traditions,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{110} Neither occurs in any original pre-Conquest litany.\textsuperscript{111}

Similarly, the ‘Eadui Psalter’ was overhauled during the first half of the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{dies natalis} of St Amphibalus (25 June), whose

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{108} Watson 1979, no. 638 and pl. 102 (fol. 1r).
\textsuperscript{109} e. g. ‘\textit{dominus} dixit ad me filius meus es tu \textit{\textipa{h}ebraica} ueritas/ ego hodie genui te’ (fol. 8v/10 = Ps II.7); ‘\textit{qui}que terrigene et filii hominum \textit{\textipa{h}ebraica} ueritas/ in unu\textipa{w} diues | et pauper’ (fol. 35r/11-12 = Ps XLVIII.3). I have not been able to establish whether these are typical Hebraic readings.
\textsuperscript{110} Fol. 110v/7-8: Dewick and Frere 1914-1921, i, pl. XVII.
\textsuperscript{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 ‘Eadui 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).
\textsuperscript{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 + vii, and to have written Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 1. 17 (16), a copy of Jerome, \textit{In Mattheum}, and Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 3. 9 (88), a copy of Ambrose, \textit{Expositio evangeli secundum Lucam} during the early-twelfth century. For discussion, see Dumville 1991, 47; Marsden 1994, 114; Marsden 1995, 333-4; Webber 1995, 155-6.
\textsuperscript{113} Fols. 2-7: Wormald 1934, 170-81.
\end{flushright}
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).\textsuperscript{114} Additions to calendars were generally accretive; old feasts were seldom erased.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{116}

Many other types of liturgical books were overhauled after the Conquest, including pontificals,\textsuperscript{117} handbooks,\textsuperscript{118} hymnals,\textsuperscript{119} and legendaries.\textsuperscript{120} Such books would provide ample evidence for a liturgiologist studying the consequences of 1066 on the conduct of the \textit{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.

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

\textsuperscript{115} However, on fol. 5v, the names of two saints have been erased, and the names of other saints entered in rasura: ‘Sanct Bartholomai apostoli’ (24 August); ‘Sancti audoeni archiepiscopi’ (25 August).

\textsuperscript{116} Of the nineteen calendars printed by Wormald, only one has no additions.

\textsuperscript{117} e. g. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 146 (s. xi\textsuperscript{n}, Winchester OM (or Cant CC??), prov. Worcester s. xi\textsuperscript{2}); London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius C. i, fols. 43-203 (s. xi\textsuperscript{1} or xi\textsuperscript{med}, Germany, prov. Sherborne s. xi\textsuperscript{2}, then Salisbury). For the latter manuscript, see Ker 1959.

\textsuperscript{118} e. g. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 391 (s. xi\textsuperscript{1/4}, Worcester); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 422, pp. 27-570 (s. xi\textsuperscript{med}, prob. Winchester, prov. prob. Darley Dale). For the former manuscript, see Hughes 1958-60.

\textsuperscript{119} e. g. London, British Library, Cotton Julius A. vi (s. xi\textsuperscript{ix}-xi\textsuperscript{1}, prob. Cant CC, prov. Durham); London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D. xii (s. xi\textsuperscript{med}, Cant CC).

\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{1/4}, Worcester)
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 Ā-, B- and C-versions of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle were all continued after 1066. 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. However, the version containing the most spectacular continuations and alterations is undoubtedly Ā – the ‘Parker Chronicle’. 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’. 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: Dickins 1940; O’Brien O’Keeffe 1998, 141-7 and pl. 13 (fol. 164r).
122 Guimond 2006, 141-5.
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 (\textit{theonolia et consuetudine}) of Sandwich in 1127.\(^{129}\) At the \textit{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:

\[
\text{Da } \textit{ða} \text{ Landfranc crafede fastnunge his gehersumnesse mid aðswerunge, p} \textbf{a} \text{ forsoc he 7 s} \textbf{æ} \text{de } \text{p} \text{æt he } \textit{\'hit/ nahte to donne}. \\
\]

Since his stint begins immediately after the first half of a ‘\textit{ða } \textit{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 (\textit{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 \textit{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.  
\(^{130}\) 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-xlili.  
\(^{132}\) 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 (*strangon cwydan*), 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*), and numerous additions to the Parker Chronicle, though the identification is not certain. 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, 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.

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. 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’. Dunville 1983, 44: ‘there is not a little plausibility to this (e.g. 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 \ul Patricius/ se biscep wæs onsended to Scottum þæt he hiera gelefan trymede from Celestino þam papan.’ (E Patricius); ‘AN. .dxxviii. Her Cerdic 7 Cynric \Westse\na/ rice onfengun . . . ’ (E Westseaxna); ‘AN. .dlxxi. . . . (Benningtun) Bænesington 7 Egonesham, 7 þy ilcan geare he gefor.’ (E Benesington).
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.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{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):\textsuperscript{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 \textit{de facto} pre-Conquest dominance of Christ Church, adding the \textit{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 Æ 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 \textit{Historia ecclesiastica} in Hatton 43. Other alterations

\textsuperscript{138} Hayward 2004, 152.
\textsuperscript{139} Brooks 1984, 369n11.
\textsuperscript{140} London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi, fol. 35v: Taylor 1983, 58.
\textsuperscript{141} London, British Library, Cotton Faustina B. iii, fols. 158-198 + Cotton Tiberius A. iii, fols. 174-7 (Faustina B. iii, fol. 158r): Ker 1957, no. 155 (p. 197). The list has never been printed, but see Kornexl 1993, cxiv-xv.
\textsuperscript{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 (*Hemigii*, pp. 49-50) [Ker (A iii), s. xi\(^{14}\)].
55. Fol. 33v: First entry in the bishop of Worcester’s fee in Worcester Domesday (*Hemigii*, p. 72) [Ker (C iii), s. xi/xii].
56. Fol. 34v-35v: Royal Diploma of King Offa (*Hemigii*, 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 (*Hemigii*, pp. 75-6) [Ker (C v), s. xi/xii].
58. Fols. 36r-37r: Three documents relating to a dispute between Worcester and Evesham (*Hemigii*, 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) (*Hemigii*, pp. 79-80) [Ker (C vii), s. xi/xii, same hand as art. 58].
60. Fol. 37v-38v: ‘Commemoratio placiti’ in the Evesham dispute (*Hemigii*, 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 (*Hemigii*, pp. 83-4) [Ker (D iii), s. xi\(^{15}\)].
69. Fols. 44v-45v: Royal Diploma of King Offa (*Hemigii*, 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*.
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 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.\footnote{Stenton 1918, 444-5; Galbraith 1967, 101; Williams 1997, 390, 395; Barrow 2005, 121n76.} 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 \textit{Historia ecclesiastica} had to have the extra miracle of St Oswald. Such comparisons led to a progressive deviation from Bede’s \textit{ipsissima verba}. Collations bred of unfamiliarity and suspicion even seem to underlie alterations to pre-Conquest psalters, and
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. xi1/4, 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 xi2med, probably Canterbury); London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. x, fols. 3-101 [with the Dialogue on declinations] (s. xi2 or xi31/4, ?Worcester); London, British Library, Cotton Julius A. ii, fols. 10-135 [with a treatise on Latin verbs] (s. xi2med); London, British Library, Harley 107 [with the Dialogue on declinations and supplemental glossary] (s. xi3med); London, British Library, Harley 3271 [part of miscellany] (s. xi3); London, British Library, Harley 5915, fols. 8 and 9 + Bloomington, Indiana University, Lilly Library, Add. 1000 [f] (s. xi3); London, British Library, Royal 12 G. xii, fols. 2-9 + Oxford, All Soul’s College, 38, fols. I-VI and i-vi [f] (s. xi2med); London, British Library, Royal 15 B. xii (s. xi31/4 or xi3); Oxford, St John’s College, 154 [with colloquies and Bella Parisiacae urbis, bk iii] (s. xi3, prov. Durham); Paris, BNF, anglais 67 [f] (s. xi3).
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. xi1/2). In addition, excerpts from both Grammar and Glossary were added to Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barlow 35, fol. 57rv (s. xi3): 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*. 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). Both *Grammar* and *Glossary* proved very interesting to readers after the Conquest.

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. 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 ‘primitua’ (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:

```
```

---

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* on *alma*, *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 *hat hlea*, ‘hot fire’. The curious spelling *dogetrina* may indicate that the Anglo-Norman *doctrine* (with variant spellings *doutrine, droitrine*) was intended, rather than Latin *docetra*. 
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 *nel* 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 ‘nuscia i. munimentum sobrietatis in pectore’, ‘a protection for temperance, [worn] on the chest’. *Ic 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 *teco* (fol. 55r/13; Zup. 168/3-4), ‘weave’, is ‘unde teextrinum 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 *nel* wudea *nel* holt *interlined above*] fenus. *nel* feneris. [fenoris *interlined above*] pignus. [filz *interlined above*] pignoris. [tudder *interlined above*] pignus. [weddd *interlined above*] pignercis. [weddd *interlined above*] et cetera’. Other French glosses printed Hunt 1991, i. 26.
(fol. 41v-46r; Zup. 129/14-141/12).\(^\text{13}\) 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.\(^\text{14}\) 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 . ægber byð welig ge wer . ge wif. hie 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’ (fol. 4v-5r), ‘De Nomine’ (fol. 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 fol. 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’, ‘adverbum’, ‘participium’, ‘coniunctio’, ‘prepositio’ and ‘interiectio’ in the margins of fol. 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

---

\(^\text{13}\) Printed Hunt 1991, i. 111-113.

\(^\text{14}\) London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. x, fols. 3-101 (s. xi\(^2\) 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.\(^\text{15}\) 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,\(^\text{16}\) 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,\(^\text{17}\) a scribe of the first half of the twelfth century made some alterations to a passage concerning third-declension nouns:\(^\text{18}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{no} & \mid \text{miniatio}. \ Hoc \ poema. \ h\acute{e}s \ le\circ\acute{e}cra\acute{f}t. \ Uocat(\text{er})\mid\text{iuo}. \ o \ poema. \ e\acute{a}l \ p\acute{u} \ le\circ\acute{e}cra\acute{f}t. \ Genit(\text{er})\mid\text{iuo}. \ h\acute{u}u\acute{i}s \mid \text{poemat}. \ h\acute{\i}s\acute{e}s \ le\circ\acute{e}cra\acute{f}t\text{es}. \ Dat\acute{u}o. \ h\acute{u}i\acute{c} \mid \text{poemat}. \ h\acute{\i}s\acute{e} \ le\circ\acute{e}cra\acute{f}t. \ Ablat(\text{er}) \ ab \ h\acute{oc} \ p\acute{o}e \mid \text{mate}. \ f\acute{r}a\acute{m} \ h\acute{i}s\acute{u}m \ le\circ\acute{d}cra\acute{f}t\text{e}. \ et \ \text{pluraliter}. \ Nomi\mid\text{nat(\text{er})}\mid\text{iuo}. \ h\acute{c}c \ poema\acute{a}t. \ h\acute{\i}s \ le\circ\acute{d}cra\acute{f}t\text{as}. \ Geni\mid\text{t(\text{er})}\mid\text{iuo}. \ h\acute{o}ru\acute{m} \ poemat\acute{u}m. \ h\acute{i}s\acute{e} \ le\circ\acute{d}cra\acute{f}t\text{a}. \ h\mid \text{Dat\acute{e}r} \ h\acute{o}\acute{c} \ poemat\acute{u}b. \ h\acute{i}s\acute{u}m \ le\circ\acute{d}cra\acute{f}\acute{t}um. \ accu\acute{c}u\acute{e}r\acute{a}t \ h\acute{e}c \ poemat\acute{a}. \ h\acute{\i}s \ le\circ\acute{d}cra\acute{f}\acute{t}\acute{a}s. \ Uocat\acute{e}r \mid \ o \ poemat\acute{a}. \ e\acute{a}l \ ge\circ\acute{d}cra\acute{f}\acute{t}\acute{a}s. \ Ablat(\text{er})\mid\text{iuo}. \ a\acute{b} \ h\mid \text{his poematib\acute{u}s}. \ f\acute{r}\acute{a}w \ h\acute{i}s\acute{u}m \ le\circ\acute{d}cra\acute{f}\acute{t}\acute{\acute{u}}}\text{m}. \ (\text{fol. 21v}/8-20)
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{15}\) 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\text{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 *-tuo* 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).\(^\text{19}\) 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. ablative). 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 declination of nouns (fols. 71v/5-72v/3) which survives alongside the Grammar and Glossary in two other manuscripts.\(^\text{20}\) 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 declinations. 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 accusatio, genitio.

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, and many pre-Conquest copies of school texts incorporate glosses copied from their exemplars, which were supplemented by generations of readers *calamo tenente.* These glosses interpret the text and give guidance on prosody, lexis, morphology, syntax and context. 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. 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

---


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 Juvenecus, *Evangelia*; Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale*; Arator, *De actibus apostolorum*; Prudentius, *Psychomachia*; and Boethius, *De consolatione 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.

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 virginitate* (fols. 280r-327r),\(^ {27}\) to Book III of Abbo of St Germain, *Bella Parisiaceae 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 evangeliorum*, 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.

\(^{26}\) Cambridge, University Library, Gg. 5. 35 (s. xi\(^{\text{med}}\), 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 vulgare (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 uiruitum gratia fretus | Percepturus in excelso gaudia uictor’. The corrector rectified the erroneous sequence of the lines by copying ‘percepturus in excelso gaudia rector (*sic*)’ by ‘regnus’, and marked ‘gratia’ for deletion, and replaced it with ‘munere’.
\(^{28}\) ‘Abbaso quo fuerit sit hirudo frequens comitata disparet ac ualidos interca 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 consolatione 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 consolatione* than the first two, and in the prose 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 ‘byrnstan beoffan sunu ælfnoð 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 nirtute in uicium de castitate in luxuria de abstimencia in gula 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:

Nam si aliorum quam prouiaae sunt detorqueri ualent. non iam erit futuri firma praescientia. sed opinio potius incerta. quod de dieo credere nefas iudicio; (fol. 88v/2-5)

Aliorum] ses de praescientia et facta; praescientia. s. d.; sed] s. est; opinio] in RH margin. via signe de renoun. Ex persona ueritas quod in dieo 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 aliteruenire. quia si aliter possituentire non est vera praescientia. a pari in conversione

Neque enim illam probo rationem qua se quidam credunt hunc questionis nodum posses dissolvere (fol. 88v/5-8)

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 arbitra et in hac dibutatione adhuc maneo. quia non sufficit mihi solutio quorumdam. ca[ula]ta est. et hoc est neque enim et cetera. Et apponit sententiam eorum quam posse destruit

Alien enim; non ideo quid esseuenturum quoniam id prouidentia futurum esse prospeuit.’ sed e contrario potius quoniam quid futurum est id diuinam prouidentium latere non posse. (fol. 88v/5-9)

Alien enim uere habent rationem quia istam a parte ratioris, Non] in LH margin via signe-de-renoun ac si dicerent prouidentia 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

54 I print all pre-Conquest glosses, original or not, in plain type, and all twelfth-century glosses in bold type.
55 ‘For if they [as 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’.
56 ‘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’.
57 ‘For neither do I agree with that argument according to which some believe that they can solve this knotty question’.
58 ‘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’.
59 ‘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 …’
60 ‘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])’.
61 ‘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’.
...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, for knowledge 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 conversione. 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 spaciously, 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 lumhartz’ (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. xii1, Bury) [f: bks i, ii only]; Maidstone, Kent County Archives, U1121 M2B, pp. 103-6 [f] (s. xii1, 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 soelebant prologu in libris suis prescribere’].

53 Theological treatises: Cambridge, Jesus College, 64 (Q. G. 16) (s. xii1, Durham); Cambridge, Pembroke College, 84 (s. xii1, Bury), De musica. Cambridge, University Library, li. 3. 12, fols. 62-133 (s. xii1, Cant CC); Oxford, Magdalen College, lat. 19 (s. xii1, England or Continent).
Prudentius, *Psychomachia*. Though a few post-Conquest copies of the poem survive, post-Conquest readers appear to have mostly relied on earlier manuscripts. For example, many Latin glosses were added by twelfth-century readers to the magnificently illustrated *Psychomachia* and are overwhelmingly lexical. The following passage, in which Prudentius describes Generosity slaying Avarice, may be taken as representative:

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

INVADIT] .i. agreditur; TREPIDAM] .i. auaritiam; UIRTUS] .i. operatio i. lar<gitas>; DURIS] .i. strictis
Vlnarum] .i. brachior; nodis] .i. nexibus uinculis; obliso] .i. strangulato fracto
Exsanguem] sine sanguine; siccamque] pallidam
lacertorum] ipsius operationis i. brachiorum; mentum] s. auaritiae; artis] colligatis strictis arcahis
Extorquent] .i. auferunt ui.s. uincula; quae] sine
stragulato . retento
patiur] 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. xi1, St Albans); London, British Library, Harley 4092, fols. 1-38 (s. xii1-2/4) [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. xii3), and an extract from the *Psychomachia* in Durham, Cathedral Library, B. II. 11 (Durham, s. xiv3).

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. ii4, 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), *arcatis* 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: \(^{59}\)

\[
\text{TRANSFIGIT GLADIO ; CALIDOS VOMIT ILLA VAPORES} \\
\text{Sanguine concretos caenoso ; } \text{spiritus inde} \\
\text{Sordidus exhalans uicinas pollut auras (fol. 8v, lls. 50-52)} \\
\]

\[
\text{TRANSFIGIT] transfodit s. pudicitia; CALIDOS] tepidos; VOMIT] emitat; ILLA] meretrix uulnerata; VAPORES] multitudinem sanguinis} \\
\text{Sanguine] cruore; concretos] coalites; caenosos] lucoso} \\
\text{Sordidus] inmundus; exiens] exhalans; pollut] fœtere suo i. mala fama sordidauit} \\
\]

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. ‘Vlnerata’ 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 urigo rapit; mirantur euntem
Virtutes. tolluntque animos in uota uiolentes
Ire simul. ni bella duces terrena retardent (fol. 18r, lls. 305-8)

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:

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 uictim a.e.
Docens aram cum litare quis uelit
Quod dulce cordi. quod pium. quod unicum.
Deo libenter offerendum credito;
Pugnare nosmet cum prophanis gentibus
Suasit . suumq suasor exemplu m;
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)

Sex fidelis prima credendi uia
Abram beati seminis serus pater;
Adiecta cuius nomen.’ auxit sillaba.
Abram parenti dictus. abraham deo;
Senile pignus qui dicauit uictim a.e.
Docens aram cum litare quis uelit
Quod dulce cordi. quod pium. quod unicum.
Deo libenter offerendum credito;
Pugnare nosmet cum prophanis gentibus
Suasit . suumq suasor exemplu m;
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)

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), 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’.
acustomed 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 virginitate, 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 virginitate with contemporary glosses in Latin and Old English. There are a few twelfth-century interlinear glosses in plummet on folios 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. xi\(^a\), Abingdon) [Pdh]; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 285, fols. 75-131 (s. xi\(^b\)) [Cdh]; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 326 (s. x/xi, Cant CC) [Pdh]; Cambridge, University Library, Gg. 5. 35 (s. xi\(^m\), Cant StA) [Cdh, Enigmata]; London, British Library, Cotton Domitian ix, fols. 2-7 (s. vi\(^o\) or x\(^l\), Cant CC) [Epistola ad Heahfridum]; London, British Library, Royal 5 E. xi (s. x/xi, Cant CC) [Pdh]; London, British Library, Royal 5 F. iii (s. ix\(^o\) or ix/x, Mercia) [Pdh]; London, British Library, Royal 6 A. vi (s. x\(^e\), Cant CC) [Epistola ad Heahfridum, Pdh]; London, British Library, Royal 7 D. xxiv, fols. 82-168 (s. x\(^f\), S England) [Pdh, Epistola ad Heahfridum]; London, British Library, Royal 12 C. xxiii (s. x\(^g\) or x/xi, Cant CC) [Enigmata]; London, British Library, Royal 15 A. xvi (s. ix\(^f/4\) or ix/x, N France or England, prov. Cant StA by s. x\(^g\)) [Enigmata]; London, Lambeth Palace Library, 200, fols. 66-113 (s. x\(^g\), Cant StA, prov. Barking??, prov. Waltham Abbey, Essex) [Pdh]; Miskolc, Lévy József Library, s. n. (s. vii, S England) [Enigmata (f), Epistola ad Aecirium (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. ix\(^h\)) [Pdh]; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 49 (s. x\(^m\), prov. Winchester OM) [Cdh]; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 97 (s. xi\(^a\), prov. Cant CC) [Pdh]; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 577 (s. x/xi, Cant CC) [Cdh]; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 146 (s. x\(^e\), Abingdon) [Pdh, Epistola ad Heahfridum]; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson C. 697 (s. ix\(^f/4\), NE France, prov. England by s. x\(^m\)); Paris, Bibliothèque Saint-Geneviève, 2410 + Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, 903, fols. 1-52 (s. x\(^e/-xi\), Cant CC (or StA)) [Epistola ad Aecirium (excerpt)]; Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 38 (s. x\(^e\), Cant (CC or StA)) [Epistola ad Heahfridum, Pdh]. 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\(^l\), prov. Exeter) [Pdh’], an extremely fine book measuring c. 300x200mm (220x140mm). The capitula are preceded by a half-length titlepage 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 (folis. 54v-55r). There are also many drypoint glosses to the outer margins of the text of the Prosa de virginitate.

\(^{65}\) Gwara printed these glosses in his apparatus criticus, but does not distinguish them from the original glosses; e.g. Gwara 2001, 157/27.
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), 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 virginitate*. This manuscript was at Christ Church, Canterbury in the later middle ages, before moving to Augustine's Abbey. 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 *anhelantium* (fol. 5r/3); and ‘pedibus’ to *plantis* (fol. 5r/3). The last gloss ‘pedibus’ is found in four other pre-Conquest manuscripts, while the first gloss, ‘pelices’, occurs in three, and the second gloss ‘strænge’ occurs in one other manuscript. ‘Stænienden’ is not found as a gloss to *anhelantium* in any other surviving manuscript, but the evidence of the three other glosses strongly suggests all four were

---

66 Printed Wright 1846, 180-1.
68 Christ Church pressmarks ‘SX’ (fol. 1r) and ‘D. ii. G. v’ (fol. i’): see James 1903, no. 48 (p. 21). ‘De librario Sancti Augustini | extra Cantuar’ (fol. i’).
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) *anhelantium* 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. 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):

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*; 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. cadim us*; sed uitam (43): *s. sum us nata*; rebellibus (45): *as rebataillerus*; effer (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). Most

---

73 Cambridge, Trinity College, O. 2. 31 (1135); the manuscript also contains *Prosper, Epigrammata* (fols. 1r-31v), *Bede’s De die indici* (fols. 43, 42, 41) and Prudentius, *Ditthoecon* [I] (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 volumine’ 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 clastra; (fol. 33r, lls. 665-666)

VENTUM ERAT] s. ab illis uirtutibus; AD FAUCES PORTÆ] ad introitum i. peruenunt ad portas; CASTRENSIS] a castro diciunt. castrensis herbergable i. ciuitatis; ARTUM] angustum
Liminis] lintel ianuae; bifori] gemino duble (in RH margin bifori i. duo hostia. uel duo po<ct>ta); dant] trespercoit; cardine] cum introitum cardunel; clastra] 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 scralls 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); *arlesra* is glossed ‘i. impiorum’ (fol. 170r/3; *CH* 1 454/87); *lybendra* is glossed ‘i. uiuentium’ (fol. 203v/2; *CH* 1 507/21); *heofena* is glossed ‘i. celorum’ (fol. 214r/2; *CH* 1 524/10); *geleaffuler* is glossed ‘i. fideliuمائ’ (fol. 215v/23; *CH* 1 527/94). In addition, the gloss ‘uel forhiatia’ to *biuiuia* (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). 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. 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 almihhtig* used substantively; made a number of alterations to the orthography of the manuscript (e. g. *ælme/ær, Ce/a/dwalla*); frequently corrected the vowel in inflectional syllables (including sporadically altering dative plural *him to boem*); 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. 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. These pre-Conquest scribes provide a context for

---

80 Printed Sisam 1931, 10-11.
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 Sammlung 1595 4° (version of Wulfstan’s ‘handbook’, c. 1002-1023); London, British Library, Additional 38651, fols. 57 and 58 (OE sermon notes, s. xi); 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); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 20 (OE Pastoral Care, 890x897); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 42 (Collectio canorum Hibernensis etc, s. ix/x1-med); and York, Minster Library, Add. 1, fols. 10-161 (Gospels, s. xvi).
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. 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); 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). 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). The earlier glossator also attempted to clarify Ælfric’s description of events by adding prepositional phrases, inserting *to beom* after ‘eft ða 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’ *bæfe 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).
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); *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). The interventions of the late-twelfth-century glossator evince very similar concerns. He interlined many lexical glosses, preferring, for example, *bus* 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 by bonne farað | mid gode sulfe. 7 mid | his enge on ece gefean | beofenerices. per is | merð. 7 mirbð. 7 ece blisse* for insertion after ‘7 beoð donne 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). 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 *hropa*, ‘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 pasca* (pp. 3-18),\(^92\) *dominica II post pasca* (pp. 51-79),\(^93\) *dominica III post pasca* (pp. 79-90),\(^94\) *dominica iii post pasca* (pp. 90-103),\(^95\) *dominica v post pasca* (pp. 103-18),\(^96\) *in leetania maiore* (pp. 118-35),\(^97\) *feria iii 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 iii 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 iii 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/95/1). 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.


\(^{93}\) Clemoes 1997, 313-6 and 535-42.

\(^{94}\) Assmann 1889, 73-80.

\(^{95}\) Pope 1967, i. 340-50.

\(^{96}\) Pope 1967, i. 357-68.


\(^{98}\) 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.

\(^{104}\) ‘Spíritu domini replevit orbem terrarum et hoc quod continet omnia scientiam habet vocis’ (Wisd I.7) marked for insertion before 163/10 (Clemoes 337/7-9).
creed ratified at the eleventh council of Toledo in 675, 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.

For the purpose of this discussion, I have examined the hundred-plus unpublished glosses to *Dominica Secunda Post Pascha*. 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. The function of some prepositions had also changed, and the glossator disliked the substantive use of adjectives. However, the bulk of the alterations reflect the obsolescence of particular lexical items. For example *eowde* is frequently glossed ‘sceap’, *genesian* ‘sundian’, *wita* ‘wisa’, *arfast* ‘mild’, and *sæðfug* ‘hermful’. 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. 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 *pas godsundan geleafan* as ‘pañ is on gode bileafan’ (75/11; *CH 1* 536/51) etc.

---

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 *cniht* 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 \ha/ gedredednyssa \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); ‘pa laere (wið) \for/ heora bigleofan’ (62/9; *CH 1* 536/51) etc.
109 e. g. ‘ða geleaffullan \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 *genihu|mlice*).
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 *cedel.*
Sometimes, though, the interlinear additions are merely expansive, perhaps adapting the homily to the greater verbosity customary of oral delivery. Occasionally, the alterations are simply orthographical: for example, *wo\'/lice* (64/16; *CH 1* 537/78); and *wo\'/oruldlica* (75/13; *CH 1* 541/208). 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 anno* and one of his pastoral letters. 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). These are the interventions to *Feria secunda. letania maiore*:

*Finc* above ‘magas’ (fol. 196r/12; *CH 2* 180/10); *nabl* marked for insertion after ‘menn’ (fol. 196r/17; *CH 2* 180/16); *paraph* mark before ‘Gehyrað’ (fol. 197r/22; *CH 2* 183/100); *br\'/m* (fol. 197r/15; *CH 2* 183/101); *swi\'/m* (fol. 197v/3; *CH 2* 184/125); *eage* above ‘(for)sawon’ (fol. 197v/5; *CH 2* 184/126); *sym\'/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 ‘his sædde drihten’ (fol. 197v/14; *CH 2* 184/139); punctus altered to punctus versus after ‘his sædde drihten’ (fol. 197v/14; *CH 2* 184/139); *wræððieð* interlined above ‘geyrsiað’ (fol. 197v/16; *CH 2* 184/141-2); *were 7 wife* above ‘twan’ (fol. 197v/29; *CH 2* 184/160); *he* inserted before ‘lærð hit annradlice’ (fol. 198r/24; *CH 2* 186/194); *munegode* above ‘manode’ (fol. 198v/9; *CH 2* 186/215); *eade\'/mod\'/messe* (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); *ne\'/a/ (fol. 198v/12; *CH 2* 187/219) *eian* over ‘ogan’ (fol. 198v/13; *CH 2* 118/220); *eadmodnesse* over ‘paestlycynesse’ (fol. 198v/14; *CH 2* 118/221); *bi\'/ber\'/ gearniað* (fol. 198v/16; *CH 2* 118/224); *eac\'/hine\'/on edleane* (fol. 199r/17; *CH 2* 188/265); *larow\'/paukus\'/ sode* (fol. 199v/1; *CH 2* 188/265).

116 e. g. *for ðan ðe se wyrhta bið wyrmde his metes \ponne he ðer æfter swinceð\'/* (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, *cirican* to *cirican* and *wred* to *wrodd*.
118 ‘14 8’ l (fol. 1r), apparently a Durham pressmark, and ‘Leo Pylkonyn’ (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.
Many of these glosses are stylistic: the suggestion we read *pínc*, ‘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 *bym* rather than *bim* in both singular and plural; and for *forswigade* and *forsegen* rather than *forsuwade* 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/ heor tan’, where the adverb *unlustlice*, ‘wearily’, 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. If the book was not produced at Bury, it is likely it was there shortly afterwards. An early addition to the manuscript was an Old English translation of the *Vita sancti Mariae Aegyptiae* (fols. 123r-136r). 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 *Unlustice*, 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). 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 þere 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. When he was unable to supply a feasible correction, he underlined impossible readings like *wyrcum* for *wyrsun* (fol. 128v/16; Magennis 447). He also sharpened the rather verbose style of the translation by omitting unnecessary conjunctions. 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.
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 Ælfric’s 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, 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. 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 Ceolfrith 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 þat oþer 7 oþer | ðam wiðsoc. se wæs yldra 7 oþer| hydýgra’ (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 | ðan/ 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, adding a comment on specially-ruled lines in the lower margin of fol. 160v: ‘þis sindon for ællu ifelu m unkistu m þingum’. 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, Eonomina and Eotropia (fols. 135r-136r) and reads ‘[Deus] qui tribus pueris | [mi]tigasti flammæ | [ign]iæm concede propicius | [et] nos famulos tuos | [no]n exurat flamma | [ui]ciorum’. 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:

fol. 4v/15 (*i. formidant* above *forwandiað*) [Sw. 19/9], 4v/20 (*syrædenne* above *somrædenne*) [Sw. 19/18], 5v/2 (*we* added before *woorlen*) [Sw. 23/2], 5v/4 (*we* added before *style*) [Sw. 23/3], 8r/10 (*be* added before *to halgum*) [Sw. 31/23], 10r/20 (correction of *Foor* to *Feorðe*) [Sw. 41/15], 13r/11 (*bit* added after *hat be*) [Sw. 55/20], 13r/21 (*ael gelædd* above *keled*) [Sw. 57/9], 16v/17 (*ge* added before *netlices*) [Sw. 77/12], 22r/16 (*he* added before *gesio*) [Sw. 111/21], 33v/22 (*sua eac mid hære* interlined above *sua eac mid hære*, 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 *forwandiað* (fol. 4v/15) and *syrædenne* ‘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’, 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

---

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. red 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, pp. 1-142: 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 selesan 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. xi2ed, prob. Worcester).
137 Stoneman 1987, pl. (p. 79). Compare Alcuin’s responsio ‘[Quia] Abel Deo optima et naturalia offerebat, Cain uero uilliora et humana inventione excogitata, ut putatur’ (PL 100, col. 518).
CCCC 178, p.97: ‘Bysne be drymannum 7 be anum godan man macharius gehatæn’, 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 ‘ciricle þeawas forbeodað to secgenne ænig spell on þam þrim swigdagum’ (CH 1, xiv. 220), Coleman comments ‘Ac þis ne bynecð no us well gesed. forðy on alene timan mon ah to læanne 7 to tihtanne folc to behræowsunge. 7 to wircæanne ures drihtnes willan 7 allra swiðost folce is to reowsienne on ðisnum þrim dagum. þonne gi gehyræþ. hu ure drihten halend crist ðrowade for us. Eac biscepas æt heora biseçopstole sægðar larþpel þonne gi læðad in penitenes. 7 hi doð absolutoñem. 7 sume sægða spell of þære crismhalgunge 7 of þæm balsome’ (signed).138

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 265

p. 41: ‘Be mæislæhte 7 broðerslæhte’ in rustic capitals against the heading ‘De parici ðis ni et fratricidiis’ in the penetential of St Egbert.


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 andetnyssé. 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 almessan. 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 forgiuian swa swa hi wyllað þæt godd forguiue 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 xmed; fols. 105-164: selections from the Verba seniorum: s. xi/xi or xi xmed.

fol. 86r: ‘Quomodo papnu tius 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 simuluit. a sancto piterione cognita’.
fol. 152v: ‘De paulo simplic e’.

Worcester, Cathedral Library, Q. 21
Gregory, Homiliae XL in Evangelia: s. x/xi or xi xii, 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. 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

---

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. xi\(^1\), prov. Worcester); London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. iv, fols. 2-107 (s. xii\(^1\)); Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 197, fols. 1-105 (s. xii\(^1/4\), prov. Bury by s. xii\(^1\)); Wells, Cathedral Library, 7 [f] (s. xii\(^2\)). One post-Conquest copy also follows this pattern: London, British Library, Cotton Claudius D. iii, fols. 55-140 (s. xiii\(^\#\), 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 Theodulfii*: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 191 (s. xiii\(^2/4\), Exeter); Canterbury, Cathedral Library and Archives, Add. 20 [f] (s. xiii\(^2/4\), Cant CC?); London, British Library, Additional 34652, fol. 3 [f] (s. xi\(^2\); and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 865, fols. 97-112 (s. xi\(^1\), 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 *interprementa* are presented less prominently than the primary text.


\(^{147}\) Marsden 2005. Crawford 1922, pl. between 372 and 373 (fol. 97r, reduced) shows glosses.

\(^{148}\) e. g. ‘*hominebus*’, ‘*noiter*’, ‘*species*’.
in the gloss give rise to some suspicion about the glossator’s understanding of Old
English.\footnote{Marsden 2005, 140-1. Dr Marsden tells me he now has some doubts about this conclusion.}

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.\footnote{Cambridge, University Library, Li. 2. 11 + Exeter, Cathedral Library, 3501, fols. 0-7.} 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.\footnote{His revisions are recorded in the \textit{apparatus criticus} of Liuzza 1994, 152-3, 186-7.} We might note that there are also two post-Conquest copies of the Old English
Gospels extant.\footnote{London, British Library, Royal 1 A. xiv (s. xii\textsuperscript{med}, prov. Cant CC); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 38 (s. xii/xiii, Cant CC).} 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 ableutes pharisei concilium inerunt ut
iesum in sermone’.\footnote{For the pericopes, see, in general Lenker 1999.}

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 \textit{Dialogues}, a brief
passage concerned with predestination was glossed in Latin (fol. 20r), drawing from a Latin
manuscript of the \textit{Dialogues}.\footnote{Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 322. Glosses printed Yerkes 1978, 246.} 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.\footnote{Cambridge, Clare College, 30, pt. i; see Yerkes 1978.} 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
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. xvi, 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 Stephen\(^{159}\) and Passion of St Stephen,\(^{160}\) and the Nativity of St Paul.\(^{161}\) To my knowledge, the glosses have never been printed.\(^{162}\)

---

\(^{156}\) 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.
It is likely that the Cotton fire obliterated other twelfth-century interlinear glosses. Those that survive seem to give straightforward lexical equivalents for the Old English lemmata. 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. This scribe, who was probably working during the second quarter of the thirteenth century, annotated some nineteen manuscripts and copied one (Worcester, Cathedral Library, F. 174). This manuscript contains Ælfric’s Grammar and Glossary, now imperfect (fol. 1-63r), a fragment in loose alliterative metre beginning ‘Sanctus Beda was...
iboren her’ (fol. 63r), and fragments of a poem now known as The Soul’s Address to the Body. 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, 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’.

Study of the Tremulous Hand has been polarised between interest in the scribe’s linguistic glossing, and in his annotations. However, Christine Franzen has shown that any interpretation of the Tremulous Hand’s activities must account for four observable features of his work:

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.
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, but that did not exempt him from
the doubts about the problems of transmitting the bible in the vernacular which had earlier
afflicted Ælfric.

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 ‘þurh þeos weren ilærde ure leoden on Englisc’ (9); ‘þeos læ[rdən] 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 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\(^{c}\), prob. Winchester), fol. 111v: ‘Sawine est frater nostrae. 7 Byrhtgyt 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. x\(^{1}\), England), p. 87: ‘Hugo adeliz .iii. kal iunii o hugo. Ermen|gardys prōdest kl iun. o Rodbertus in .x. kl augu [st. 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. paraux. D. xj. G. 2’).
ADDING LEGAL RECORDS TO GOSPEL BOOKS

Insular scribes were copying records into gospel books as early as the ninth century. Gospel books and bibles were treated with great respect in Anglo-Saxon England, bordering on awe. 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’. Riddle 26 (‘Gospel Book’) describes the manufacture of a codex, and its ability to inspire men:

```
Nu þa gereno ond se reada telg
ond þa wuldorgesteald wide mere
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). In a grant to Muchelney, King Æthelstan wrote:

```
Et hujus doni confirmacionem in hoc sancto evangelii volumine perstrinxi ut nemo successorum nostrorum audacter livore perculsus ex omnibus vel aliquid ab hoc cenobio arriperæ audet. Quod si aliquis, ut non optamus, presumptive fecerit hujus insania sacri voluminis adhibicione hujus deterreatur, et si non adquieverit rogamus Deum ut illius hic
deterre
detrua
detr
```

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 diplomats 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’.
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. 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. The eighth-century ‘Lichfield Gospels’ were perhaps produced at Lindisfarne for donation to the community founded by St Chad at Lichfield, but subsequently passed to the church of St Teilo, apparently at Llandeilo Fawr in Carmarthenshire, in the early ninth century, where eight marginal entries resembling charters were added during the ninth and early tenth centuries. 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. 960] notes that one copy (of three) will be preserved ‘æt þæs ci ðes haligdom’. There are similar clauses in S981 [1016] (spurious); S1478 [1053x1055]; and S1521 [1035x1044]. London, British Library, Cotton Augustus ii. 3 (S89, Æthelbald, King of the Mercians to Cyneberht, coma, 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 single sheet 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).


15 Chad 1 records that ‘emit † gelhi † filius . ariht iud. hoc euangelium . de cjngal. et dedit . illi pro illo equm optimum. et dedit pro anima sua istum euangelium deo et sancti teliaui. super altae ‥‥’: Jenkins and Owen 1983, 141. One of the witnesses to the gift, ‘Cincenn filius Gripiud’, has been identified as the son of ‘Griphiud filius Cincen’, who died in 814: James 1996, 52.

memorandum was added (p. 4). 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. 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. Early English examples include the bounds added to the ‘Book of Nunnaminster’ at the turn of the eighth century, and the tenth-century records transcribed into the ‘Bern Gospels’. 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. 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. 15v). 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 sancte 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.
20 London, British Library, Harley 2965 (s. viii/ix or ix, Mercia or S England, prov. Nunnaminster), fol. 40v. The document is S1560, printed Birch 1885, no. 630.
21 Bern, Burgerbibliothek, 671 (s. ix, SW England, Cornwall or Wales, prov. Great Bedwyn, Wiltshire s. x), 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. 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 Ely and Exeter.

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’. 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. Similarly, a survey of the diocese of Hereford was copied into a lavishly-illustrated mid-eleventh-century gospel lectionary shortly after its production. 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.

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

---

25 Cambridge, University Library, Kl. 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).
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).


\(^{34}\) 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. Robert Cotton’s decision to excise most of the documents severely hampers analysis of the additions to the manuscript. 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.
- **Claudius A. iii, fol. 5v:** writ of Edward the Confessor, datable 1051-63, copied in lower margin. 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. 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. In Old English.
- **Claudius A. iii, fol. 6r:** Thored to Christ Church; grant of land at East Horsley, Surrey, ?1036. 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. 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. 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 crîtes bec | crîte betæhte on uppan crîtes 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. In Latin.

Between Matthew and Mark
Tiberius A. ii, fol. 73v, Faustina B. vi, fol. 95r: bull of Pope Boniface V, ‘susceptis vestrae’. 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’.

Between Mark and Luke, after Tiberius A. iii, fol. 111v
Claudius A. iii, fol. 7rv: bull of Pope Boniface IV, ‘dum Christianitatis’.
Claudius A. iii, fols. 7v, 9rv: bull of Pope Sergius I, ‘sicut nobis’.
Claudius A. iii, fol. 9rv: bull of Pope Sergius I, ‘donum gratiae spiritualis’.
Claudius A. iii, fol. 9rv: letter of Pope Paschal II to Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, ‘fraternitatis tuae’.

Supplementary leaves from the end of the gospel book
Faustina B. vi, fol. 98r: bull of Pope Vitalian I, ‘inter plurima’.
Faustina B. vi, fols. 99v-100r: bull of Pope Formosus I, ‘auditis nefandorum’, preceded by ‘memorabile factum’.

The bull of Boniface IV confirming the monastic status of Christ Church was probably added around 1070. 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, 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 uerac egnitionis 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. Both the ‘Gospels of St Augustine’ and the ‘Bodmin Gospels’ likewise contain post-Conquest records, as well as Anglo-Saxon memoranda.

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. A portfolio of five documents was added at the end of the ‘Bury Gospels’ in the late eleventh century: (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); (2) Cnut’s bilingual charter of privileges in favour of Bury St Edmunds; (3) Pope Alexander II’s bull placing Bury under papal protection (1071); (4) the Latin report of the trial of Bishop Arfast of East Anglia’s claim that Bury should be his episcopal church (1081); and (5) a writ addressed to Roger Bigod, sheriff of Norfolk, enacting William’s verdict. 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-Thanet?), s. vii/viii, perh. Canterbury s. vii/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 Bates 1998, no. 225 (pp. 712-4).
65 S980; Kemble 1839, no. 735.
66 J-W 4692: Ep. 81 (PL 146, cols. 1363-4); Hervey 1925, i. 3-4.
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, 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. 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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{74} Nonetheless, Herbert visited Rome in 1102 hoping to restore his authority over the abbey (HN 132).\textsuperscript{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;\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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 (\textit{bonae voluntatis uoto}), and concludes by


\textsuperscript{74} Arnold 1890, i. 87.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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*. 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.

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 Ælfwig, who was probably abbot in the 1060s, it would seem that this habit imitated very late Anglo-Saxon practice. 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. 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 books and probably a third. Though records occupied much of the once spare space in these books, 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 Ælfwig’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 (fol. 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. 190v). Two manumissions and a guild notice (added s. x1-xii) occupy the margins of Cotton Tiberius B. v, fol. 75.
commissioned for or written at Exeter after the Conquest.\textsuperscript{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’.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{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 \textit{tempore regis Edwardi}.

\textbf{RECORDS IN LITURGICAL AND CEREMONIAL BOOKS}

Liturgical books also offered a divine stamp to records copied within them.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{84} Oxford, Bodleian Library, Lat bib. d. 10; Paris, BNF, lat. 14782. For these manuscripts, see de la Mare 1982-85; Alexander 1966.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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. 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). The hand of this survey is datable to the mid-eleventh century, and is ‘high grade and stately’. 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 mondes ferme to the abbey; and a survey of farm goods at Egmer, 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 fiece rendered by French bacun. In the mid-eleventh century, Ælfric II, bishop of Elmham, had bequeathed thirty acres at Egmer to Ælfwine, his priest at Walsingham, leaving the rest of the estate to Ufi ‘the prior’ (prouast). By 1086, Egmer 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 Egmer 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.

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 (mylnegafol) at Lackford (Suffolk),

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 (*Uniges 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. 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. 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. 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; 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; details of pittances instituted by Abbot Anselm, probably between 1125 and 1135; and four lections for the Vigil of the feast of St Edmund. 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.
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.\textsuperscript{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’,\textsuperscript{103} the bilingual copy of the Rule of St Benedict and a post-Conquest Latin homiliary.\textsuperscript{104} A scribe supplemented the Easter Tables of the Vatican Psalter with two annals:\textsuperscript{105}

\begin{quote}
Hinc denique presul \textit{Ælfwinus} sub comite \textit{Dúrkillo} constituit regulam monachorum sancti \textit{Eadmundi} monasterio; et sub uoluntate licentiae \textit{Cnutoni} regis permanet usque in presens (fol. 16v, opposite year 1020, extending to 1024).

Hic sub \textit{Cnutone} rege constructam basilicam beate memorie \textit{Ægelnoðus} consecrauit eam in honore Christi et sancte Marie sanctique \textit{Eadmundi} (fol. 17v, opposite year 1032, but extending to 1035).
\end{quote}

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:\textsuperscript{106}

\begin{quote}
M' .xx. Hic denique presul \textit{Ælfuuinus} sub comite \textit{Thurkillo} constituit regulam monachorum sancti \textit{EADMVNDI} in monasterio et sub uoluntate licentiae \textit{Cnutoni} regis permanet usque in presens.

M' .xxxii. Hic sub \textit{Cnutono} rege constructam basilicam beate memorie \textit{archipresul Ægelnothus} consecrauit in honore Christi et sanctæ Mariae sanctique \textit{Eadmundi}.
\end{quote}

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

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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).

\textsuperscript{104} Cambridge, Pembroke College, 25 (s. xi\textsuperscript{e} or xi\textsuperscript{ii}), fol. 181v: Cross 1988. A new digital facsimile and edition is being prepared \textit{curante} Thomas N. Hall.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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:

Anno ab incarnatione domini millesimo uicesimo a passione gloriosi regis et martirisædmundi centismo quinquagesimo | regnante chnutone piisimo [...] olizantur monachi aput | sanctam ædmundum [...]atis clericis prefectur abbas Uvius | ur 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. 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,
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, while a short mid-eleventh-century list of Worcester books was added to a booklet containing the Life of St Kenelm. 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, 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. Later legislation suggested that such inventories should be copied into liturgical books.

Scribant autem sacerdotes in missalibus et in alis libris possessiones et reditus ecclesie et nomina librorum et vestimentorum et ornamentorum ecclesie, nec ipsi nec parochiani sui sine consensu nostro aliquid alienare presumant de his 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. 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, but the

---

111 Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner 3, fols. 189v-190r: Lapidge 1985, no. 11.
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).
manuscript was acquired by Bishop Leofric only a few years later.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{probationes penna}e.\textsuperscript{117} They refer to the day-to-day management of Ely estates between 1007 and 1025.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{119} It had certainly reached Bury by Kirkstede’s time,\textsuperscript{120} and was probably brought to England by Baldwin, who had professed as a monk at Saint-Denis.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{117} The innermost and central strips (\textit{olim} Cambridge, Queen’s College, Horne 74) were discovered by W. W. Skeat in the binding of Diophantus, \textit{Rerum arithmetica} \textit{libri} \textit{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 Threecingham 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.

\textsuperscript{118} Hart 1966, 32, 47.

\textsuperscript{119} Cambridge, Pembroke College, 83, fol. i; printed Robertson 1956, 253. See also Rushforth 2002, 61-2 and pl. 4. For the script and origin, see Vezin 1986, 38-9.

\textsuperscript{120} Pressmark ‘B. 28A’ (fols. iv, 1r) and \textit{ex libris} ‘Liber sancti Edmundi Regis in quo continetur | Beda super Lucam’ (fol. iv); identifiable as Sharpe, Carley et al. 1996, B13.209.

\textsuperscript{121} On Baldwin, see Gransden 1981.
overhauled and twenty supply leaves were introduced at the end.\textsuperscript{122} Another example from Bury is a short inventory, transcribed at the end of a copy of Laidcenn’s *Egloga de Moralisbus in Job*, probably produced in France during the first half of the tenth century,\textsuperscript{121} though it contains insular abbreviations and decoration.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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*.\textsuperscript{126}

Even when records were not being assiduously copied, the abbey concentrated on its business side. We know far more about the cellarer and sacrist 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.

\textsuperscript{122} See above 40-1.
\textsuperscript{123} Cambridge, Pembroke College, 88: Bischoff 1998, no. 832 (p. 183); Gransden 1998, 253 and pl. LVIIb (fol. 87).
\textsuperscript{124} Bishop 1971, xii.
\textsuperscript{125} Bishop 1971, xxv, 5, 18; McKee 1997, 96-109, 120-2.
\textsuperscript{126} Davis 1936, 231.
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. The practice has been described as ‘almost diagnostic’ of Worcester provenance, 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), 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’. 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). 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’, 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. 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 Turold (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).
133 Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 23.
1106) was transcribed at the end of the manuscript (fols. 145rv). Paschal deposed Turold of Evermeu for receiving his appointment from a lay power without election and for being ordained deacon without passing through the minor orders; Turold retired to Bec in 1107. 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). 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.

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. 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. 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).

---

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 humili priori 7 conuentui | maluernensis [over w][i][g][r][m][e][n][i][s][i][s] ecclesie dilectis filius in xo saltem, presentem lator | walterus mansellus in auditorio nostro lacrimablem [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.
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). 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. A stub (fol. ii’) 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’, written in the early ninth century in a calligraphic cursive minuscule, similar to the script of the Book of Cerne. 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). 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. 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). 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:  

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.  
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.  
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.  
Vespasian E. iv, fols. 205v-6: Thomas of York to Lanfranc (June 1072 – February 1073), concerning the consecration of the bishop of Orkney.  
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.  
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.  
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. xii). 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 … disserrui’: 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. xii, 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*.  
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.  
Vespasian E. iv, fol. 210r: Paschal II to Anselm, ‘tibi reverentissime’. Confirmation of Christ Church’s privileges.  
Vespasian E. iv, fol. 210r: Paschal II to Anselm, ‘de presbyterorum filiis’, giving Anselm permission to consecrate the sons of priests and receive back into communion Richard of Ely.  
Vespasian E. iv, fol. 210r: Anselm to Paschal II, ‘non debo tacere excellentiae’, notifying Paschal that Henry has given up the investiture of churches.  
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.

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 Church and Winchester, 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-]60245. The copying of Fulk of Reims’ letter to King Alfred into the ‘Grimbold 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’. 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).
between the two accounts. Most significantly, Symeon states that Æthelwald ordered Billfrith to ornament the binding, while Aldred (who uses the obscure phrase giðryde 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) and finds it ‘a wonderful thing that after so many years it retains its original newness and elegance’ (prisca nonitate ac devore, 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. Moreover, according to the Liber de translationibus et miraculis Sancti Cuthberti, 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). 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’, which has a thirteenth- or fourteenth century inscription ‘Ewangelium Iohannis quod inuentum fuerat | ad capud beati patris nostri Cuthberti 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.
Translacionis ipsius’ (fol. iii).\textsuperscript{11} Though Reginald of Durham does not mention the discovery of a gospel book in his account of the translation, the \textit{Liber de translationibus et miraculis} records that the monks saw a gospel book lying at the head on the board (Miracle no. 20, \textit{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{13} Though a poem praising King Æthalstan 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 \textit{pietas}’, for which a blank leaf preceding one of the gospels would have been more appropriate.\textsuperscript{14} Moreover, the surviving leaves also contain many crude attempts to imitate the original script. Pentrials in this hand

\textsuperscript{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 (\textit{Chutberti}) and in having \textit{iacentis} for \textit{iacens}.
\textsuperscript{12} Brown 1969b, 2-5. For a different view, see Mynors 1956, 359-60.
\textsuperscript{13} Durham, Cathedral Library, A. II. 17, fols. 2-102: Verey, Brown et al. 1980.
\textsuperscript{14} For the addition of the poem as an ‘act of \textit{pietas}’, see Lapidge \textit{apud} Verey, Brown et al. 1980, 35.
refer to Aldred, bishop of Chester-Le-Street (d. 968). The ‘Uncial Leaves’, fragments of another early Northumbrian gospel book, now bound with the Durham Gospels, also contain pentrials 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.

Nonetheless, the Durham monks may have began 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. 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. 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.

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: part one is in eighth-century uncial (fol. 1-23, 34-86, 102 and the Pepys fragment); part two is in eighth-century insular majuscule (fol. 24-33 and 87-101); and part three, John’s gospel, is in late-eighth-century insular majuscule (fol. 103-34). 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, a document of 1127 in which the Bishop of St Andrews promised not to extract customary dues from Durham’s church at Coldingham, and a version of Thomas of York’s spurious confirmation of Durham’s privileges. The two spurious documents seem to have been forged as a result of tensions between the monks and Bishop Hugh de Puiset (1153-1195). 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’; 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 (fol. 12r, 28r, 121r), Mynors 1939, no. 7 and pls. 5(a), (b), 6, 7 (fol. 37r, 34v, 91r, 125v); Story 1993. For the text see Verey 1999. I have not seen this manuscript.
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).
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. 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. 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.

---

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.
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 (\textit{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 \textit{Meldanum}, 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.\(^{34}\)

\(^{32}\) Piper 1978, 220.

\(^{33}\) Watkiss and Chibnall 1994, 11.

\(^{34}\) It appears in the early-thirteenth-century relic list as the ‘liber … qui inuenuit fuerat cum ipsa cruce qui et nigra dicitur, pro eo quod littera et parcamenum utilissima sint et antiquissima’: Rogers 1992, 175. London, British Library, Harley 3766, fol. 18v, compiled shortly after 1345, carries the colophon ‘Explicit liber \textit{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.  

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:


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. The ‘aliud psalterium’ is

intitulantur 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 (G.A.S.A 26-8).
36 Hardwick 1858, 96-99. For commentary and translation, see James 1903, lxiii-lxvii.
almost certainly the ‘Vespasian Psalter’,\textsuperscript{38} though it is notable that Elmham ignores the eleventh-century additions in his description.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 uncial, 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.\textsuperscript{41} The other manuscripts do not survive or have yet to be identified.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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’.\textsuperscript{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

\begin{footnotes}
\item[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.
\item[39] For these additions, see above 96.
\item[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.
\item[41] For Augustine’s cult, see Sharpe 1995.
\item[42] On the ‘Biblia Gregoriana’, see Budny 1999.
\item[43] Hardwick 1858, 237-8. For discussion, see Kelly 1995, xxxvi-vii.
\item[44] Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 391, p. 1.
\end{footnotes}
another example. The inscription on the spine, now read as ‘LIBER S. WUFSANI’, is usually assigned to the twelfth century. Though Hatton 42 contains the hand of Archbishop Wulfstan, 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.

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 page subut | uisa est.’ de propria manu sancti dunstani’. The script of the inscription is very artificial, and may be the work of a later scribe imitating an earlier hand. It is now accepted that this manuscript contains the hand of St Dunstan. Likewise, the Parkerian inscription – ‘hoc Psalterium laminis argenteis deauratis et gemmis ornatum, quondam fuit N. Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi, tandem uenit in manus Thoma 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. 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.

45 Barker-Benfield 1993.
46 Ker 1971, 328-30.
47 For the development of Wulfstan’s cult, see Mason 1990, 254-85.
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 questiones. 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*, 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. 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

---


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. I begin by summarising the basic structure of the manuscript:

Part I (fols. 4-14): originally a quire of twelve, but now lacking the first leaf. Contains extracts from the Gospels, s. xi\textsuperscript{med} or xii\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{r}'): 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). 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fols. 15v</th>
<th>‘Nomina regum uel ducum’.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15r2</td>
<td>Name of King Æthelstan entered at top of page (s. xi\textsuperscript{1}, 924x929).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15v2</td>
<td>Names of Godwine, earl of Wessex (d. 1053) and Tosti, earl of Northumbria (d. 1066) entered in gold (s. xii\textsuperscript{3}). Erased after s. xii\textsuperscript{in}.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15v3</td>
<td>Names, including kings of England and Scotland (s. xii\textsuperscript{in}, 1100x1107). Same scribe as 15v4 and 46v1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15v4</td>
<td>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\textsuperscript{in}).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15v5</td>
<td>Name of King Alexander of Scotland (s. xii\textsuperscript{1}, 1107x1124). Same scribe as Durham, University Library, Cosin V. II. 6, the earliest extant copy of the Libellus de eorðio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15v6-10</td>
<td>Lists of names (s. xii\textsuperscript{1}).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fols. 16r-17v</th>
<th>‘Nomina reginarum et abbatissarum’.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17v2-30:</td>
<td>Lists of names, both male and female (s. xii\textsuperscript{in}-xii\textsuperscript{3}). 17v2 and 17v3 are in the same hand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fol. 18r</th>
<th>‘Nomina anchoritarum’.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fol. 18v-19r</th>
<th>‘Nomina abbatum gradus presbyteratus’.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19r2</td>
<td>‘Ægeluii presbiteri’, perhaps in continuation of the original list (s. xi/xii).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r3</td>
<td>Lists of Bishops of Lindisfarne and Archbishops of York (s. xii\textsuperscript{in}, 1108x1114).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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. xii\textsuperscript{2} 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\textsuperscript{med}).
List of four names (s. xii), headed by Roger of Mowbray, who inherited the Honour of Mowbray from his father (d. 1129).

Fol. 19v

‘Nomina abbatum gradus diaconatus’.

19r2

‘ÆDRED diaconus’ (s. x or xi), perhaps in continuation of the original list.

19v3-12

Lists of names (s. xii1-xii3).

Fols. 20r-21r

‘Nomina abbatum’.

20v2

‘Ælfred abba. | Ælfwald abba’ (s. x or xi), perhaps in continuation of the original list.

20v3

Lists of names (s. xi/xii).

Fols. 21v-25r

‘Nomina praebysterorum’.

23v2

Four names (s. xii).

23v3

Eight names (s. xii).

24r2

‘Uulfstan presbyter. Æðelstan presbyter’ (s. xi).

24r3

‘Afun presbyter. Auun presbyter. Ôdelrig presbyter’ (s. xi).

24v2-3

Two pairs of names of priests (s. x).

24v4

‘Hermer. presbyter’ (s. xii).

24v5

‘Ælfwine presbyter’ (s. xii).

24v6

54 names of monks of Evesham (s. xii).

24v7

Two names, perhaps additions to the list of Evesham monks (s. xii).

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).

25r4

Three names (s. xii).

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, ?1115). Written by Symeon.

25v2

List of three names (s. xii).

25v3

List of names (s. xii), including Robert de Bonneville and family.

25v4-16

Lists of names (s. xii).

25v17

Posthumous entry for Peter de Humet, lord of Brancepath (Durh.) entered during reign of Henry I (s. xii).

25v18-28

Lists of names (s. xii).

25v29

Three names (s. xii), the last being Hugh, abbot of Chertsey (1111-1128).

25v30

‘Robertus’ (s. xii).

Fols. 26rv

‘Nomina diaconorum’.

26r2-5

Names of eight deacons (s. x-xi).

26r4-5

Lists of names (s. xii-xiii).

Fols. 27r-36v

‘Nomina clericorum’.

36r2

‘Æadstan’ (s. x or xi).

36r3

‘Lefsi’ (s. xii).

36r4-5

Four names (s. xii).

36r6

Three names (s. xii) including ‘Abbas Wido’, probably Guy, abbot of Pershore (1088-1136/7).

36v7-13

Lists of names (s. xii).

36v1-8

Confraternity agreements (s. xi/xii or xii). 36v1-2 are in Symeon’s hand.

Fol. 37r-45v

‘Nomina monachorum’.

44v2

‘Albinus monachus. et Adam monachus socius eius’ (s. xii).

45r2

Two names (s. 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, 1107x1137).

45v5-8

Lists of names (s. xii).

45v9

‘GAUFRIDUS Dunhellensis episcopus’ (s. xii, 1133x1141).

45v1

Continuation of 45r3.
Names of Durham monks (s. xii-xii\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{med}).
46r3 List of names (s. xii\textsuperscript{med}, 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\textsuperscript{med}).
46r5-20 Lists of names (s. xii\textsuperscript{med}).
46v1 List of 44 names (s. xii\textsuperscript{med}), 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\textsuperscript{med}).
47r1 Parts of two manumissions (s. xi\textsuperscript{med}).
47r2-33 Lists of names (s. xi\textsuperscript{ex}-xii\textsuperscript{1}).
47v1: Grant of land by Earl Thureth [S1660] (s. x\textsuperscript{ex}).
47v2 Grants of land by Earl Northman and Ulfcytel, son of Oswulf [S1659, S1661] (s. x\textsuperscript{med}).
47v3-18 Lists of names (s. x\textsuperscript{ex}-xii\textsuperscript{1}).
48r1 Partial and modified transcript of parts of damaged fol. 51 (s. xii\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{1}).
51r6 † Eadwine munuc seruus dei et Sanct Cuðberhtis sit nomen eius in libro uitae. †Eadmund munuc seruus dei et Sanct Cuðberhtis sit nomen eius in libro uitae’ (s. xi/xii).
51v1-38 Lists of names (s. xii).
52r1 Confraternity agreement between William of St Carilef and Vitalis, abbot of Westminster (s. x\textsuperscript{2}, 1083x1085).
52r2-4 Confraternity agreements (s. x\textsuperscript{ex}).
52v1-7 Confraternity agreements (s. x\textsuperscript{ex}).
53r1 General confirmation of William of St Calais (s. xii\textsuperscript{1}).
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\textsuperscript{1}).
55r1 Continuation of 54v1.
55v1-46 Lists of names (s. xii\textsuperscript{ex}-xii\textsuperscript{2}). 55v1 is in the hand of the scribe of Durham, University Library, Cosin V. II. 6, the earliest extant copy of the Libellus de exordio; 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), the list of bishops of Lindisfarne and Archbishops of York (19r3), and the list of Durham monks (45r3). The inclusion of a similar list of monks in the Libellus de exordio, 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. 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’. 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.

---

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.
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). 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, 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’, 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). The *Liber vitae* could now also record royal donations (54v1), and the hard-won rights of Durham over its properties (51r5). 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. 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.
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.\textsuperscript{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’,\textsuperscript{73} witnessing many royal writs and charters, serving as a Domesday commissioner and perhaps even masterminding the whole project.\textsuperscript{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 (\textit{LDE} iv. 3).\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{76} His letter to the monks, prescribed weekly reading in chapter and incorporated in the \textit{Libellus} (\textit{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{78} When he died in 1087, the bishop appointed Turgot in

\textsuperscript{72} For William of St Carilef, see Otfler 1946-53; Aird 1994a.
\textsuperscript{73} Aird 1994a, 291.
\textsuperscript{74} Chaplais 1987. Doubt has been cast on the importance of St Carilef by Lewis 1990.
\textsuperscript{75} The accuracy of Symeon’s account has been questioned; see Aird 1998, 121-22.
\textsuperscript{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’ (\textit{LDE} iv. 1).
\textsuperscript{77} Aird 1994a.
\textsuperscript{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. 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. With William of St Calais, he laid the foundation stone of the new cathedral in 1093 (being appointed archdeacon to mark the occasion) and masterminded the translation of St Cuthbert’s relics in 1104. He was also notably close to Scottish royal family, composing a *vita* of Malcolm III’s wife, Margaret of Scotland (d. 1093), probably acquiring her gospel lectionary for the cathedral, and encouraging the presence of Malcolm at the ceremony of 1093 and of his son, Alexander, at the Cuthbert’s translation in 1104. 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, 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 inusta vexacione 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. 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. 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. 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), 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.
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.\footnote{Offler 1968, nos. 24, 25. Both survive as original singlesheets, copied by Symeon.} 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 Willelmus, 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
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/fulle 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 particularly\(^5\) – 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. xi\(^1\) or xi\(^2\med\), Cant CC) and London, British Library, Harley 585 (s. x/xi and xi\(^1\)) – 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 pentrials 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. 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’. 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’.  

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’. His later, very influential survey, ‘On the Continuity of English Prose from Alfred to More’, set out to demonstrate that:

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’. 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. Chambers even went as far as to state that the Ancrene Wisse ‘is all in the tradition of Ælfric’. 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, lxxi.
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.
literate 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 \textit{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’.

This is similar to the Poema Morale’s advice that ‘lutel lac is gode lof þat kumeð of gode wille | 7 ec-lete muchel geue of þan þe herete is ille’.

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.

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. 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 perigrinatione in the macaronic incipits of some Katherine Group texts; in Benedeit’s Voyage of St Brendan, which uses two nautical loanwords from English, raps ‘ropes’ and haspes ‘hasps’; and in the many Old English words borrowed into Latin.

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. The answer may lie in
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25 See above 140.
26 Edited Hall 1920, i. 30-53 (lls. 73-4, Lambeth MS).
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.\textsuperscript{34} Benedeit and Phillipe de Thaon dedicated texts to Henry I’s queens;\textsuperscript{35} and Geoffrei Gaimar and Samson de Nantuill dedicated their works to the wives of prominent landowners.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.

\textbf{READING THE BOOK, 1066-1200}

The Conquest influenced the \textit{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,\textsuperscript{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

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{34} See Short 1992.
  \item \textsuperscript{35} Dean 1999, nos. 504, 348.
  \item \textsuperscript{36} Dean 1999, nos. 1, 458.
  \item \textsuperscript{37} For example, though the \textit{Ancorne Wisse} appears initially to have been written for three well-born lay anchoresses, this is never explicitly stated: see Edwards 2003.
  \item \textsuperscript{38} e. g. Leclercq 1961; Smalley 1983; Irvine 1994.
\end{itemize}
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:\(^{41}\)

\[\text{The physical nature of the book and the history of the circulation of books ensure that there is always a third party tacitly present at the writing of marginalia.}\]

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.\textsuperscript{42} Future research might usefully investigate whether different practices prevailed in monastic books, where \textit{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 \textit{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 \textit{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:\textsuperscript{43}

\begin{quote}
Every note entails a degree of self-assertion, if not aggression. The reader leaves a mark and thereby alters the object.
\end{quote}

Few personal reactions are expressed in the margins of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. The Tremulous Hand’s non-lexical annotations largely consist of ambiguous \textit{nota} marks, scriptural citations and the identification of \textit{auctoritates}. Coleman, with his recommendations

\textsuperscript{42} Jackson 2001, 30.
\textsuperscript{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 pentrials with no real connection to the text.\(^\text{44}\)

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.\(^\text{45}\) 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.

\(^\text{44}\) The name ‘Eadgib’ 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.

\(^\text{45}\) Lapidge 2000; Stanley 2002.
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 forewarned 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 pentrials 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.
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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, 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 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian A. xxii</td>
<td>fols. 60-129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian B. x</td>
<td>fols. 31-124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D. xii</td>
<td>65-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D. xiv</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius A. xv</td>
<td>fols. 4-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius A. xix</td>
<td>12, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius C. iii</td>
<td>fols. 11-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius D. xvii</td>
<td>fols. 4-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Egerton 874</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Egerton 874, fols. 9-72</td>
<td>32, 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 76</td>
<td>75, 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 107</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 208</td>
<td>159-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 491, fols. 3-46</td>
<td>107, 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 491, flyleaves</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 585</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 863</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 865</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 865</td>
<td>96-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 865</td>
<td>26, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 2110, fols. 4* and 5*</td>
<td>35, 62, 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 2965</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 3080</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 3271</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 3376</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 3680</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 3766</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 3826</td>
<td>81-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 3969</td>
<td>82-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 4092, fols. 1-38</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 4092, fols. 87-158</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 4688</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 5915, fols. 8, 9</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 6258B</td>
<td>12, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Loan 11</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Loan 74</td>
<td>180-1, 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Royal 1 A. xiv</td>
<td>12, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Royal 1 B. vii</td>
<td>154-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Royal 1 B. xi</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Royal 1 D. iii</td>
<td>63, 65-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Royal 1 D. ix</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Royal 1 E. vii + viii</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Royal 2 B. v</td>
<td>38, 87-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Royal 4 A. xiv</td>
<td>38-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Royal 5 B. vii</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Royal 5 B. xii</td>
<td>169, 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Royal 5 B. xiv</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Royal 5 E. vi</td>
<td>33, 44, 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Royal 5 E. xvi</td>
<td>38, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Royal 5 F. iii</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Royal 6 A. vi</td>
<td>124, 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Royal 6 B. vii</td>
<td>124, 125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
London, British Library, Royal 7 C. iv
London, British Library, Royal 7 C. xii, fols. 2 and 3 See 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. xiiii, fols. 2-83 147
London, British Library, Royal 12 C. xxii 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 See 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, Lévay József Library, s. n 124
Monte Cassino, Archivo 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 See New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, 401 23-6
New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, 926 52
New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 708 52
New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 709 166
New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 776 59
New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 826 67

O

Oslo and London, Schøyen Collection, 197 See New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, 401 51, 162
Oxford, All Soul's College, 38, fols. I-VI and i-vi See London, British Library, Royal 12 G. xii, fols. 2-9 41, 56
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Add. C. 181 37, 44
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Arch A. f. 131 (ptd. bk.) See New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, 401 51, 52
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct D. 2. 16 51, 52
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct D. infra 2. 9 52
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct F. 1. 15 51, 52
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct F. 3. 6 51, 52
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Call Number</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct F. 4. 32</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barlow 25</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barlow 35</td>
<td>74, 107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 49</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 86</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 97</td>
<td>124, 125-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 126</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 134</td>
<td>41, 56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 145</td>
<td>41, 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 163</td>
<td>91-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 180</td>
<td>12, 119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 223</td>
<td>173-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 230</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 297</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 314</td>
<td>34-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 319</td>
<td>37-8, 57, 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 340 + 342</td>
<td>128-9, 131, 134, 141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 381</td>
<td>33-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 391</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 394, fols. 1-84</td>
<td>37-8, 51, 52, 151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 426, fols. 1-118</td>
<td>72-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 441</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 577</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 579</td>
<td>51, 52, 163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 708</td>
<td>51, 52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 718</td>
<td>51, 52, 169-70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 730</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 815</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 819</td>
<td>36-7, 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 849</td>
<td>51, 52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 865, fols. 97-112</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 101</td>
<td>93-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 146</td>
<td>124, 125, 126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 175</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 211</td>
<td>90, 93-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce 296</td>
<td>60, 61, 62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, e Mus. 66</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, e Mus. 93</td>
<td>See Hereford, Cathedral Library, P. V. I, fols. 29-152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, e Mus. 115</td>
<td>90, 93-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Gough liturg. 17</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 20</td>
<td>75-6, 129, 139, 146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 23</td>
<td>44, 172-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 30</td>
<td>32, 54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 42</td>
<td>129, 187-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 43</td>
<td>92-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 48, fol. 77</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 76</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 93</td>
<td>174-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 113 + 114</td>
<td>141, 142, 146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 115</td>
<td>46, 146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 116</td>
<td>12, 146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Holkham misc. 7</td>
<td>93-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121</td>
<td>142, 146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 See Cambridge, University Library, Ec. 2. 4
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Lat. th. d. 24, fols. 1 and 2 See New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, 401
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc 482 35
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud misc. 509 146
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud misc. 636 143-4
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson C. 697 12, 13, 91, 99, 200
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Th. d. 33 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 See Oxford, Bodleian Library, Lat. th. d. 33

P

Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, 903, fols. 1-52 See 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 See Paris, BNF, lat. 5506, pt. i 10
Paris, BNF, lat. 8092 68
Paris, BNF, lat. 8824 69
Paris, BNF, lat. 10575 68
Paris, BNF, lat. 10913 See Paris, BNF, lat. 5506, pt. i 124
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 See 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, DRe/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
Rouen, Bibliothèque Publique, 1343

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  See Cambridge, Pembroke College, 312C, nos. 1 and 2
Stockholm, Kungliga Bibliotek, A. 135 53
Stuttgart, Württemburgische 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
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