THE COMMUNITY OF ST. CUTHBERT IN THE LATE TENTH CENTURY

The Chester-le-Street Additions to Durham Cathedral Library A.IV.19

KAREN LOUISE JOLLY
# CONTENTS

*Abbreviations* ix  
*Illustrations* xiii  
*Preface and Acknowledgments* xv  

**CHAPTER 1**  
**History: The Temporal and Geographic Landscape in Northumbria**  
- Northumbria and Wessex: English Identity and Christian Reform 4  
- Chester-le-Street in the Tenth Century: Land and Power 15  
  **THE SOCIOPOLITICAL LANDSCAPE** 17  
  **THE NATURAL WORLD AND THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT** 24  

**CHAPTER 2**  
**Biography: Aldred and His World** 37  
- Lindisfarne Colophon and Gloss: A Good Woman’s Son Earns a Place 41  
- Durham Colophon: Provost of Cuthbert’s family 60  

**CHAPTER 3**  
**Paleography and Codicology: The Chester-le-Street Scriptorium** 71  
- In the Scriptorium: Paleography and Codicology 73  
CHAPTER 4
Liturgy: The Community of St. Cuthbert at Prayer

Service Books 110
Office Materials 119
PRAYER IN THE DIVINE OFFICE 120
READINGS 129
HYMNS 131
Communal Services 136
COMMUNITY OF THE SAINTS: MEMORIALS FOR THE LIVING AND THE DEAD 137
COMMUNITY SERVICE: BLESSING THINGS 143

CHAPTER 5
Scholarship and Education: The Textual Community at Chester-le-Street

Learning to Write and Writing to Learn: Scribe B 155
Thinking and Teaching: Aldred’s Glosses 162
Language Study at Chester-le-Street: Encyclopedic Additions 172
QXI.48 NOTAE JURIS 175
QXI.49 DE OCTO PONDERA 179
QXI.50–52 OFFICIAL LISTS 183
QXI.53–55 PLACES IN CHRISTIAN HISTORY 190

CHAPTER 6
Conclusion: Religious Formation and the Vocabulary of Prayer

In the Scriptorium, Schoolroom, and Library: Reading, Writing, and Study 202
In the Church and Cloister: Individual and Corporate Prayer 207
In the Field and On the Road: Blessings and Protection 210
A Sacramental World 214

The Texts: Additions to Durham Cathedral Library A.IV.19 217
Collation Diagrams 220
Codicological Map 223
Quire VIII 230
Quires IX–X Booklet + Fol. 76 246
Quire XI Booklet 280
Bibliography 361
Index of texts 395
Index verborum 397
General index 402
ABBREVIATIONS

Ælfwine  Ælfwine’s Prayerbook (BL Cotton Titus D.xxvi + xxvii), referenced by item number.

ASC  Anglo-Saxon Chronicle

AHR  American Historical Review

ASE  Anglo-Saxon England

ASM  Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile

ASPR  Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records

Augustine, Confessions  Cited by book and chapter.

Bede, EH  Bede’s Ecclesiastical History of the English People, cited by book and chapter numbers.

Ben. Æthel.  Benedictional of Æthelwold (BL Additional MS 49598)

BL  British Library


CCCC  Cambridge, Corpus Christi College

Cod. Lind.  Evangeliorum Quattuor Codex Lindisfarnensis, cited by volume, book, and page number; index verborum cited by headword.

Corrêa  Durham Collectar, ed. Alicia Corrêa, HBS 107, cited by item numbers.

CUL  Cambridge University Library
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>Dictionary of Old English Project and Corpus (Toronto: PIMS), cited by headword.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEMF</td>
<td>Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EETS</td>
<td>Early English Text Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHD</td>
<td><em>English Historical Documents</em>, ed. Whitelock et. al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHR</td>
<td><em>English Historical Review</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fulda</em></td>
<td><em>Sacramentarium Fuldense saeculi X</em>, ed. Georg Kopp, et al., HBS 101, cited by item number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBS</td>
<td>Henry Bradshaw Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEGP</td>
<td><em>Journal of English and Germanic Philology</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ker</td>
<td>N. R. Ker, <em>Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon</em>, cited by item number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Leofric Collectar</em></td>
<td><em>The Leofric Collectar</em>, ed. E. S. Dewick and W. H. Frere, 2 vols., HBS 45–6 paginated continuously; first volume with Leofric Collectar cited by column number; second volume containing the Collectar of St. Wulfstan cited by page number.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LM *Leofric Missal*, ed. Nicholas Orchard, HBS 113–114, cited by item number. LM A refers to the c. 900 portion of the manuscript.


N&Q *Notes & Queries*

NCMH *The New Cambridge Medieval History*

n.s. new series

o.s. original series

PASE *Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England*

PIMS Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies


PMLA Publication of the Modern Language Association


Regularis concordia *Regularis concordia anglicae nationis monachorum sanctimoni-alumque* (editions by Kornexl and Symons), cited by chapter number.


Rule of St. Benedict *Regula sancti Benedicti*, cited by chapter number.


TRHS *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*
ILLUSTRATIONS

IMAGES

[chapter 1]
1 Lindisfarne Priory, author photo 7
2 Bamburgh castle seen from Lindisfarne, author photo 7
3 View from Chester-le-Street, author photo 25
4 Cuthbert’s Isle, author photo 25
5 River Wear in summer, Chester-le-Street, author photo 29
6 Chester-le-Street and church, author photo 30
7 Ruthwell Cross, photograph by Lairich Rig, Creative Commons license 32
8 Eadmund monument, Chester-le-Street Anker House, author photo 32

[chapter 2]
9 Lindisfarne Gospels colophon, British Library Cotton Nero D.IV., fol. 259r 42
10 Durham A.IV.19, fol. 84r Cuthbert collects, memorandum, and colophon 62
11 Durham A.IV.19, fol. 84r memorandum, enhanced 64

[chapter 3]
12 Durham A.IV.19, fol. 61r 98
13 Durham A.IV.19, fol. 66r 99
14 Durham A.IV.19, fol. 77v 100
15 Durham A.IV.19, fol. 78r 101
16 Durham A.IV.19, fol. 86r 102
17 Durham A.IV.19, fol. 63v 103
18 Durham A.IV.19, fol. 64r 104
19 Durham A.IV.19, fol. 64v 105
20 Oxford, Bodleian, Bodley 819, fols. 19v–20r 106–7
21 Durham Cathedral Cloister, author photo 108
22 Durham Cathedral Library, author photo 109
**MAPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>British Isles in the Tenth Century</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Northumbria in the Tenth Century</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wessex in the Tenth Century</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURES AND CHARTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chester-le-Street Church</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cuthbert Coffin, apostles and archangels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lindisfarne Gospels colophon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43–45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lindisfarne Gospels Colophon Chart</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Durham Cathedral Priory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book examines the daily life and thought world of a tenth-century Northumbrian religious community through the lens of a surviving service book manuscript, Durham Cathedral Library A.IV.19. This artifact, bellying its ragged appearance and hybrid materials, is prime evidence of a lively and imaginative community of scribes at Chester-le-Street in the second half of the tenth century. Although sometimes marginalized as an isolated backwater beset by vikings, the community of St. Cuthbert in this era evidences a rich linguistic fusion of local religious traditions from its Irish and Lindisfarne past with the new currents of monastic reform emanating from Wessex.

While the risk of loading more weight on one source than it can bear is cause for trepidation, recent scholarship provides some excellent models for excavating a manuscript artifact within the context of a larger set of historical and cultural connections. Cumulatively, these studies are transforming our understanding of the hopes and aspirations as well as daily realities experienced and expressed by the men and women who lived in these communities and labored in the production of the surviving manuscript artifacts. The present book endeavors to add a small

1. A free translation from Aldred’s colophon to the Lindisfarne Gospels; see chapter 2 for a full discussion.
drop to this increasingly deep pool of studies on early medieval religious communities by looking at how Durham A.IV.19’s additional texts were written, emended, and read by the community at Chester-le-Street in the late tenth century. In particular, as part of the Text and Context series, it offers a new critical edition of these materials in the appendices.

In some ways this project has its roots in an earlier conjunction of cultural anthropology and history explored in my first book, Popular Religion in Late Saxon England: Elf Charms in Context. Clifford Geertz’s “webs of significance,” Carlo Ginzberg’s microhistory, and Robert Darnton’s “incident history,” for example, have offered various means to examine the small and even peculiar in light of larger cultural trends. Brian Stock’s “textual communities” and Henry Mayr-Harting’s “thought world” provide labels for contextualizing the particular and local, a way of making the specific artifact significant to broader themes and a wider audience.2 Meanwhile, the disciplines of language and literature have developed ways of applying postmodern and postcolonial approaches to medieval studies, most fruitfully when combined with traditional paleographic methods, as Stephen Nichols suggests with “material philology.”3 This approach requires considerable historical empathy, both at the level of detailed analysis of the artifact and in a willingness to enter into the thinking processes that accompanied the manual labor to produce it.

But perhaps beyond the theoretical is an intangible found in the models from Anglo-Saxon scholarship most inspiring this book, a trait I am going to risk calling devotion. The love of learning and the desire for God, as Jean LeClerq describes monastic practice, is echoed by Aldred in his poem *Littera me pandat* quoted above, rooted in a love of the word, spoken, written, and performed. This devotion in the relationship between the scholar and the objects of their study is visible in Michelle P. Brown’s engagement with the Book of Cerne and loving care of the British Library’s Lindisfarne Gospels treasure, or Éamonn Ó Carragáin’s immersion in the liturgical thought world of the Dream of the Rood and the Ruthwell Cross.4 The labor of love these scholars devote to


these manuscripts mirrors the object’s devotional intentions. Prayers, poems, illuminations, sculpted stone, and rituals that express spiritual and scholarly desires attract religiously mindful scholars in the present day who endeavor to understand an early medieval sensibility and explain that understanding to a modern audience.

Such is the case with this volume and the need to articulate my relationship to the manuscript. Durham Cathedral Library A.IV.19 and the scribes at Chester-le-Street drew me in, first because of the anomalies related to my own interests in popular religion—odd prayers for clearing birds from fields—but then increasingly because of the unusual conjunction of Latin and vernacular. The latter interest was the product of a long and fruitful dialogue with Trent University Professor Sarah Larratt Keefer, still going on, as we contemplate “two languages at prayer” in various Anglo-Saxon liturgical manuscripts. Durham A.IV.19 became our touchstone, the anomaly that suggested wider possibilities for the languages of religious devotion in Anglo-Saxon England. The deeper I was drawn into the study of the manuscript, the more lines of inquiry, both divergent and intersecting, emerged in the study of this manuscript: paleographic and codicological issues, liturgical reform and experimentation, communal religious life and pastoral care, bilingual scholarship and pedagogy, and the political and social dimensions of viking era Northumbria.

_The Community of St. Cuthbert in the Late Tenth Century_ highlights in Durham A.IV.19 these intertwining strands of material, sociopolitical, and religious culture as a way of furthering a conversation about the nature of liturgical life in an early medieval religious community. The bilingual materials compiled in this manuscript while it resided at Chester-le-Street served multiple purposes both in the process of producing them and in their uses thereafter: as liturgical experimentation in a workbook format, as collaborative scribal projects, as a study and reference tool, for instruction in prayer and Latin, and for devotional reflection and meditation. The chapters in this volume extrapolate these purposes and uses from the texts by exploring the scribes in their historical and manuscript contexts.

The first chapter, “History: The Temporal and Geographic Landscape in Northumbria,” uses the concept of _landscape_ both literally and metaphorically

---

6. The lower case “v” in viking throughout this volume follows Richard Abels’ lead in deconstructing this amorphous label: “Alfred the Great, the micel hæðen here and the viking threat,” in _Alfred the Great_, ed. Timothy Reuter (Oxford: Ashgate, 2003), 265-79, at 265 n. 1. Viking is neither an ethnic label like Dane or Swede, nor is it a geographically defined sociopolitical entity like Scandinavia; rather it is a collective label for subgroups of people with a shared pattern of behavior and an era in which that activity took place across a broad geographic landscape.
as a way of understanding the manuscript artifact in its historical context. \(^7\) How did the scribes at Chester-le-Street see the world around them? To gain a sense of place, I needed to visit and explore the physical land itself, as well as the manuscript, in order to begin to see it through their eyes, particularly as an outsider from half way around the globe. This kind of cultural geography is encouraged by recent interdisciplinary and boundary crossing studies such as Clare A. Lees and Gillian R. Overing’s *A Place to Believe In* and Nicholas Howe’s *Writing the Map of Anglo-Saxon England*. \(^8\) I also relied on insider and expert views of previous scholarship on the history of the community of St. Cuthbert in Northumbria. In particular, the work and insights of historians David and Lynda Rollason and archaeologist Rosemary Cramp, who also served as generous hosts in my forays into the surrounding countryside, allowed me to construct my own picture of that landscape, although they are not to be faulted for any misconstructions on my part. David once sent me hiking across several pastures to visit Escomb church and helped me navigate the Durham area, while Rosemary gave me a personal escort to Chester-le-Street and Lindisfarne. \(^9\) Their publications, along with that of other Northumbrian and Anglo-Saxon specialists, supplied the foundation on which the first chapter is built.

The temporal aspects of this history are likewise complex in trying to relate what appears to be a remote community on the periphery to larger political and religious affairs. The first chapter opens with Aldred and Bishop Ælfsige in Wessex in 970 for this reason, to locate the religious landscape of tenth-century Northumbria in relation to the more historiographically dominant Wessex. The backbone for this short history of Northumbria and the community of St. Cuthbert comes from both older and a more recent spate of interdisciplinary scholarship, evident in the footnotes to literary, artistic, religious, archaeological, and historical research.

Cultural history of the type developed in chapter 1 for tenth-century Northumbria attempts to engage both conceptually and pragmatically with “lived religion,” that is, to take seriously the worldviews of communities from the past even when their perceptions are alien to ours. \(^10\) For comparative world history, I define worldviews as the way a people group perceives their relationship to the natural or material world (the temporal and geographic landscape), each

---

\(^7\) On landscape painting as a historiographical metaphor, see John Lewis Gaddis, *The Landscape of History: How Historians Map the Past* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).


other (the human and sociopolitical dimension), and the supernatural or divine (beliefs and values)." Tracing how all three of these aspects are interdependent allows for greater historical empathy and understanding of a culture. Thus, connecting geographic space, the sociopolitical human realm, and the thought world of religious belief enables us to understand the diverse materials found in Durham A.IV.19. These texts function along a spectrum from literal threats of divine and demonic activity in the fields, to political reform of religious life, to the spiritual impact of heathen Scandinavians on the Northumbrian landscape.

The second chapter, “Biography: Aldred and His World” narrows this focus from tenth-century Northumbrian cultural history to a biography of Aldred, the Chester-le-Street scribe and glossator in the Lindisfarne Gospels and Durham A.IV.19. Whatever we know about him comes only through his self-revelation in the colophons as well as his scribal activities in these and one other volume. Writing a biography of a medieval scribe based on such slim and self-serving evidence is risky, but is in other ways central to the book’s premise that we can enter into the thought world of an individual or group through their linguistic exploits. The edginess involved in such an enterprise is expressed well in Janet Nelson’s comments about “sailing close to the imaginative wind and certainly into the eye of the speculative storm to make the acquaintance of my subject as a person, to guess plausibly, if no more, at what made him tick.” Chapter 2, in particular, but also the subsequent chapters, attempts just such an imaginative guesswork to reconstruct something of Aldred’s personality.

Aldred was in some ways a Tolkien-like philologist, a figure immortalized by C. S. Lewis in the character Ransom in his space trilogy. Aldred as a lover of words was curious about their historic origins as a means of establishing a sense of cultural identity. Thus he was also a “religious specialist,” in Philippe Buc’s terms, who used his philological expertise to enhance the devotional life of his community. Words as visual objects mattered to him, so this volume takes his words seriously, not just for their linguistic import, but for what they say about his thought processes and worldview. Even his errors and corrections are insightful.

Colorful as his revealing colophons are, Aldred’s scribal work did not occur in a vacuum but amidst a community of scribes in a “scriptorium” at Chester-le-Street, whether that was a physical room or not. The third chapter, “Paleography and Codicology: The Chester-le-Street Scriptorium,” therefore examines the scribes who worked with Aldred on Durham A.IV.19, whose unfortunate modern names are Scribes B, C, D, E, and F, as well as Scribe O of the southern English original manuscript, Durham Scribes M1, M2, and M3, later medieval and early modern handlers of the manuscript, and finally modern paleographers and codicologists. The physical aspects of the Chester-le-Street scribes’ labor are important components in understanding the community and what they produced, so this chapter works quite literally to examine the manuscript as a material witness to their craftsmanship, a concept long underrated and overshadowed by more aesthetic considerations; what often creeps into analyses of “scrap” manuscripts like Durham A.IV.19 is a type of paleographic snobbery that values newer scripts and more complete texts versus older or more fragmentary and workaday texts. Chapter 3’s detailed paleographic and codicological examination of the material artifact in all of its complexity, as well as its later history, is a necessary preliminary step to understanding the texts as read and performed by the community.

Like the scribes of Durham A.IV.19 in their manuscript project, I am beholden for my own to communities of scholars, both living and dead. The latter include the long chain of paleographers and editors of Durham A.IV.19, from Humphrey Wanley’s patient cataloging, N. R. Ker’s insights on Aldred’s hand, to the meticulous work of T. J. Brown in the EEMF facsimile, a history traced at the end of chapter 3. Among the living are the current librarian and staff at Durham Cathedral Library who have patiently assisted me when I was there in person and electronically from a distance. Additional thanks are due to the Dean and Chapter of Durham Cathedral, as well as manuscript archives at the British Library and Oxford Bodleian Library for providing unfettered or low cost access to high resolution digitized images.

My own training as a budding paleographer traces an arc in the increasing integration of technical specializations within the interdisciplinary field of medieval studies. It began with the obligatory graduate seminar where Professor Jeffrey Russell urged us to “gestalt it” when the facsimile page looked to be nothing more than chicken scratchings. It continued with an outstanding

1997 NEH seminar at the Parker Library, Cambridge Corpus Christi College
where Timothy Graham and Paul Szarmach encouraged Anglo-Saxonists to “go
back to the manuscript,” followed by a sabbatical at the Hill Monastic Manu-
script Library and Ecumenical Institute at St. John’s University where I expe-
rienced liturgical experimentation directly. And most recently it culminated
in the innovative seminar hosted by Jon Wilcox and the Obermann Center at
the University of Iowa in 2008 that brought together both book artists (cal-
ligraphers, parchment and paper makers, book binders and preservationists)
and medieval scholars with troubling manuscripts to understand.17 At the lat-
ter seminar, I was able to deconstruct Durham A.IV.19’s codicology as well as
to experience the labor of love the production of a manuscript represents as we
sanded animal skins, cut and folded quires, and then attempted our own feeble
minuscule and majuscule with goose quill and ink, knife in hand to scrape
away the errors. The process gave me a new appreciation for and understanding
of the script and text of Aldred and Scribes B-F, an empathy and admiration
that I hope comes through in chapter 3.

The fourth chapter, “Liturgy: The Community of St. Cuthbert at Prayer,”
endeavors, in so far as it is possible, to identify and contextualize the frag-
mentary liturgical materials added by the Chester-le-Street scribes to Durham
A.IV.19. While the previous chapter examines the physical writing and layout
of the texts in relation to one another, this chapter tackles their contents in
order to correlate them with each other and to other service books with the
goal of better understanding the relationship between spiritual reflection and
ritual performance. As with the paleography and codicology, liturgists have
already laid the groundwork for sourcing the materials, the first generations of
whom worked by hand to correlate texts with an eye to uncovering the roots
and long history of Christian orthopraxis. The names of Andrieu, Deshusses,
Gambert, Vogel, Frere, and Franz, among others, have become synonymous
with their reference volumes of liturgical materials. For Anglo-Saxon liturgy, I
am indebted in particular to the cataloging work of Helmut Gneuss, Richard
Pfaff, and the contributors to his Old English Newsletter Subsidia volume.
Contemporary Anglo-Saxonists such as Sarah Keefer, Helen Gittos, Brad Bed-
ingfield, Francesca Tinti, Catherine Cubitt, and Mary Frances Giandrea are
mining liturgy for larger cultural purposes, as is the present work.18

17. See also Raymond Clemens and Timothy Graham, Introduction to Manuscript Studies (Ithaca: Cor-
nell University Press, 2007).
in Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England, ed. Michael Lapidge and Helmut Gneuss (Cambridge:
Old English Newsletter Subsidia 23 (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 1995) and more re-
Gittos and Bradford Bedingfield, eds., Liturgy of the Late Anglo-Saxon Church (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005);
Francesca Tinti, ed., Pastoral Care in Late Anglo-Saxon England (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005); Catherine
Yet, despite the heroic efforts of my research assistant, Josh Hevert, and the generous support of the University of Hawai‘i library staff, Special Collections, the InterLibrary Loan department, and their partner libraries to access rare volumes and databases, tracking the sources for the Durham A.IV.19 additions requires more data than is currently accessible and would in turn involve a collaborative effort. The liturgical material in particular needs to be digitized in a searchable format more reliable than the older volumes randomly surfacing on Google Books. The current sourcing method involves searching incipit indices in printed volumes of individual liturgical texts or in edited collections; the majority, like the original Durham Collectar edited and analyzed by Alicia Corrêa, were produced by the Henry Bradshaw Society, of which I am a grateful member. However, as Josh and I discovered, incipits are insufficient when texts are hybrid, either intentionally or accidentally as occurs in the Durham A.IV.19 additions; and since liturgy is not fully represented in the Patrologia Latina, an electronic search there was mainly useful for the encyclopedic materials in Quire XI. Consequently, this project contributes to the digitization process by placing the Durham A.IV.19 additions online with source parallels currently identified in the hopes that others will be able to search and suggest further sources. The resulting comparisons should allow us a better picture of the relationship between a universal standard of liturgical uniformity and regional variations representing a particular community’s needs and interests.

The fifth chapter, “Scholarship and Education: The Textual Community at Chester-le-Street” examines both Aldred’s vernacular glossing and his “educational” additions at the end of Quire XI, mining them for insights into the practice and teaching of writing and reading in religious formation. The theoretical work on orality, literacy, and bilinguality serves as background for much of this study. In the foreground is more recent work on the complex relationships between reading, writing, and thinking, particularly in the educational environments of medieval religious communities. For example, Anna A. Grotans’ exploration of the thought world of St. Gall and the activities of Notker is in some ways comparable to the present examination of Aldred and the community of St. Cuthbert at Chester-le-Street, although Notker has left more scholarly materials to work with than Aldred. Nonetheless, Aldred’s Northumbrian glosses are a goldmine not only for linguists, but also for cultural historians. The analysis of Aldred’s glosses in chapter 5 selects examples from his hymns and prayers to illustrate the way that his mind worked bilingually, but

and Mary Frances Giandrea, Episcopalian Culture in Late Anglo-Saxon England (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007). See also the insightful work of Susan Boynton, Shaping a Monastic Identity: Liturgy and History at the Imperial Abbey of Farfa, 1000–1125: Conjunctions of Religion and Power in the Medieval Past (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006).

also relies on the scholarship of linguists engaged in extensive word analyses. Essential to this analysis are the Dictionary of Old English Corpus (DOE) and the Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture (SASLC).

The approach in chapter 5 aims to recreate the writing scenario, the scholarly thinking that went into the act of glossing, and the possible pedagogical functions of the glossed additions. For this purpose, the lone contribution of Scribe B corrected and glossed by Aldred provides a basis for imagining an interactive dialogue between master and pupil, one that I confess to both recreating with quill and parchment and fictionalizing as preparation for this analysis. The so-called educational additions at the end of Quire XI, as with some of the liturgical material, are hard to source but appear to be a collection unique to Aldred. Their encyclopedic nature combined with vernacular glossing suggests a pedagogical component comparable to glossaries, glossed manuscripts, and classbooks emerging in tenth- and eleventh-century England. Chapter 5 endeavors to add Durham A.IV.19 to that corpus and weigh in on some of the debates surrounding reading, writing, and education in late Anglo-Saxon religious communities. Nonetheless, the intention of this volume is not to classify Durham Cathedral Library A.IV.19 as a single type of manuscript, either as a service book or a classbook. Rather it was a multifaceted and multi-purpose collection of texts in the process of being compiled in separable quire booklets by a group of scribes with varying abilities and interests, but all intent on improving the devotional life of their community.

The final, sixth chapter of this volume, “Conclusion: The Community of St. Cuthbert in the Late Tenth Century,” offers both a summary of what can be said about religious life at Chester-le-Street and suggests new avenues to relate that life to movements of reform and liturgical innovation in England and elsewhere. While the previous chapters disassembled the manuscript and looked at its components through different lenses—history, biography, paleography, source analysis, educational theory—the last chapter attempts to construct a coherent picture of life inside the scriptorium, library or classroom, within the church and cloister, out in the community and fields, and on the road. The result is a sense that a small early medieval religious foundation like Chester-le-Street fostered an active connection between ritual performance, spiritual reflection, and pastoral care. Individual and communal life within the religious compound centered on daily rituals that patterned their lives and therefore were the subject of intensive study. Aldred, as the religious specialist, used this “service book” along with his fellow scribes to explore the history, meaning,

20. In particular, the Aldrediana series of articles by Alan S. C. Ross and others, as well as more recent work done by Sara María Pons Sanz.
21. The experiment with quill and parchment is the result of the Extreme Materialist Readings of Medieval Book seminar at the University of Iowa Obermann Center. The fictional account is not included in this volume but may appear elsewhere someday.
and significance of these rituals for himself, his bishop, and members of his community under his oversight. Durham A.IV.19’s additions suggest that Chester-le-Street was not a stagnant backwater but a site of liturgical experimentation contributing to the reform movement underway in England and on the continent. The current church site, although a later building, still honors this early community with a stained glass representation of Aldred and a facsimile of the Lindisfarne Gospels, testament to the continuity of the spiritual tradition they worked hard to preserve in the tenth century.

The Texts section appended to this volume contains the vital material on which this book’s analysis rests. The Text and Context series of The Ohio State University Press, ably edited by Frank Coulson, provides the perfect venue to carry out this project, since it allows the incorporation of a critical edition with a monograph. The appendices provide the fullest information possible on the texts, short of accessing the original manuscript or a facsimile. The text transcription of the Durham A.IV.19 additions was done from the EEMF facsimile edition of T. J. Brown, compared to the Surtees edition of Lindelöf, and checked against the manuscript itself in Durham Cathedral Library. The footnotes point out anomalies, questionable readings, and variations from previous editors. Analysis of source text parallels are in the body of the monograph using a system of references to the appendix. The Quire map prefacing the Texts section provides a guide to the entire manuscript’s codicology as well as the location of the additional texts in the quire booklets posited by this analysis. The texts are numbered sequentially (1–56) but all references within the body of the monograph preface these numbers with the quire booklet number (VIII, IX/X, XI) so that even when the texts are discussed by type their relative location is retained: QVIII.1–13, QIX/X.14–25, and QXI.26–56. This same numbering system will be used in the online edition to enhance the ongoing, collaborative pursuit of sources by liturgical scholars.
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1.

HISTORY

The Temporal and Geographic Landscape in Northumbria

In 970 a.d. a Northumbrian priest named Aldred the Provost wrote down four prayers in honor of Cuthbert, the patron saint of his religious community at Chester-le-Street, formerly of Lindisfarne. He copied these collects on a manuscript page that is now attached to a larger book of service prayers that his community had acquired, a manuscript known as the Durham Ritual or Collectar (Durham Cathedral Library A.IV.19). Although he does not tell us why the occasion was significant, Aldred does tell us exactly where and when he copied the Cuthbert prayers: far south of his northern home, in Wessex, while sitting in the tent of Bishop Ælfsige of Chester-le-Street, before 9 a.m. on St. Lawrence’s day, a Wednesday five days after the new moon. That date is now established as August 10, 970. Google Earth can take you to 50° 58’ N x 1° 58’ W where you can see Oakley Down and its Neolithic barrow mounds just south of Woodyates on a Roman road.


2. “Besuðan wudigan gæt æt åcleo on westsæxum on laurentius messan daegi. on wodnes daegi ælfsige ðæm biscope in his getelde aldred se p fast ðas feower collectæ on fif næht aldne mona æt underne awrat. . . .” “Aldred the provost wrote these four collects at Oakley, to the south of Woodyates, among the West Saxons, on Wednesday, Lawrence’s feast day (the moon being five nights old), before tierce, for Ælfsige the bishop, in his tent” (T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 24). See chapter 2 for analysis of the colophon (QXL46).
Chapter 1

that deviates from the A354. As the crow flies, Aldred and Bishop Ælfsige were almost 300 miles from Chester-le-Street, presently a small town just six miles north of the later seat of the bishopric at Durham (map 1). Although the details of time and place for his excursion and acquisition are unusual in their specificity, even more intriguing are his scribal activities in the Durham A.IV.19 folios at his Chester-le-Street scriptorium: Aldred added a vernacular Old English gloss to the Latin texts of the original service book while he and other scribes appended supplementary materials to the end of the manuscript and on new quires, which he also partially glossed in Old English.

The resulting compilation represents one of the most intriguing collections of ritual material from Anglo-Saxon England because of its varied contents, its unusual layout, and its multiple languages. The main body of texts consists of Latin collects and chapters for the daily office, the round of prayers, chants, and readings performed by clergy living in a religious community, as well as blessings and rituals used for pastoral care, supplemented by additions copied by a group of scribes using different styles and formats. All of the prayers, rituals, hymns, and readings were intended for oral delivery in Latin, yet Aldred has added to the original collectar material, as well as most of his own additions, a gloss translation into the vernacular speech of Old English.

As a consequence of these diverse materials, Durham A.IV.19 is difficult to label, hence the variable titles assigned to this hybrid manuscript: ritual or collectar service book, workbook or archive, commonplace book, or even classbook. The early tenth-century Southumbrian portion of the manuscript inspired the name “collectar” since it is dominated by collects adapted from the mass for the daily office, yet like many service books, it includes a number of other useful ritual materials at the end. The additions in the late tenth century by the Chester-le-Street scriptorium to the last quire of the original collectar and in the appended quires continue with more daily office materials and rituals for pastoral care as well as Aldred’s harder-to-classify “educational” materials in the back of the last quire. Hence some scholars apply the more general service book label of “ritual” in light of these additions: Corrêa’s HBS edition


4. “Durham A.IV.19 adheres to no clear-cut definition of a service book and resists all efforts at categorization using terminology of a later period—it is more than a monastic book for the daily office, but less than a massbook for a priest or a bishop’s manual, yet it contains elements that might be found in such books” (Sarah Larratt Keefer, personal correspondence). Corrêa, Durham Collectar, 77–78, notes the disordered variety of materials added by all of the scribes that makes them hard to categorize, concluding that they appear to constitute a “commonplace book” for reference. She also comments that “there is a wealth of important information here concerning the liturgy at Chester-le-Street in the latter half of the tenth century.”
of the original collectar without the gloss is titled *The Durham Collectar,* while T. J. Brown’s facsimile edition of the whole manuscript is titled *The Durham Ritual.* The older critical edition of the manuscript with additions and gloss by Lindelöf and Thompson splits the difference with *Rituale ecclesiae Dunelmensis: The Durham Collectar.* To avoid the impression of dealing with a single book of one type or purpose, I use throughout this book a shortened form of the manuscript name, Durham A.IV.19, arguing in chapter 3 that the added quires originated as separate booklets and in chapters 4 and 5 for multiple uses of the texts.

This symbolic name change grants the manuscript its own voice—or voices, since it is bilingual and a collaborative compilation. The manuscript’s parts, taken collectively in relation to one another rather than as separate texts, offer a more varied view of early English religious communities than found in more complete and synthetic service books. Durham A.IV.19 provides a venue to explore Anglo-Saxon attitudes towards translation, the processes of liturgical compilation, and the varied uses of those texts within the community and in pastoral care. Most of all, it offers rare insight into the daily life and relationships within a small religious community during a period of transition and dislocation, otherwise invisible to us given the paucity of evidence.

This book focuses on the additional materials compiled by Aldred and his community that are now bound with the original southern English collectar in Durham A.IV.19. The aim is to understand the evolving nature of ritual practice and devotional life in the late tenth century, during a period of political upheaval and religious reform, but from the perspective not of one of the major centers but a smaller, seemingly more remote, yet prestigious ecclesiastical establishment, the community of St. Cuthbert at Chester-le-Street. In turn, questions about Aldred and Durham A.IV.19 raise larger issues about religious communities and their service books in Anglo-Saxon England.

- A Northumbrian religious community endeavoring to survive the sociopolitical disruptions of the viking era acquired a southern English collectar, while its bishop and provost recorded a journey to Wessex right on the eve of a massive royally sponsored church renewal. What does this transmission of ritual texts tell us about the relationships between religious centers across Anglo-Saxon England during an important period of institutional transformation, monastic reform, and liturgical renovation?
- Aldred used the vernacular Old English in relation to Latin in some unusual ways in his colophons to the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* in Durham A.IV.19, and in his glossing in both manuscripts, especially the vernacular gloss of liturgical texts that were not known to have been used for classroom teaching, and were only ever performed in Latin during church services. What does this linguistic enterprise say about the role of the vernacular in the Anglo-Saxon church?
• The way that the scribes at Chester-le-Street, and later at Durham, handled the manuscript folios—adding, marking, and collating—suggests a more flexible relationship between text, writing, and performance. How did scriptoria function in small religious communities and what can we learn about the community’s scholarly and pedagogical relationships from the manuscript evidence?
• The Durham A.IV.19 compilation was a work in progress used for a variety of purposes by the community of St. Cuthbert at Chester-le-Street; hence it shows us ongoing processes of liturgical reflection, experimentation, and scholarship in a religious community. Fragmentary as the surviving record is, how were service books used in religious communities for private devotion, study, and teaching as well as the public performance of church rituals?

Addressing these questions about the development and function of compilations like Durham A.IV.19 requires an examination of the larger historical context for Anglo-Saxon religious communities and the Northumbrian landscape in the ninth through early eleventh centuries, which this chapter aims to do. The first part examines the ninth- and tenth-century Wessex-centered trends in reform and royal centralization, highlighting Northumbria’s historic role in an emerging sense of English identity as well as its own distinctiveness apart from Wessex. The second section consequently pulls Northumbria out of the Wessex orbit and into the center, focusing on the Northumbrian environment and political developments that shaped the Chester-le-Street community and the production of Durham A.IV.19.

NORTHUMBRIA AND WESSEX: ENGLISH IDENTITY AND CHRISTIAN REFORM

The historical circumstances of Bishop Ælfsige’s Wessex journey with Aldred may ultimately prove inexplicable, but the enigmatic note in the Durham A.IV.19 colophon remains symbolic of the intriguing relationship between Northumbria and Southumbria, the latter dominated in the ninth and tenth centuries by the rise of Wessex. Wessex is commonly the center of historical attention for the development of an English polity in the ninth and tenth centuries, with Northumbria playing a supporting role from a troubled periphery, valued primarily for its Christian legacy. And yet Northumbria not only contributed to the long history of an emergent “English” identity, but had its own distinctive locus of identity, in partnership with, and sometimes in contradistinction to, that promoted by Wessex. Reevaluating that legacy from a Northumbrian-centered view offers a different perspective on the English Christian heritage Wessex rulers and reformers sought to exploit in the ninth and tenth centuries.
Map 1  British Isles in the Tenth Century (Julius Ray Paulo)
In the long view of Anglo-Saxon historiography, English identity and its Christian heritage form one complex story, in which Northumbria played an early starring role. Cultural identity and religion were inextricably intertwined in the formation of Anglo-Saxon Christianity from its very beginnings because the processes of conversion occurred in conjunction with the development of regional kingdoms in the sixth and seventh centuries. As a consequence, the ethnogenesis of the “Anglo-Saxons” and the emerging concept of Englishness cannot be separated from their Christianization. The Venerable Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* is itself both a product of these acculturation processes and an agent in the creation of a hybrid “English” identity. Insofar as Bede’s narrative became the base text for “Englishness” in later Anglo-Saxon polity, Northumbria emerges as its birthplace and as a valuable source of English heritage later to be tapped by the royal house of Wessex.

But that evolving Englishness collides and colludes with a distinctively Northumbrian identity colored by its Irish past and viking present. Northumbrian Christian identity was tied very closely to the heritage of Lindisfarne, itself a product of the Irish monastery of Iona through its foundation in 635 by Bishop Aidan on a tidal island off the western coast of Northumbria (image 1). Lindisfarne may have been somewhat isolated on its estuary, but it was in visual proximity to the royal site of Bamburgh (image 2) and hence an active part of the political landscape, both in the north and beyond. Similarly, the Wearmouth-Jarrow monastic complex—Bede’s world—was in his time and later a hub of activity as well as a retreat from the world.

What Northumbria, and by extension all of Anglo-Saxon England, inherited from the early Irish Christianization of this northern landscape were some uniquely insular patterns of acculturation. This Romano-British and Irish Christian legacy was fostered, preserved, and transmitted elsewhere by the community of St. Cuthbert. Cuthbert, trained in the Irish tradition and expelled from Ripon when it came under the Roman style of rule, went on to become the peacemaker bridging these traditions, a role he continued to fill after his death as patron saint for his community and later Anglo-Saxon kings.

---


The resulting blend of Hiberno-Saxon and Latin cultural materials is visible in distinctively insular art, as for example the *Lindisfarne Gospels*, perhaps the greatest relic of St. Cuthbert’s community next to the saint’s body itself.\(^9\) The “golden age of Northumbria” was indeed glorious; and although it inevitably came to an end, its legacy outlived the vikings, not just because of Wessex’s appropriation of that heritage but also because of Northumbrian agency in its preservation at places like Chester-le-Street.

The viking impact in the ninth and tenth centuries and Northumbrian responses thus need to be measured both in terms of invasive destruction as well as settlement acculturation.\(^10\) The destructive aspects in eastern and northern England are easily visible in the attacks on Lindisfarne in 793 and the 875 flight of the community of St. Cuthbert and their subsequent settlement at Chester-le-Street. In contrast, the rise of Wessex and its renewal programs initiated by King Alfred (871–99) and his heirs through King Edgar (959–75) often figure as the success stories for overcoming the viking impact, leaving Northumbria with its fragmented ecclesiastical structure as a struggling hinterland, in need of rescuing by Wessex rulers. But in the long view, the survival of an Anglo-Saxon Christian heritage and English sense of identity was in part due to trends visible in Northumbria in the acculturation of the Scandinavian

---

\(^9\) To view images from the *Lindisfarne Gospels*, go to the British Library website *Turning the Pages* (http://www.bl.uk/onlinegallery/ttp/ttpbooks.html), “Pinnacle of Anglo-Saxon Art.” Partisanship among modern scholars over the origins of the *Lindisfarne Gospels* in the late seventh or early eighth century is indicative of the contested history of these cultural interactions, with some scholars claiming the book was the product of an Irish monastic foundation in Ireland or on the continent while others argue for a Hiberno-Saxon site in Northumbria. See M. Brown, *Lindisfarne Gospels*, 6–8, for these competing claims and 38–53 for her defense of Lindisfarne and its Northumbrian environs as the site for its production.

newcomers in relationship to royal centralization and reform emerging from Wessex. Thus Northumbria under the watchful eyes of Cuthbert, as will be explored below, has a story of its own, separate from but also connected to the Wessex-centered narrative and sense of English identity that dominates most historical accounts. The additions made to Durham A.IV.19 in the late tenth century reflect local Northumbrian traditions and Irish connections, as well as reform trends in Wessex. Far too often, however, those Northumbrian developments in the viking era are eclipsed by and measured against a standard of Wessex progressiveness, rather than taken on their own terms.

Three aspects of these broader developments in ninth- and tenth-century Anglo-Saxon England have a bearing on our understanding of Durham A.IV.19 and the Chester-le-Street community in relation to Wessex: first, the role of the vernacular in literacy; second, the monastic reform and reorganization of religious communities; and third, the expansion of pastoral care and the emerging standards of orthodoxy.

First, the role of the vernacular in relation to reform often focuses on the role of King Alfred’s literacy program. However, Alfred’s justification in the Old English Preface to his translation of Gregory the Great’s Pastoral Care about the decline of Latin is in some ways disingenuous. Alfred aimed to revitalize and unify a fragmented society by making the Christian Latin tradition “English,” so Old English played a dynamic role in that program. But vernacular translations and written vernacular were not new in post-viking Alfredian England. Rather, Latin–vernacular bilinguality was a particular product of the Irish-rooted Northumbrian heritage, symbolized in Bede’s glorification of the rustic Caedmon’s vernacular versification of sacred history. Because the Celtic and Germanic language groups were different from Latin in syntax, vocabu-
lary, and grammar, bilingual Latin–vernacular textual traditions and translation projects emerged not necessarily as a symptom of decreased literacy but as evidence of increased literacy and demand for texts, whether translations of classic Latin authors (Boethius, Gregory the Great, Bede), glossed Gospels and Psalters, or original vernacular compositions. Aldred’s bilingual glossing and liturgical enhancements were primarily drawing on the older Irish-influenced Northumbrian traditions that predated King Alfred’s Wessex initiatives.

Second, Chester-le-Street’s location and secular status place Aldred’s vernacular liturgical project in an ambiguous relationship to the tenth-century monastic reform under King Edgar. Chester-le-Street was not one of those major religious centers targeted by the reformers Æthelwold, Oswald, and Dunstan, nor was it a major site of manuscript production for disseminating reformulated service books. The community remained primarily secular, seemingly remote from the centers of reform, and struggling to survive the viking upheavals. Later Norman historians accused the secular canons of practicing a monastic office, although Symeon of Durham also asserted a monastic core remained under a monk-bishop. It is tempting, as some scholars have done, to use the Durham A.IV.19 colophon to align Bishop Ælfsige (Bishop of Chester-le-Street 968–90) and Provost Aldred’s visit in relation to Wessex events in the early years of the 970s, whether the Council of Winchester and subsequent promulgation of the *Regularis concordia*, circa 970–73, Kenneth, King of Scots’ submission to Edgar and transfer of Lothian, escorted by Ælfsige, or Edgar’s coronation at Bath and securing of oaths from sub-kings in 973 at

---


16. For dating of the council, see Thomas Symons, *Regularis Concordia: The Monastic Agreement of the Monks and Nuns of the English Nation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1933), xxiv, where he posits a range of 965–73, settling on the median c. 970 and speculating on the possible correlation with the Easter gathering mentioned in the *Vita Osvaldi*; but he narrowed the range and advanced the date to 973 and a correlation with the Bath coronation in “Regularis Concordia: History and Derivation,” in *Tenth Century Studies: Essays in Commemoration of the Millennium of the Council of Winchester and Regularis Concordia*, ed. David Parsons (London: Phillimore, 1975), 37–59, 214–17 (at 39–43). Bonner (“St. Cuthbert at Chester-le-Street,” in *St. Cuthbert*, ed. Bonner et al., 394–95) posits a pre-council meeting in which Ælfsige and Aldred may have been consultants.

17. See De Northymbrorum Comitibus (late eleventh or early twelfth century), in *Symeonis monachi Opera omnia*, ed. Thomas Arnold, 2 vols., Rolls Series (1882–85), II, 382; Roger of Wendover, *Flores Historiarum* (Flowers of History), trans. J. A. Giles (London: H.G. Bohn, 1849), 264 under the year 973; and Thompson, *Introduction, Rituale*, xviii–xix, who points out that Kenneth did not become king until 971, but perhaps sought Edgar’s protection the year before via Ælfsige’s good offices, possibly at an otherwise unknown witan.
Chester. However, this is again to impose a Wessex oriented narrative on an event—the copying of the Cuthbert collects noted in the colophon—whose significance lies back home in Northumbria with the audience to whom the vernacular note describing the occasion is addressed.

Moreover, although the liturgical materials added to Durham A.IV.19 at Chester-le-Street partially intersect with the continental and English liturgical reform, they also stand apart from it in a distinctively Northumbrian way. The Wessex-initiated reform, drawing on continental trends, aimed in part to define just how a universalizing religion could be made local as a means for creating a cohesive Christianized identity. The *Regularis concordia* not only attempted to impose uniform monastic practices on select institutions, it also established practices that were particular to the English, especially in support of the monarchy. Aldred and his colleagues updated the liturgy with some of the reform innovations noted in the *Regularis concordia* while at the same time localizing them with the Northumbrian dialect and texts. What remains unclear is the degree to which the impulse behind the additions was a response to the external stimuli of reform in the south or an assertion of consciously local Northumbrian identity in the face of it.

Third, the next wave of reform in the late tenth- and early-eleventh centuries targeting pastoral care and the standards of orthodoxy among the clergy and laity can be misrepresented anachronistically to Chester-le-Street and Durham A.IV.19 in a negative way. For example, some of the local, especially Irish, heritage practices appear through the lens of later reforms as heterodox remnants of an older system in need of purifying. The homilies, letters, and law codes of Ælfric (c. 950–1010), abbot of Eynsham, and Wulfstan, Archbishop of York (1002–1023) envisioned purified religious communities as centers of pastoral care that should have a ripple effect throughout society. Despite the
later prominence of Ælfric and Wulfstan in the historical record, if their lives intersected with Ælfsige or Aldred, more than likely it would have been earlier in their careers when the Bishop and Provost would be their superiors in age and rank.  

Although their aims were hardly achievable or enforceable, both Ælfric and Wulfstan expected priests to be celibate like monks, perform the daily office, and be set apart from the laity by rank, behavior, and sanctity in their performance of the mass. Evidence for some, though not all, of these expectations can be found in the Durham A.IV.19 additions to the daily office, and perhaps also in Aldred’s materials concerning the ranks of clergy. Aldred and Ælfsige undoubtedly missed Wulfstan’s era as Archbishop at York, but his concerns might have resonated with them. Wulfstan endeavored to restore proper church function in Northumbrian dioceses that had been seriously disrupted or destroyed by the vikings. He, along with Ælfric, fulminated against immoral practices, false gods, and pagan magic, endeavoring to replace them with Christian practices such as the sign of the cross, relics, and prayer. Durham A.IV.19 includes elaborations on daily prayers emphasizing the power of the cross and extensive memorials to saints. But notably the items that provide exactly the kind of apotropaic Christian ritual advocated by Ælfric and Wulfstan as an antidote to pagan magic are older Irish Northumbrian compilations, such as the John poison prayer and the five prayers for clearing birds from the field. Regardless of the heterodox elements purged by later liturgists, these prayers at the time they were copied represented a liturgical tradition of great veneration that met a very present need. Rather than dismiss these older practices as liturgical dead ends, Durham A.IV.19 allows us to see the influence they might have had on ritual development.

A similar anachronism afflicts our perception of pastoral care in the tenth century when seen through the lens of eleventh-century and later reforms. Despite its viking-induced move and seeming downgrade to secular status, the community of St. Cuthbert at Chester-le-Street continued to preside as a mother church over its Northumbrian territories and churches on

23. Ælfric was born c. 950, around the time that Aldred came as a new priest to Chester-le-Street; by 970 he was at the Winchester monastic school and by c. 987 a monk and priest, sent to Cerne Abbas. His Catholic Homilies were produced after Ælfsige’s death in 990 and he only became abbot of Eynsham in 1005. Wulfstan became bishop of London in 996 and then bishop of Worcester and Archbishop of York in 1002.


an older model of monastic bishopric, which may explain why it was left relatively untouched by the tenth-century monastic reform. The word “model” has proved contentious in the scholarly debates over parochial reorganization sparked by John Blair’s work, but his basic outline helps contextualize the situation at Chester-le-Street in the tenth century.

Blair contends that minsters—whether monastic or secular is difficult to distinguish—were the main source of pastoral care and organization circa 650–850, a pattern that was disrupted and reorganized along different lines circa 850–1100 with the growth of local churches, some continuing as daughter churches to mother houses but many independent of minster centers; other scholars question the extent of actual pastoral care delivered from episcopal or monastic churches. The establishment of local churches by lay owners dissociated from these centers is particularly evident in viking-held eastern England and visible in Domesday Book. In Northumbria, for which Domesday Book evidence unfortunately is lacking, we see both the Archbishop of York and the community of St. Cuthbert through its network of estates endeavoring to re-establish minster-centered control of religious life. Durham A.IV.19, in so far as it represents an episcopal service book, may be part of that effort to assert a Northumbrian Christian identity by tying together older and newer liturgical practices and by enhancing pastoral care for the people of St. Cuthbert. The people included in that oversight were those on the Lindisfarne-owned estates, those falling within the bishoprics’ boundaries, as well as the Scandinavian settlers whose latent heathenism needed to be counteracted.

And yet the liturgy for pastoral care remains elusive, despite the increase in service book production beginning in the ninth and tenth centuries. The emphasis of most liturgical scholarship has been on the scriptoria of major reform centers in Southumbria importing or adapting continental liturgical manuals in the latest scripts, whether the newly reformed monastic communities at Canterbury and Winchester, or at Exeter with the development of liturgy for secular clergy. Essential as these manuscripts are to our understanding of late Anglo-Saxon liturgical practice, their importance tends to overshadow the liturgical efforts of provincial clergy and scribes, often denigrated for their poor Latin skills and lack of required or up-to-date service books. Based on the fragments that have survived, it would seem that in smaller or more isolated rural communities, clergy collected every scrap of new prayer that came their


way, along with older practices and forms they treasured. For example, in the margins of an otherwise serviceable copy of Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History* in Old English (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41), an anonymous scribe copied Latin and vernacular prayers, formulas, and homilies for everything from liturgical celebrations and angelic protection to recovering stolen cattle and settling bees. It is far too easy to see this marginalia, like the additions to Durham A.IV.19, as evidence of degraded liturgical practice rather than as evidence of clerical self-improvement and a desire to enhance pastoral care by infusing Christian ritual into local daily life.

Combining the fragmentary evidence with the more complete service books of the ninth through eleventh centuries gives a different picture of the long history of early English liturgy. The late Saxon church drew on a rich tradition, found most deeply in Irish and Northumbrian practices, of integrating Latin texts with local vernacular traditions. Christian rituals and prayers not only invited Anglo-Saxons into the atemporal and universal world of the Roman liturgy but also addressed agricultural concerns, the needs of families, and the stresses of life in an unstable world. These pragmatic rituals, far from being superficially Christianized remnants of paganism, were part of the evolving liturgy of the early medieval church.

Thus Aldred’s field prayers and other additions to Durham A.IV.19 may appear heterodox and out of sync with liturgical and educational developments elsewhere when we view them, somewhat anachronistically, through the lens of later reformers or in comparison to major scriptoria at centers like Winchester and Canterbury. But when we see them as products of a venerable Northumbrian bicultural legacy and as a response to the expansion of liturgical life within and around religious communities, these texts form a temporal and cultural bridge. In many ways, Durham A.IV.19 shows us a community caught in the act of negotiating between various forces and concerns, past and present, Northumbrian and English, viking and Christian, clerical and lay, monastic and secular. Rather than merely asking “what are they lacking” in tenth-century Northumbria in comparison to Wessex, this chapter and book look for “what are they contributing” to late Saxon religious life and English cultural identity from a Northumbrian-centered view.

---

CHESTER-LE-STREET IN THE TENTH CENTURY: LAND AND POWER

The Northumbrian contribution to a broader English cultural and religious identity in late Anglo-Saxon England began at home, with an effort to maintain and promote a distinctive local identity, both in terms of surviving the viking incursions and in relation to the Wessex powerhouse. The history of St. Cuthbert’s community from its Lindisfarne origins to its Chester-le-Street and Durham homes shows how a sense of historic continuity was maintained despite geographic shifts, internal changes, and external pressures. Wherever it was located in Northumbria on the estates owned in continuity from Lindisfarne, the familia bearing the body and relics of St. Cuthbert acted on his behalf and at his behest to protect their lands and serve the pastoral needs of “the people of St. Cuthbert.”

The liturgical and educational materials added in Durham A.IV.19 by Aldred and the Chester-le-Street scriptorium, including the Cuthbert collects and colophon written in Wessex, need to be placed into this material, sociopolitical, and spiritual landscape.

Much of the tenth-century physical landscape is unrecoverable, but we can reconstruct some aspects of the natural world and built environments from archaeological, architectural, historical, and artifactual evidence. The temporal circumstances were shaped by local as well as larger economic, social, and political structures, whose histories also influenced Aldred’s and his community’s perceptions of their environment. The material conditions help us understand Northumbrian devotional life and pastoral care evident in the rituals and texts found in Durham A.IV.19 examined in the following chapters.

Although the sociopolitical landscape overlays and is therefore secondary to the natural and built environments, the history of the Cuthbert community’s landholding offers an historical overview of Aldred’s world before turning to the land itself and how humans shaped that environment, particularly around Chester-le-Street.


The Sociopolitical Landscape

The sources for the cult of St. Cuthbert, the history of the Lindisfarne to Durham community, and Northumbrian religious life as a whole are rich, but by comparison poor for the late tenth-century Chester-le-Street era. The early period of Northumbria’s “Golden Age” in the seventh and eighth centuries is of course well-served by the Venerable Bede and the material record of manuscripts and stonework, extending into the early ninth with continuing written production and artifacts from the Lindisfarne and Wearmouth-Jarrow communities. But one of the effects of the viking incursions was the disruption of narrative and historical sources in the ninth and tenth centuries. As a consequence, we often rely on materials surviving in eleventh- and twelfth-century compilations from the Durham era of the community looking back from an Anglo-Norman point of view that, among other things, valorizes their restoration of true monastic life to the community. The surviving sources are also distorted by the competing political interests in tenth-century Northumbria between local, Scandinavian, and Wessex rulers as the community negotiated a secure position for itself between them.

The key narrative sources are the Historia de Sancto Cuthberto (HSC), of which the main core is thought to have originated at Chester-le-Street in the tenth century, Symeon of Durham’s twelfth-century History of the Durham Church (Symeon, Libellus) and continuation chronicles, as well as the Durham Liber vitae record of names (LVD). For insights into Northumbria from outside these Durham sources, we can make use of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (ASC) D and E northern recensions, Alcuin’s writings, Asser’s Life of Alfred, and other chronicles such as Æthelwulf’s De abbatibus and The Chronicle of Æthelweard. We also have some of the manuscripts mentioned as existing at the time in the community’s library, as well as artifacts, most notably the relics of Cuthbert himself and other treasures produced by or given to the community, such as the gifts of King Athelstan in 934.

From these textual and artifactual sources, we can extract some of the events, people, and places familiar or known to Aldred and affecting his com-

munity. However, the main text of the *Historia de Sancto Cuthberto*, presumed to rely on earlier traditions and documents of circa 900–45, is silent from there to the Durham era a half century later, precisely when Aldred was resident at Chester-le-Street, circa 950 to after 970. Symeon of Durham’s chronicle, relying on the *HSC* and other traditions retained in twelfth-century Durham, is colored by its monastic reform context and efforts to sustain a thin chain of monastic life from Lindisfarne through Chester-le-Street to Durham. For example, Symeon maintains that a small group of monks continued to escort the body of Cuthbert on its travels, that a monastic office was sung, and that the bishops were all monk-bishops. Although the value of Symeon’s chronicle for the Chester-le-Street era remains sketchy and dubious, we should not automatically discount the oral traditions he recorded about a residual monastic community at Chester-le-Street, which might find some confirmation in Durham A.IV.19.

Aldred’s scribal glosses and additions explored in subsequent chapters thus become one of the best sources for his era. We do not know why the community under Aldred and Bishop Ælfsige did not maintain historical records associated before and after with the community, such as the Durham *Liber vitae*. Whether the *Liber vitae* was held by another house or neglected, its absence at Chester-le-Street suggests a partial breakdown in the community’s continuity from the past.

In addition to problematic sources, the political environment of ninth- and tenth-century Northumbria is complicated by landholding patterns, cultural and religious affiliations, and competing notions and centers of rulership. The players included the local Northumbrian aristocracy of Bernicia and Deira, Scottish kings to the north, Mercian and Wessex rulers to the south, Danish raiders and settlers direct from Scandinavia in northeast Northumbria, and Irish Norse from Dublin in northwest Northumbria. The Lindisfarne bishopric and its *familia*, virtually identical to and identified with the cult and community of St. Cuthbert, was also a player: the bishop acted as the titular landowner in control of various estates strategically located within Northumbria, while the community itself functioned as the curators for the illustrious monastic heritage from Lindisfarne, Wearmouth, and Jarrow. The community surrounding the body of St. Cuthbert and all that it represented served as a traditional center of cult worship, a rallying point for dominance of the culture, presided over by the bishop. Unsurprisingly, alliance with a local church or bishop was to the advantage of any ruler, even, or especially, a pagan invader, while it was to the bishop’s and his church’s advantage to ally themselves with the most likely successful and peaceable ruler, or better yet, to be involved in the choice.

34. Symeon, *Libellus*, ii.6 (pp. 102–5), ii.12 (pp. 116–17), ii.20 (pp. 140–43).
is precisely what St. Cuthbert’s community did in a series of incidents featured in the HSC. These episodes show how the community negotiated with the prevailing local rulers, whether Northumbrian or Danish, and eventually aligned itself with Wessex.36

The HSC is a combination of both early and late sources organized more thematically than chronologically, so there is some contention about its accuracy.37 Moreover its overall purpose was, as is true with most ecclesiastical and monastic histories, to document the institution’s historic claims to land and privileges; so it is selectively biased toward the interests of preserving those properties and claims. Nonetheless, the stories it tells, sparse as they are for the tenth century, are very revealing of the sociopolitical dynamics of which Aldred would have been aware. In particular, the HSC’s record of Cuthbert’s posthumous miracles focus on royal incidents, either kings or chiefs who met a bad end for alienating the community’s lands or those given visionary support by Cuthbert because they honored him and his community’s interests.38

The thread connecting all these stories is the material and spiritual presence of Cuthbert, his body as it journeyed with the migrating community and his spirit directing temporal affairs.39 According to the HSC, they left Lindisfarne in 875 on a seven-year odyssey, attempting first to take the body to Ireland, evidence for the historic and contemporary link the community maintained with Irish monastic institutions. Then, thwarted by Cuthbert himself out of concern for his people in Northumbria, the entourage visited other religious communities in their network at Whithorn and Crayke before settling at the Chester-le-Street estate in 883 for what turned out to be a century before the final, miraculously directed, move to Durham in 995 (map 2).40

The contrast the HSC makes between good and bad rulers, and the ways in which the community of St. Cuthbert negotiated a secure place for itself in this rapidly changing political environment, are illustrated in the stories of two Danes, Halfdan and Guthred. The Danish invader Halfdan arrived in

38. Johnson South, Historia, 77, notes seven such episodes.
40. In an earlier phase, Bishop Ecgred of Lindisfarne (830–43) had moved Cuthbert and the historical wooden church of St. Aidan to the nearby site of Norham. Cuthbert’s body was either moved from there or returned to Lindisfarne before the new journey.
Northumbria circa 874–876; his destruction of monasteries presumably precipitated the abandonment of Lindisfarne and the so-called seven years wandering of the community before their 883 settlement at Chester-le-Street. Halfdan’s odiferous end, abandoned by his followers because of his madness and body odor, is attributed to God and St. Cuthbert’s avenging hand; but other evidence suggests that few of his followers wanted to accompany him on his next adventure in Ireland, preferring instead to settle down to farming the lands he had distributed to them in Northumbria. Indeed, it appears that these Scandinavian settlers took over existing estates as overlords, leased land from the community, or cultivated it themselves as peasant farmers, in some cases filling in unencumbered lands. According to the HSC (14) and the ASC 876–78, the vikings in the Northumbrian area settled into farming, while the rulers of Wessex and Mercia, notably Alfred the Great and his daughter Æthelflæd, Lady of the Mercians, continued to struggle to hold the line against their viking threats.42

The Northumbrian land settlement may be due in no small part to the active agency of the community of St. Cuthbert, as recounted in the story of Guthred, eventual Danish successor to Halfdan. According to the account in the HSC, repeated with varying details in later versions, Cuthbert appeared in a vision to Eadred, abbot of Carlisle, a monastery associated with the Lindisfarne community (and possibly a stopping place in their itinerary of wandering at the time of their aborted attempt to flee to Ireland). In Abbot Eadred’s vision, Cuthbert instructs him to go over to the Danish-controlled area; buy from a particular widow a slave named Guthred, son of Hardacnut; and make him king, conditioned on his granting the land between the Tyne and the Wear with rights of sanctuary to the community of St. Cuthbert (i.e. the Lindisfarne episcopal see). This Guthred may be the same Danish Christian king who died in 895 and was buried in York church, but little evidence survives to substantiate his existence or document the various other Scandinavian rulers who came and went in the tenth century. With Guthred, the community became the agent for the next Danish ruler, formalized in a ritual on a hill swearing oaths on the body of St. Cuthbert. The visionary plan worked amazingly well as a peacemaking device, demonstrating how much it was in the interests of both communities, the Danish and the Christian, to settle terms with one another. The HSC implies that the successful alliance was linked to the relocation

41. HSC 12; Johnson South, Historia, 86–87; see also Downham, Viking Kings, 68–78, on Halfdan and Guthred.
42. King Alfred’s settlement with Guthrum drew the line at Watling Street; Æthelflæd, even after the death of her husband Æthelred, held the northeast border of Mercia against Hiberno-Norse incursions (Wainwright, Scandinavian England, 305–24).
44. For an analogous situation with Alfred and Guthrum, see Richard Abels, “King Alfred’s Peace-
of Cuthbert and his community to Chester-le-Street, but the separate events conflated in this account were probably far more complex. What is clear is the degree to which landholding was the key to security and settlement for both communities.

The Guthred agreement is reinforced thematically, if somewhat unchronologically in the HSC, by a King Alfred story that adds the support of Wessex to the community’s claims. In another extraordinary vision, St. Cuthbert appeared as the divine agent of King Alfred’s miraculous victory over the vikings at Athelney. In this story, similar in type to one in the Life of St. Neot, Alfred and his wife, while living on limited means in their retreat from the vikings, kindly feed a hungry stranger, who, as it turns out in a subsequent vision, is actually Cuthbert. Cuthbert then tells Alfred how he will be victorious over the vikings. The HSC compares Cuthbert and Alfred to the Biblical exemplar of Samuel’s choice of King David and Bede’s story of St. Peter’s visionary appearance to King Edwin of Northumbria. And, of course, Alfred (re)grants the lands of St. Cuthbert already given by Guthred. As David Hall argues, the Guthred arrangement included rights of sanctuary (asylum and intercession) that matched Alfred’s laws—supporting the Wessex connection—and also assured the church’s status as a head-minster.45 The zones or areas may even have marked boundaries on the property delineating the physical space over which the church had spiritual jurisdiction. Such boundary marking has ritual significance as well for liturgical processions around the religious compound or the fields. Thus these grants of land not only ensured economic security but also status, control, and a measure of autonomy for the community as spiritual guardians.

The violation and alienation of land versus the cultivation and restoration of land was a continuing theme in the HSC’s record of the tenth century, with the contrasting stories of King Rægnald, a Hiberno-Norse invader of Northumbria, and the Wessex King Athelstan, a giver of gifts and patron of St. Cuthbert. Rægnald, ravaging Northumbria in several battles and capturing York, took land from the community and gave it to evil followers.46 Like Halfdan, Rægnald died during the pursuit of his rapacious interests, while his unbelieving follower Onlafbald, “son of a devil” who received some of the land, was struck down while arrogantly challenging St. Cuthbert on his own territory in the church. Cuthbert answered the pleas of his people for vengeance, transfixing Onlafbald with an iron bar on the threshold of the church, and the land was

restored. By contrast, the community leased the same land and other parcels to lay lords willing to cultivate it peacefully, including one Eadred son of Ricisige who, having violated the peace by killing a Prince Earwulf and taking his wife, fled into the asylum offered within the Cuthbertine bounds of immunity. Such was the power of Cuthbert to protect his lands and people, according to the HSC.

Again in the tenth century, as in the ninth with Alfred, the community’s claims were reinforced by royal Wessex patronage, under Athelstan and his successor Edmund, while the line of Scandinavian rulers in Northumbria remains murky. Both Wessex kings made campaigns into the north solidifying their control of Northumbria and alliances with the Scots. Along the way, both stopped at Chester-le-Street to patronize a saint who was, in turn, becoming one of their patrons, Athelstan in 934 and Edmund in 945. Athelstan’s gifts and grants of land are more thoroughly substantiated in the HSC with a copy of the charter. The list of gifts is a window into the material life of the church in this period, its furnishings, ornamentation, and treasures, including books, treated below. More important, for the HSC, were the new grants of land extending the community’s control, land grants also affirmed by Edmund and reinforced by King Eadred’s visit and gifts.47

However, in the second half of the tenth century, Aldred’s period, the HSC is silent. Although the community’s economic and political security seemed stable based on royal patronage, control of land, and rights of sanctuary, the local political tensions may have persisted amidst continuing collaboration with local rulers. Archbishop Wulfstan of York (931–56) supported, apparently willingly, both Olaf Sihtricson and Eric Bloodaxe as rulers over Northumbria. He was incarcerated for a time by King Eadred (946–55), probably for this collaboration, and his irregular charter attestations suggest he was in and out of favor. The archbishop’s actions may be seen as part of a regional resistance among the Northumbrian elite to Wessex rather than just capitulation out of fear of the vikings.48

Wessex reasserted control of Northumbria in 954 with the overthrow of Eric Bloodaxe as king of York, after which no new waves of vikings occurred until 980. Nonetheless, Wessex was far away and its kingship divided for a time between King Eadwig (955–59) and his brother Edgar, who was initially King of the Mercians (957–59) controlling the north and supported by Northumbrians, before he succeeded Eadwig and ruled as king of the English (959–75).49

47. The latter recorded by Symeon, Libellus, ii.20 (pp. 140–43).
49. Bonner, “St. Cuthbert at Chester-le-Street,” in St. Cuthbert, ed. Bonner et al., 394–95. Further evidence for northern alignment with Wessex in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries is the episcopal plurality whereby the Archbishop of York also held the see of Worcester, a stabilizing factor for York during
Aldred, a native Northumbrian who arrived in the Chester-le-Street community presumably sometime in the 950s, must surely have been aware of the recent history of unrest, the insecurity of the land, and the episcopal involvement in brokering political relationships. Indeed, as noted earlier, Bishop Ælfsige is credited in later sources with accompanying Kenneth, King of the Scots, on his submission to King Edgar, 973. This is unlikely to be the same journey as that recorded in the Durham A.IV.19 colophon, but adds to the picture of a mobile and politically connected Northumbrian bishop and provost. Whether Aldred lived long enough to experience the upheavals and invasions under King Æthelred (978–1016) is unknown, although Bishop Ælfsige lived through the early, and less tumultuous, part of his reign. But for a time, at least, during the earlier part of Ælfsige’s episcopate, he, and Provost Aldred with him on at least one occasion, was secure enough to travel and be involved as a negotiator in north–south political affairs.

The other aspect that is abundantly clear in the HSC is the emphasis on the cultivation of land as a symbol of peace and stability for community life. Land and power are intertwined in medieval Europe but not in the sense of the feudalism model from which medievalists have been trying to extricate themselves. Rather, the pattern emerging in tenth-century England is one of, as Susan Reynolds titles it, “kingdoms and communities.” Kingdom-building on the scale of Wessex emerged from rulers harnessing the energy of existing networks of communities, such as the node found at Chester-le-Street powered by the legacy and territories of Lindisfarne under the patronage of St. Cuthbert. In this context of land and heritage, the HSC’s primary concern was to establish the community’s rights over land historically granted to them by those with authority to do so, as they claimed. But the physical land itself was crucial to their survival, economically, politically, and legally and therefore claimed as their inherited right. The accent placed on cultivation in several of the HSC entries, whether as evidence of vikings settling peacefully or Northumbrians returning to a productive life, shows how arable land formed the base of the community’s economy, while negotiations over boundaries, rights, and leases show the political dynamics involved in sustaining the community’s central place in Northumbria. David Rollason makes the point that Cuthbert served

the viking disruptions. Both the reformers Oswald (972–92) and Wulfstan the Homilist (from 1002–16) combined the sees. The plurality was renounced under the reign of Cnut in 1016 when it was no longer necessary for political or cultural reasons. See Frank Barlow, The English Church, 1000–1066, 2nd ed. (London: Longman, 1979), 226–29 and Blair, Church in Anglo-Saxon Society, 313.


as lord of the land and lord of men, citing the phrase “populus sancti” (Old English haliwerfolc) to describe those who wept when the community tried to take Cuthbert to Ireland, only to be thwarted by the saint: these were the people of the land who saw the dead saint as their lord and protector of the life of the land.\textsuperscript{52} One of the provost’s duties that Aldred must have inherited was ensuring the productivity of estate lands and protecting their boundaries, not just through political means but also through divine intervention in liturgical rituals. Under the circumstances, Aldred might very well have been concerned to have on hand rituals for exorcism, judicial ordeals, and protection of crops from damage, as are all found in Durham A.IV.19.

**THE NATURAL WORLD AND THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT**

The Northumbrian landscape exhibits diversity both regionally and across time, making it hard to map what was experienced and perceived in the tenth century. Chester-le-Street lies amidst gently rolling hills and cultivated farmlands, just north of the escarpment on which Durham was built (image 3). But north of Hadrian’s Wall and approaching Lindisfarne, the broader landscape throws elevations into sharp relief and exposes the hugeness of the horizon: the world seems larger and the sky higher, like a massive bowl over an enormous plate with far distant rims. That impression may very well have been shared by our medieval predecessors and have played a role in their religious thinking and cultural practice: on this broad expanse of creation, it is hard not to contemplate the sheer size of the universe and the nature of the God who created it, as is evident in Bede’s opening description of the richness of Britain.\textsuperscript{53} On the one hand, Christians in the North saw themselves on the periphery of the religious world centered in Jerusalem, connected by the whale-roads of the ocean to other Christian sites. And yet at the same time they found their isolation a fortuitous point of connection to the divine, feeding an Irish and monastic impulse for ascetic pilgrimage and retreat, of which the tidal island of Lindisfarne is a perfect image. Even from that remote isolation, St. Cuthbert felt the need to retreat further to his own offshore island where he sometimes consorted with God’s creatures (image 4).

However, the spectacular landscape of the North was not left uninhabited or unmarked by human history. Secular and religious sites arise sparsely and sometimes dramatically from this giant landscape: the ancient Yeavering Bell hillfort, the Bernician seat at Bamburgh on a coastal outcrop, and the Lindis-
farnes complex on its tidal island (images 1 and 2). Moreover, the terrain is
dotted with stone artifacts, some memorializing the cross—evidence of God
Incarnate in the world—and some inscribed with local events and persons.
Other markers, such as wooden structures, are more ephemeral, their traces
buried under later habitations or discovered in archaeological digs.

On a more prosaic level, a scientific description offers a sense of the natural
world with which the human inhabitants interacted over many centuries. Nor-
thumbria is close to the upper limit of the temperate zone and its mountainous
terrain with woodlands leaves less land for farming than elsewhere in England
(map 2). Upland areas were more likely to be uninhabited, sparsely settled, or
used as wood or pasture resources. The best arable land was between 100–200
meters in elevation and had already been exploited for centuries by the Anglo-
Saxons and their predecessors back into the Iron Age. Archaeological evidence
now suggests that Anglo-Saxon plant agriculture and animal husbandry in
Northumbria extended well beyond this fertile zone with the development of
more marginal lands, such as those leased to Scandinavian settlers. Although
obviously colder than southern England, the winters were milder at the begin-
ning of the medieval warming period (c. 900–1300). Combined with the Gulf
stream air, the ground even with frost on the surface might have allowed winter
as well as spring ploughing for two harvests. Crops grown in northern England
in the early Middle Ages included bread wheat, barley, oats, rye and flax, as well
as peas and beans, probably alternating with each other and rotated with fallow
and grazing to replenish soil and reduce pests. Fruit and nuts from woodland
edges supplemented the diet, along with meat from domestic animals on graz-
ing land and from hunting, for which Durham A.IV.19 has appropriate bless-
ings. Unlike the Celtic dispersed settlement patterns with scattered farmsteads,
however, the Anglo-Saxons began developing nucleated settlements amid open
fields within this landscape. In such nucleated villages with a cluster of homes,
the community shared grazing pasturage and ox-driven plough teams.

54. See Clare A. Lees and Gillian R. Overing, “Anglo-Saxon Horizons: Places of the Mind in the Nor-
thumbrian Landscape,” in A Place to Believe In: Locating Medieval Landscapes, ed. Clare A. Lees and Gillian
was built on a bell-shaped hill on the edge of the Cheviots, southwest of Lindisfarne. Vikings destroyed the
Bamburgh fort in 993.

Della Hooke, The Landscape of Anglo-Saxon England (London: Leicester University Press, 1998); Peter Fowler,
Farming in the First Millennium a.D.: British Agriculture between Julius Caesar and William the Conqueror
(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 213, 247, 276; Higham, Kingdom of Northumbria, 2–9;
Hadley, Northern Danelaw, 94–215. For specific sites, see Dominic Powlesland on West Heslerton, 55–65 and
Susan Mills on Bede’s World, 66–72 in Northumbria’s Golden Age, ed. Hawkes; and M. W. Beresford and

56. The medieval warming period or European Climatic Optimum is assigned to either c. 900–1200 or
c. 1000–1300 (see Hudson, Viking Pirates, 7).

57. See Julian Richards, “Anglo-Saxon Settlements of the Golden Age,” in Northumbria’s Golden Age,
ed. Hawkes., 52, in reference to Wharram Percy; Margaret L. Faull, “Late Anglo-Saxon Settlement Patterns
The villas owned by the community of St. Cuthbert as described in the HSC were large resource areas with possibly several nucleated villages. Before the Viking invasions, the Lindisfarne community had already acquired a number of scattered estates in Northumbria that coalesced into large blocks of territory under their control between the Tyne and the Wear. These lands were in prime farm areas, fully cultivated and stocked, inhabited by farm laborers and perhaps leased out to individuals. Some had small monasteries or churches. In the Viking era, as hinted in the HSC, Scandinavian settlers fitted themselves into this existing landscape: some tried to take over existing estates as overlords, peacefully or not, or as leases from the community of St. Cuthbert.

Among these estates, Chester-le-Street was not an unlikely choice for the eventual settlement of the St. Cuthbert community in the political geography of the time as well as their traditions. The site had a particular connection to their patron saint in the Life of St. Cuthbert, a food miracle. Although Bede’s account does not name the place, he gives more detail to the story than the anonymous account of the incident at “Kuncacester,” variously spelled. According to Bede, the youthful Cuthbert was traveling through a village where he was offered a meal by a God-fearing woman, but he refused to eat on a Friday before the ninth hour. Even though warned that he would not find another place of human habitation before nightfall on his journey, he persisted, ultimately stopping for the night at some shepherds’ summer huts, abandoned in the winter. Inside this uninhabited shelter, his horse was the discoverer of miraculous sustenance. When the animal started nibbling on the thatch, down fell a bundle wrapped in cloth containing a half warm loaf of bread and some meat. After giving thanks, Cuthbert shared the bounty with his horse. Bede identifies the location as a “solitary place” (solitudine), mirroring saintly ascetic behavior for encounters with God’s miraculous provision (Elijah is the example given). Unlike Bede, the anonymous author does not include this context of fasting for the miracle, emphasizing rather angelic assistance, but does give a
more specific geographic description. Cuthbert was traveling north (probably on the Roman road), crossed the Wear (image 5) at a place called Kuncacester and stopped there because of the weather.\textsuperscript{62} He holed up with his horse in these seasonal huts, currently deserted, because there were no surrounding humans who could help supply him.

It would appear from this description that Chester-le-Street in Cuthbert’s time was no more than a spring–summer pasturage for shepherds, without a permanent settlement, although remains of the Roman fort of Concangis presumably would have been extant. County Durham was probably only sparsely inhabited in the sixth and seventh centuries, but was developed in the eighth and later centuries with Anglo-Saxon agriculture and estates, many of them coming into the purview of the Lindisfarne see in the ninth century, which also established monastic cells throughout the region.\textsuperscript{63} We know from the \textit{HSC} that Chester-le-Street was one of a number of acquisitions the Lindisfarne see retained or recovered in the tenth century in the lease by Guthred.

Why this site for the bishop’s see after the migration from Lindisfarne in 883? Chester-le-Street controlled a large surrounding territory and was centrally located in relation to the community’s other estates, allowing the bishopric to monitor their territory north of the river Tees and retain economic and political control of their properties and income during tumultuous times. Situated on a major road, it probably served as part of a network of royal estate centers and monastic sites used as staging posts for the bishop and his \textit{familia} when they traveled; as Eric Cambridge suggests, Chester-le-Street may best be conceived as a “bishop’s household.”\textsuperscript{64} Politically, Chester-le-Street lay in a buffer zone between the two former Northumbrian kingdoms of Bernicia and Deira, while the bishopric was also balancing somewhat precariously between the shifting control of Scandinavian rulers and the rising power of Wessex in Northumbria.\textsuperscript{65} Indeed, some scholars argue that the community chose Chester-le-Street and a Danish alliance over the Northumbrian elite ruling at Bamburgh over

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{62} “Pergenti namque eo ab austro ad flumen quod Uuir nominatur, in eo loco ubi Kuncaster dicitur, et transuadato eo ad habitacula uernalia et aestualia, propter imbrem et tempestatem reuersus est.” “Coming from the south to a river which is called the Wear, on reaching a place called Chester-le-Street, he crossed it and turned aside on account of the rain and tempest to some dwellings used only in spring and summer.” Colgrave, \textit{Two Lives}, 70–71.
\item \textsuperscript{64} Eric Cambridge, “Why Settle at Chester-le-Street?” in Bonner et al., \textit{St Cuthbert}, 367–86, at 385.
\item \textsuperscript{65} Rollason, “Cuthbert Saint and Patron,” 18–19, describes the boundaries of Bernicia between Tees and Forth and Deira between Tees and Humber; by Cuthbert’s time, Bernician kings had become kings of Northumbria, but tensions may have remained with the cult of Cuthbert serving as a unifying force. See also Anne Lawrence-Mathers, \textit{Manuscripts in Northumbria in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries} (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), 3–5 and 12–26.
\end{itemize}
Lindisfarne. In the tenth-century geopolitics of Northumbria, Chester-le-Street was in the center, not on the periphery, of affairs and its bishop was not only situated at a major intersection but on the road himself quite a bit.

A Chester-le-Street church still stands in the same location, but no remains of the wooden church of Aldred’s day are extant because of a series of stone churches built over the same site (image 6; fig. 1). Why the community, accustomed presumably to a stone-built church at Lindisfarne, remained in a wooden church for a hundred years has contributed to several speculations. On the pragmatic side, little stone building was taking place in the tenth century, although since the church is sited within the bounds of the Roman fort, there


67. The present church includes a medieval anchorhold that currently displays sculptural remains from as early as the tenth century. See http://www.maryandcuthbert.org.uk/content.php?page_id=65 for a plan of the church showing the phases of building.
Figure 1  Chester-le-Street Church (Julius Ray Paulo)

Image 6  Chester-le-Street and church, author photo
must surely have been hewn stone available for recycling by the community. They may have thought their stay at Chester-le-Street would be shorter than it turned out to be, but we should be wary of assuming that they perceived a wooden structure as flimsy or temporary. Indeed, the community had a tradition of wooden churches treated as relics (the Aidan church moved to Norham), perhaps related to Irish patterns of wooden church building. There may also be some echo of the thatched shelter in which Cuthbert took refuge, although it is impossible to know if those roadside shepherd’s huts were in the vicinity of the Roman fort and later church site. Nonetheless, this wooden church did not stand alone but was part of an estate that must have included dormitory or other housing facilities for the clergy and their families, if they had them, and lay servants, outbuildings for kitchen and crafts, as well as one or more villages of homes where the agricultural laborers lived and worked the fields.

Although the wooden remains of such estates have not stood the test of time, stone artifacts and fragments survived. Roman ruins, older stone crosses, boundary markers, and other monuments remained from earlier ages. Symeon of Durham, in a later account, reports that the community carried a stone cross associated with Bishop Æthelwold with them when they left Lindisfarne; in their migration through their western coastal estates, they may very well have encountered stone cross monuments like the Ruthwell cross (image 7) and been influenced by their style of liturgical commemoration. Stronger evidence suggests that contemporary stone cross remains found at Chester-le-Street do not match the style of Lindisfarne craftsmen but reflect the work of local carvers and Scandinavian influences (image 8).

The ninth-century move of the Lindisfarne community to Chester-le-Street was strategic in response to the viking threat, not a headlong flight. The

---

68. The archaeological report by M. C. Bishop from the 1990–91 excavations (http://www.armatura.connectfree.co.uk/concangis/acrep/reportf.htm) found no evidence for or against reuse during the Cuthbertine community’s residence there, probably due to later destruction, but speculates that given the church’s position and orientation, Cuthbert’s shrine reused the fort’s principia or main building (http://www.armatura.connectfree.co.uk/concangis/f.htm and http://www.armatura.connectfree.co.uk/concangis/photos/church.htm).


70. Symeon of Durham, Libellus, i.12 (p. 61); Rollason, “Wanderings,” 47; Ó Carragáin, Ritual and the Rood, 146 on the Solway Firth area, site of the Ruthwell cross, and its potential links to lands held and visited by the Cuthbert community during their migration.


72. See Higham, Kingdom of Northumbria, 151, 183; Rollason, Northumbria 500–1100, 271–72, and Cuthbert, Saint and Patron, 18, 47, 50; Cambridge, “Why,” 379–86, and Bonner, “St. Cuthbert at Chester-
Image 7  Ruthwell Cross, photograph by Lairich Rig, Creative Commons license

Image 8  Eadmund monument, Chester-le-Street Anker House, author photo
community brought artifacts with them from Lindisfarne, including the wooden coffin of Cuthbert (fig. 2) containing a Gospel book, the bodies and relics of other saints, a portable altar of wood overlayed with silver, the *Lindisfarne Gospels*, and other manuscripts and treasures used for services in the church. These relics served as symbols of their identity as a community and continuity with the past, while their transferal signaled the movement of the Lindisfarne see. Such familiar artifacts would recall their Lindisfarne home, and even the second or third generation, such as Aldred, must have recognized the stylistic differences between their own day and the golden age of Lindisfarne. But Chester-le-Street also received new treasures in the form of royal gifts that added to the community while building continuity with the past through Cuthbert. The most famous of these gifts were those from King Athelstan’s visit in 934, securing Wessex patronage for the cult of St. Cuthbert and giving the community a stronger bond to the monarchy. The charter list of gifts copied into the *HSC* specifies the following, some of which have been identified with surviving artifacts:

> In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. I, King Æthelstan, give to St Cuthbert this gospel-book, two chasubles, and one alb, and one stole with maniple, and one belt, and three altar-coverings, and one silver chalice, and two patens, one finished with gold, the other of Greek workmanship, and one silver thurible, and one cross skilfully finished with gold and ivory, and one royal headdress woven with gold, and two tablets crafted of silver and gold, and two silver candelabra finished with gold, and one missal, and two gospel-books ornamented with gold and silver, and one of St Cuthbert written in verse and in prose, and seven palls, and three curtains, and three tapestries, and two silver cups with covers, and four large bells, and three horns crafted of gold and silver, and two banners, and one lance, and two golden armlets, and my beloved vill of Bishop Wearmouth with its dependencies. . . .

The liturgical furnishings and ornamentation rivaling that of the treasures brought from Lindisfarne suggest that the wooden church at Chester-le-Street, whatever its appearance on the exterior, was glorious on the interior, a ritual space glittering with gold and silver as well as tapestries and fabrics, not to mention the illuminated Gospel books.

The first Gospel book mentioned is probably London, British Library, Cotton Otho B.ix since it contained a donor portrait of King Æthelstan giving the book to Cuthbert and Old English inscriptions, dated to the late tenth century.

---

73. A move that coincides with the mysterious end of the Hexham diocese over the area of Chester-le-Street (Rollason, *Northumbria 500–1100*, 247).
Figure 2 Cuthbert Coffin, apostles and archangels. Courtesy of C. V. Horie; J. M. Cronyn and C. V. Horie, St Cuthbert's Coffin: The History, Technology & Conservation (Durham: Dean and Chapter, Durham Cathedral, 1985)
century, describing the donation.\textsuperscript{75} The lives of St. Cuthbert in prose and verse undoubtedly refer to the biographies by Bede and an anonymous hagiographer found in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 183, along with Cuthbert liturgy and an intact donation portrait.\textsuperscript{76} CCCC 183 has additions by both Chester-le-Street Scribe C and Durham Scribe M3, demonstrating its presence in the community at both locations.\textsuperscript{77} London, British Library, Royal 7.D.XXIV might have originally been compiled as a gift to Chester-le-Street but CCCC 183 was given instead.\textsuperscript{78} Royal 7.D.XXIV contains, in addition to his \textit{De virginitate}, a letter of Aldhelm to a Bishop Eadfrith, possibly the \textit{Lindisfarne Gospels} creator, praising English scholarship vis-a-vis the Irish while also condemning heathenism. If the manuscript was aimed initially at Chester-le-Street, the letter reinforces the perception of the community as dealing with both an Irish heritage and a Scandinavian “pagan” presence.

Other books and materials may have come to Chester-le-Street from the nearby twin monasteries of Wearmouth and Jarrow with its Bedan legacy.\textsuperscript{79} The eighth-century \textit{Durham Gospels} of probable Lindisfarne origins includes a poem honoring King Athelstan added by a late tenth- or early eleventh-century hand presumably at Chester-le-Street.\textsuperscript{80} These royal gifts, borrowed books, and artifacts brought from Lindisfarne suggest something of the library and visual landscape influencing Aldred and his community.

Aldred and the Durham A.IV.19 additions fit into this tenth-century picture of local and kingdom-wide forces. The fact of a literate Northumbrian provost traveling in Wessex with his bishop was not unusual or surprising. Rather, it indicates the growing sense of an English church united above and below the Humber through common liturgical concerns evident in the additions Aldred and the other scribes made in Durham A.IV.19. Aldred in particular focuses

\textsuperscript{75} This information is derived from eighteenth-century transcriptions since the manuscript was later severely damaged in the Cotton fire. Johnson South, Historia, 109; Keynes, “King Athelstan’s Books,” 175–78.


\textsuperscript{77} T. J. Brown, \textit{Durham Ritual}, 32, 56; see chapter 3 and chapter 5 for additions connected to CCCC 183.

\textsuperscript{78} Gretsch, \textit{Intellectual Foundations}, 364.


on integration of their diverse heritages in his Old English gloss to the community’s treasured *Lindisfarne Gospels* and in the multilingual vocabularies he explores in Durham A.IV.19. Although Aldred’s linguistic experiments and influence might not reach the level of Alcuin, Aldhelm, or Notker, arguably this man was thoughtfully contemplating the meaning of the Latin rituals and prayers in his native language in line with the Carolingian inspired reform.81 Later liturgists’ fears notwithstanding, Aldred’s seemingly heterodox prayers actually sustained an older, northern liturgical tradition of great veneration. What we find in the Durham A.IV.19 manuscript may not fit neatly into the Wessex-generated pattern of liturgical reform, but this study seeks to discover how Durham A.IV.19 functioned as a collection that was of use for enhancing devotional life and pastoral care in its community, despite modern reservations about its scholarly quality or liturgical centrality.

The following chapters explore first Aldred and what he reveals about himself in the context of his linguistic projects (chapter 2), then the community of scribes visible around him in the additions to Durham A.IV.19 (chapter 3). Subsequent chapters unravel the liturgical materials added by the Chester-le-Street scribes (chapter 4) and the scholarly and pedagogical apparatus visible in Aldred’s gloss and encyclopedic additions (chapter 5). Although the materials added at Chester-le-Street to Durham A.IV.19 need further linguistic and source analysis than is presently available, this book endeavors to draw some general conclusions (chapter 6) about the character of community life at Chester-le-Street in the second half of the tenth century as revealed in the varied parts of this fragmentary, frustrating, but ultimately fascinating manuscript.

We know about Aldred because of what he told us about himself, either directly or indirectly from his scribal activities. The fact that we know his name and something of his position is in itself unusual, since so many of the clergy of his rank and scribes in general remained anonymous, particularly in ninth- and tenth-century Northumbria. Indeed, his fellow scribes in Durham A.IV.19 are labeled alphabetically, Scribes B, C, D, E, and F, while we guess at their personal traits exclusively based on their handwriting without being able to identify them with any clerical names or ranks as found in documentary sources. None of the histories or records of the Durham cult of Cuthbert otherwise make note of Aldred, although the tenth-century gaps in these records may account for his absence. As a consequence, the few details about his family and career revealed in the colophons and memoranda he added to his handiwork in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and Durham A.IV.19 stand out. His biography and personality are extrapolated from these brief statements and from the character of his scribal and glossing work, correlated with what we can glean from the general history of Northumbria and from the Chester-le-Street context detailed in the previous chapter.

That we know him almost exclusively through self-disclosure gives the impression that Aldred was a bit of a self-promoter. Part of the

---


problem in assessing his position and role, however, is the paucity of direct evidence for tenth-century Chester-le-Street which may be distorting our understanding of Aldred. In comparison to the textual, architectural, and sculptural survivals from Lindisfarne earlier or Durham later, the Chester-le-Street record is thin, as noted in the previous chapter. The gaps in the Durham Liber vitae record of monks, abbots, and bishops, the making do with a timber church, and the changes in style and quantity of sculpture, all contribute to the perception that Chester-le-Street was not a major center of religious production for the community, although the strategically located estate provided a stable home for over a century and thus ensured continuity of Cuthbert’s legacy and traditions.

Consequently, Aldred’s work as a scribe and glossator, and the unusual nature of his work, is anomalous. Was he a big fish in a small pond, an ambitious leader who found himself working under marginal circumstances to maintain an isolated community? Or was he a small fish in a big pond, a relatively minor church leader of a prestigious cult fallen on hard times, while great changes were afoot elsewhere? Perhaps both are true in conveying Aldred’s position within Northumbria and in relation to Wessex and ecclesiastical reform. In any case, his voice speaking from the manuscripts is distinctive and conspicuous amidst the otherwise silent or incomplete surviving records.3

Aldred’s manuscript glosses, additions, and personal memoranda thus stand out as major sources for the community of St. Cuthbert in the second half of the tenth century. It is significant first of all that his surviving work was not in original or new productions but on or in existing resources which he was modifying, indicating the role of the Chester-le-Street scriptorium in maintaining continuity in the community’s history and its legacy from Lindisfarne forward to its preservation at Durham. Second, it is wise to keep in mind that we identify Aldred’s work solely on paleographic grounds based on analysis of his handwriting in both Old English and Latin and that we have no way of knowing what other, non-scribal work he was engaged in or might be attributed to him since we have no third party sources on him.4

Nonetheless, the extent of Aldred’s scribal activity is unusual in comparison to similar work. Vernacular glossing was a known habit, but glossing the entirety of a treasured illuminated manuscript, the Lindisfarne Gospels, was an


3. The only previous treatments of Aldred’s life of any length have been in the context of his glosses or the Lindisfarne Gospels colophon. See in particular, Sara Maria Pons Sanz, Analysis of the Scandinavian Loanwords in the Aldredian Gloses to the Lindisfarne Gospels, Studies in English Language and Linguistics Monographs 9 (Valencia: Lengua Inglesa, Universitat de Valencia, 2000). Aldred/Ealdred is a common name in Anglo-Saxon England and in the Northumbrian records of the community of St. Cuthbert; see LVD II: 109–110, entry A.3.280 and PASE, Ealdred 1.

4. His hand also appears in Latin glosses in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 819, Bede’s commentary on Proverbs, discussed further in chapter 3 (image 21).
ambitious project even compared to other, often Irish, glossed Gospel manuscripts. Even more extraordinary is glossing the Latin prayers in a service book, the original collector and its additions in Durham A.IV.19, when those prayers ostensibly should have been performed in Latin by a priest able to do so, not to mention the peculiar nature of some of the added texts. Further, the colophons and memoranda Aldred added to both of these manuscripts are problematic for scholars who rely on them as evidence for the time and place of historical events, because it is unclear the degree to which these notations reflect the personal circumstances of the author as compared to the sources he may (or may not) have been using. For our purposes in examining the life of Aldred, the opposite is true: because of their personal nature, the colophons are an excellent place to start in order to find out what Aldred reveals about himself.

The facts and tidbits we can glean from his colophons show that Aldred was a priest and then a provost of the community of St. Cuthbert during the latter part of its residence at Chester-le-Street (883–995). We know his father’s name (Alfred) and that he thought his mother was a good woman who produced an illustrious son. His position in the community seems linked to his scribal abilities because he presented his work in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* as part of the payment for joining. He was an aspiring poet and a budding philologist. Although he displayed the appropriate authorial humility, he placed himself as fourth in a sacred quartet of makers of the *Lindisfarne Gospels*. As provost, he accompanied his bishop on at least one of his journeys to Wessex. Back home at Chester-le-Street, he apparently oversaw a scriptorium and possibly a school teaching and training clergy. His Latin was good, but not error-free, certainly superior to the scribes whom he corrects. He wrote a capable, if old-fashioned, scribal hand, including both a “handsome” Anglo-Saxon minuscule and a less expert insular majuscule, but with enough variation in style to cause paleographic debate. He collected texts and seemed to have access to a range of Biblical commentaries and Irish-influenced materials. He liked to think about texts in his native Old English. He had a strong sense of local identity evident in his Northumbrian Old English as well as pride in his community’s history and treasures. We do not know when or where he was born, nor do we know when and how he died. His life prior to his entry into the Chester-le-Street community—his education, training, and travels—is also unknown. We can make educated guesses about his age from his career and his training from his linguistic and scribal traits.

Most of this personal information is revealed in the colophons and memoranda he added in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and in the additions to Durham A.IV.19, the two manuscripts he glossed extensively in the vernacular Old English. These two manuscripts mark two stages in Aldred’s career at Chester-
le-Street: 1) his entry into the community as a priest, sometime in the mid-tenth century, as he describes it in the *Lindisfarne Gospel* colophon; and 2) his status as a provost over the community circa 970, revealed in the Durham A.IV.19 colophon. Each of these remarkable self-revelations will be treated in turn.

First, however, the nature of Aldred’s colophon writing requires some explanation, not only to understand the tradition within which Aldred was operating but also how he stands out as a chief exemplar, particularly in relation to his rich Irish Northumbrian heritage. Aldred fits the profile of Irish colophon writers who tended to express personal thoughts in the margins of manuscripts rather freely. Many short colophons consist of standard stock phrases and tropes begging the reader’s indulgence, requesting prayer, or warning of peril, amid appeals to God and his saints; they could even be copied from a manuscript exemplar intact. Less often, but more commonly in Irish-style colophons, scribes reveal personal details about the nature of their work or their status, even their names in about half the extant colophons. For example, the *MacRegol Gospels*, glossed contemporaneously with the *Lindisfarne Gospels*, has comparable colophons appealing to readers for their prayers, one identifying the eponymous MacRegol of the original ninth-century Gospel book, and two identifying the tenth-century glossators Owun and Farman in macaronic Old English and Latin, not unlike Aldred’s colophon in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*.

Since most surviving manuscripts do not have colophons, the presence of one is a rare opportunity to see an individual at work in the context of his community and to note his or her spiritual, as well as sometimes worldly, aspirations. Aldred’s two colophons are frequently cited by Richard Gameson in his survey of forty-four known colophons in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts precisely because Aldred illustrates the tradition so well that he becomes exceptional, and in some ways skews the data in such a small sample. The highly personal and complex nature of his colophons in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and Durham
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A.IV.19, combined with the silence of other historical records for his period, draws attention to the personality of Aldred but leaves us guessing about his context.

**LINDISFARNE COLOPHON AND GLOSS: A GOOD WOMAN’S SON EARN A PLACE**

Because the *Lindisfarne Gospels* was and is such an extraordinary treasure, the manuscript, now housed in the British Library, has received considerable scholarly and popular attention. Yet the Aldred colophon on fol. 259r and his prayer on fol. 89v identifying the history and construction of the manuscript remain problematic. Although most scholars assume Aldred’s information is derived from earlier but now lost sources, some question its accuracy, undermining the origins and provenance of the manuscript, generally assumed to be late seventh- or early eighth-century Lindisfarne. Nor is the colophon on fol. 259r a straightforward piece of work (image 9). It falls into distinct sections to which Aldred has added his own marginalia on himself, producing a rather uneven and complicated text. Aldred appears to have been assembling the colophon as he went, whether he was copying parts from elsewhere or not.

The colophon assemblage, not to mention the Old English gloss to the Gospels, raises the issue for modern readers as to how or why someone in Aldred’s position would “deface” a manuscript of such artistic and historic value even in its own time. Setting aside our modern aesthetics still leaves one pondering why almost 250 years after the manuscript’s initial construction someone would feel compelled to add more to it. Aldred, though, was quite clear: he saw himself as the fourth maker in the book’s history and viewed the book itself as an integral part of local religious life. Not only what Aldred said in the colophon,
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10. M. Brown, *Lindisfarne,* 84, favors early eighth century, c. 710–25, and argues for a collaboration between Lindisfarne and Wearmouth/Jarrow for its production (pp. 53–64). Nees, “Reading Aldred’s Colophon,” questions other scholars’ reliance on Aldred’s colophon, suspecting that its highly personal nature and its insistent pattern of fours undermines any oral or written sources Aldred was presumed to be using about the earlier production of the *Lindisfarne Gospels.* *Cod. Lind. Vol. 2,* Bk 2, p. 5 argues that Aldred’s attempt at majuscule in John’s name is the result of copying an inscription from a lost leaf by Eadfrith, while Nees (p. 347) thinks John’s name is larger to emphasize his importance to Aldred. M. Brown, *Lindisfarne,* 93–95, responding in part to Nees, points to the odd layout on the page as evidence that parts were copied from other sources, while Roberts, “Aldred Signs Off,” ferrets out analogues in a hidden poem (38–43). Gameson, *The Scribe Speaks?* 10, also argues in favor of an accurate tradition based on scribal habits, noting the relative obscurity of the names Aldred listed, rather than falsifying with more famous saints (and imperiling his soul thereby) and also the scribal tradition of honoring their own by accurately preserving the names of their predecessors.
but how he wrote it, tells us much about him and his *modus operandi*. Both the vernacular gloss and the personal name history he contributed complete the book by making it very local and contemporary to the Northumbrian community; his status is elevated by that of the manuscript to which he adds his gloss (itself a high-status activity), making his name worthy of inclusion in the list of the *Lindisfarne Gospels*’ makers.

**Figure 3** *Lindisfarne Gospels* Colophon

1. fol. 259r “hexameters” Latin poem in outer margin beside the start of John:

+ *Littera* me pandat
  sermonis fida¹
  ministra.

Omnes alme
meos fratres
voce salva;

2. fol. 259r “five sentences”

gisette
stituit²
pell vorvlda
ðe ðrifalde 7 ðe anfalde god ðis gods sæcula con
ær

+ Trinus et unvs *deus* evangelivm hoc ante
  arist avrat of mvðe cristes

+ Matheus ex ore *christi* scripsit
  of mvðe petres avrat

+ Marcus ex ore *petri* scripit
  ’of mvðe pavlis avrat

+ Lvcas de ore *pavli apostoli* scripit
  in deigilnisi l in foresaga siðða rogetede l gisprant³

+ Iohannes in prochemio deinde ervctvavit

---

1. The “fi” of *fida* is an older ligature in appearance like a tall descending “s” with a loop added to create an additional “p” shape.

2. The phrase *saecula con* is written above *hoc ante* and *stituit* above that, with the OE gloss also curling up above it with a line drawn to separate it from the Latin. The line should thus read: “Trinus et unvs *deus* evangelivm hoc ante sæcula constituiv” glossed with “ðe ðrifalde 7 ðe anfalde god ðis godspell ær vorvlda gisprant.”

3. The OE “a” and “u” are hard to distinguish in these lines, with many “a”’s open at the top.
3. fol. 259r “colophon proper”

_ b_

+ Eadfrïð bicop⁴ lindisfearnensis æcclesia
he ðis boc avrát æt frvma gode 7 sancte
gim æne lice⁵
cvðberhte 7 allvm ðæm halgvm. ða. ðe

in eolonde sint. 7 ðãilvald lindisfearneolondinga
hit vtan⁷ gibýrde 7 gibéle sva he vel çudç.
7 billfrïð se onçræ he gismioðade ða
gîhríno ða ðe vtan⁸ ón sint 7 hit gi
hrínade mið golde 7 mið gɪmmvm ẽ⁹
mið svlfr¹⁰ ofergylded faconles feh;
7 [-ic]¹¹ Aldred presbyter¹² indignus 7 misserim¹³
mið godes fvitvmtn¹⁴ 7 Sancti cvðberhtes
hit ofergłōesade ón englisc. 7 hine gihamadi.¹⁴
mið ðæm ðríim dælvm. Matheus dæl
gode 7 sancte cvðberhti. Marcus dæl¹⁵
dæm bisco[pe]um(?). 7 lvcas dæl ðæm hiorode
7 æht’ ora seovlfres mið tô inláde .:—

_id est feror_ his savle

7 sancti iohannes dal ferore hine so[v]lne 7 fœver ðora
seovlfres mið gode 7 sancti cvðberhti. Þette he
hæbbe ondfong ðerh godes milsæ¹⁶ on heof[n]vm.

---

4. A “b” superscript above the “p” with a long abbreviation mark above middle of _biscop_.
5. The word _gimænelice_ is spread out between the extenders of _ða ðe_.
6. The _bisc_ with long abbreviation mark over it is superscript above the end of _lindisfearneolondinga_.
7. Accent mark over the _v_ of _vtan_.
8. Accent mark over the _v_ of _vtan_.
9. Accent mark over the “_e_”.
10. Hook mark above ”_v_” of _svlfr_.
11. First person “ic” erased.
12. Abbreviation of _presbyter_ to “pbr” includes an “s” shape above the “p” as well as a line through the extender of the “b.”
13. Abbreviation mark at the end of _misserim_ resembles a _punctus interrogativus_, but is probably an abbreviation mark for _–us_.
14. This mark occurs between _gihamadi_ and the _vocor_ of the marginal comment identifying Aldred.
15. M. Brown includes a period here and a capital _thorn_ on _ðœm_ [œ] in the next line; Nees has _ðæm_.
16. M. Brown alters to _milsæ_; the “_s_” is a bit malformed and the “_a_” portion of the “_æ_” is barely visible.
The Lindisfarne Gospels colophon on fol. 259r occurs at the end of the manuscript after the conclusion of the Gospel of John. The Explicit marking the end of John finishes in the second column about a third of the way down, leaving considerable space for Aldred to add his texts in the same size hand as his gloss to the Gospels, presumably right after he finished the latter. The texts can be broken into three main parts (numbering from Cod. Lind.): (1) the “hexameters,” a short Latin poem in the right margin next to the Explicit; (2) the “five sentences” immediately below the Explicit, Latin glossed with Old English that sometimes extends into the margin; (3) the “colophon proper” in Old English and some Latin, with a marginal note. A fourth text usually discussed in conjunction with the fol. 259r colophon appears on fol. 89v, (4) a brief Old English prayer for the book’s makers.

The layout on fol. 259r suggests that Aldred copied or composed 1–3 as separate items (although it is unclear whether 1 was written before or after the 2–3 sequence) and that he added the Old English gloss to 2 and the marginal note to 3 afterward. The Old English prayer on fol. 89v (4) occurs at the end of Matthew in the same black ink as the gloss and hence is presumed to have been done at the same time, rather than with the fol. 259r colophon, by which time Aldred had switched to red. Nonetheless, its contents connect to the last
However, Lawrence Nees has shown how texts 2–4 display a larger thematic pattern of fours shaping Aldred’s thoughts about the book and his role in its history, a pattern that I extend further in the chart (fig. 4) that shows the nested four part structures shaping the content. In addition to the parallel between the four names of the evangelists and the four makers of the *Lindisfarne Gospels*, Aldred’s name appears four times as does the invocation “for God and St. Cuthbert,” while two sets of four crosses mark the texts, and the symbol for “and” (7) hanging in the margin breaks the colophon proper into four paragraphs. In addition, some section ends are marked by a punctuation mark resembling a semi-colon and period.

The Latin poem (1) added into the margin beside the Explicit to John lacks an overt pattern of fours, although it is marked with a cross as one of the sets of four. Moreover, its comments on the relationship between orality and literacy resonate with themes in the colophon texts below. Whether Aldred was attempting original verse composition or copying the poem from elsewhere, the verses reflect Aldred’s thoughts about language and books:

+ Littera me pandat / sermonis fida / ministra / Omnes alme / meos fratres/ voce salvia;,

May the letter, faithful servant of speech, reveal me; greet, O kind one, all my brothers with [your] voice.

These verses serve both as a summary of his just finished handiwork in the Gospel gloss and as a prologue to the colophon below by asking that the scribal notation speak for him to his brothers in the community. A similar sentiment

11. Nees, “Reading Aldred’s Colophon,” 344, discusses the possible order of writing and the bilingual nature of the colophon.

12. *Cod. Lind.*, Vol. 2, Bk 2, p. 5, notes the pattern of four paragraphs in (3). Unlike Nees (“Reading Aldred’s Colophon,” 345–46 and 368–69), I do not see the textual pattern of fours necessarily undermining the reliability of the tradition that Aldred received, either orally or in written form.

13. They occur at the end of the Latin poem (1) and within (3) four times: at the end of the second paragraph, ending the poem discussed below; then at the end of the third, and end of the fourth, as well as at the end of the closing coda. Note also the three-dot sign *de renvoi* for the marginal “alfredi natus” text linked to *giumadi*, discussed below.

14. M. Brown, *Lindisfarne*, 103, translates: “May the letter, faithful servant of speech, reveal me; greet, O kindly [book], all my brothers with thy voice.” Nees, “Reading Aldred’s Colophon,” 341, translates with suggestions: “+ May the letter [sc. the gloss?], faithful servant of speech, reveal me [sc. St. John’s Gospel or, better, the whole Latin text?]; greet, O kindly [book], all my [sc. the writer’s] brothers with thy voice.” Roberts, “Aldred Signs Off,” 33–34 (n. 31) translates: “Let the letter, the word’s true servant, speak for me. Greet all my brothers with a refreshing voice.” M. Brown omits the word *fida* in her transcription in two places, pp. 96 and 103, but notes on p. 96 that Andy Orchard suggested adding *fida* as well as one long or two short syllables before or after *fratres* to make the verses metrical, as *Cod. Lind*. Vol. 2, Bk 2, p. 5 also recommends.

15. *Cod. Lind.*, Vol. 2, Bk 2, p. 5, suggests that “sermonis fida ministra” sounds like a tag from an unidentified classical source or other littera greetings where the script is asked to speak.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89v</td>
<td>Prefatory, fol. 2v OE prayer for makers 5 Lat. sentences + 3+1 God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259r</td>
<td>Matthew, fol. 26v Eadfrith +Matthew: mouth of Christ +Eadfrith bp Lindisfarne wrote for God, St. Cuthbert, sts relics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259r</td>
<td>Mark, fol. 94v Æðilwald +Mark: mouth of Peter Æðilwald bp Lindisfarne islanders, impressed outside (cover)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210v</td>
<td>John, fol. 210v Aldred +John: Word, God, Holy Spirit 7 Aldred, unworthy priest glossed with help of God, St. Cuthbert in 3 sections +1 &gt;&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matthew for God and St. Cuthbert Mark for the Bishop Luke for members of the community, plus 8 ores silver for induction ;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 John for himself, plus 4 ores silver, for God and St. Cuthbert to gain &gt;&gt;; through God's mercy: 1 acceptance into heaven 2 happiness and peace on earth through merits of Cuthbert: 3 progress and increase 4 wisdom and prudence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
using different vocabulary is expressed in the opening lines of the poem honoring King Athelstan, copied into the *Durham Gospels* (held at Chester-le-Street) in the late tenth or early eleventh century: “Quarta dirie gressus per maria nauigans” (“Letter, direct your steps, sailing across the seas . . . ”). In some ways Aldred’s poem, and arguably his glossing habit, are reminiscent of Alcuin’s language theories about the relationship between the letter, the heart, and the mind, which may have influenced Aldred. For example, Alcuin’s dialogue with the young Prince Pepin, “Quid est littera . . . ” plays on the inherent philosophical or theological meaning imbedded in literal words, itself drawn from a tradition of pedagogical dialogues. Isidore of Seville asserts that letters serve as signs of things, with power to speak with the voice of those absent. Whether Aldred was familiar with this passage from Isidore, his poem plays off of the same concept, that the letters he writes would speak with his voice.

The request in Aldred’s poem also works on multiple exegetical levels. On the literal and historical level, appealed to in the “letter” (*littera*), Aldred wanted the written words of his gloss and/or the colophon to speak for him to readers like a voice, even across time to future generations, presumably even to us. On the allegorical or typological level, the letters of his gloss speak the Word, revealed in the Gospels as a whole, so the voice is also that of the Incarnate Christ. This typology of the Word is particular to the Gospel of John and meaningful for Aldred and his colophon on this page, where Aldred establishes his role as the fourth maker of the book as parallel to that of John.

The semiotic weight of the poem has a bilingual component related to orality, literacy, and glossing in Aldred’s work, explored further in chapter 5. Reading was both a skill of decoding letters but also an interpretive act of understanding meaning. Likewise, a vernacular gloss does more than translate literal word for word but interprets bilingually. It may be significant, then, that this poem is only in Latin without an Old English gloss even though it serves as a coda to his vernacular gloss of the Latin Gospel texts, while the main colophon texts are either in Latin glossed with Old English or in Old English. Perhaps the poem is an invocation addressed to the letters, not the readers or hearers. It would have been understood only by the literate, identified with Latin and universality, yet the orality of the Latin voice rivals that of vernacular

---


speech-bearers. In a sense, then, the poem’s link of oral speech to written letter invokes the universal and cosmic dimensions of the Latin Word to establish the personal and local Northumbrian speech of the gloss.

The so-called “five sentences” (2) immediately below the Explicit of John’s Gospel establish this cosmic dimension of the Word and, despite their modern title, set up the four-dimensional pattern employed by Aldred in the rest of the colophon.

+ Trinus et unus deus evangelivm hoc ante / sæcula con/stitvit
+ Matheus ex ore christi scrispit
+ Marcus ex ore petri scrispit
+ Lvcas de ore pavli apostoli scrispit
+ Iohannes in prochemio deinde ervctvavit

verbum deo donante et spiritu sancto scrispit

+ Three and one God established this Gospel before the [temporal] world
+ Matthew from the mouth of Christ wrote
+ Mark from the mouth of Peter wrote
+ Luke from the mouth of the apostle Paul wrote
+ John in [his] prologue thereafter poured forth the word, with God giving and by the Holy Spirit, he wrote.

The core four sentences, marked with crosses as is frequent in such invocations, express a commonplace regarding the four evangelists, while the + Trinus et unus sentence preceding them, perhaps added after the four, sets up a more unusual 3+1 pattern. The special nature of the number four and its common expression

20. M. Brown, Lindisfarne, 102, has eructavit, but the manuscript has ervctvavit; Cod. Lind. Vol. 2, Bk 2, p. 5, notes how unusual this usage is, appearing only here, on fol. 7rb/7 in Jerome’s Plures fuisse, and in one other manuscript, the Stockholm Codex Aureus. This isolated spelling in the Lindisfarne Gospels confirms Aldred’s use of the Plures fuisse text for his consideration of the four evangelists and John.
21. I am here translating only the Latin; see below for the Old English gloss. M. Brown’s translation (Lindisfarne, 103) is a bit freer: “God, three in one, these Gospels have since [the dawn of] the age consisted of: Matthew, who wrote what he heard from Christ; Mark who wrote what he heard from Peter; Luke, who wrote what he heard from the Apostle Paul; John who willingly thereupon proclaimed and wrote the Word given by God through the Holy Spirit.” She also cites, n. 59, Jane Roberts translation as closer to Aldred’s Old English: “+ God, three and one, established this gospelbook before the world. + Matthew wrote from the words [lit. mouth] of Christ. + Mark wrote from the words [lit. mouth] of Peter. + Luke wrote from the words [lit. mouth] of Paul the apostle. + John thereafter poured forth ‘in the beginning’; he wrote the word given by God and the holy spirit.” Nees’ translation (“Reading Aldred’s Colophon,” 340–41) runs: “The three and one God established this Gospel before time. + Matthew wrote from the mouth of Christ; + Mark wrote from the mouth of Peter; + Luke wrote from the mouth of Paul; + John then in his prologue brought [belched] forth the word, and, God and the Holy Spirit giving, wrote.”
22. The Trinus et unus line’s physical appearance suggests Aldred added it after he wrote the four, but before he added the Old English gloss to all five sentences. Not only is the first line set in on the left from the other four, but Aldred was faced with a line overrun that, for whatever reason, he declined to extend into the margin, although he does so in the texts below. Instead, he continued the words above the end of the line,
in the identification of the Gospel writers is found earlier in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* manuscript itself, in Jerome’s commentary prologue (*Plures fuisse*). Together, moreover, the five sentences parallel the five cross-carpet pages of the manuscript, themselves based on complex geometric patterns and proportions involving the golden ratio. The prefatory carpet page on fol. 2v precedes Jerome’s prefaces (*Novum Opus* and *Plures fuisse*) just as Aldred’s *Trinus et unus* prefatory line sets up the four evangelists. Each of the evangelists then has his own portrait, decorated preface, carpet page, and decorated incipit, just as Aldred elaborates each of their sources. However, the first three evangelists’ lines are formulaic, while the John description is more complex.

Aldred’s elaborations in the *Trinus et unus* line and the John line, and their Old English glosses, are thus both of interest for understanding his thinking in the texts of the colophon that follow. Three and one obviously add up to four, a symbolic play on numbers that does not imply a fourfold God, as is evident in the Old English gloss translation of Trinus as *drifalde* (threefold). But the same concept of three and one is repeated below in the Old English colophon where Aldred set himself apart with the Gospel of John as special. Moreover, John receives extended treatment here with a longer explanation of his Gospel source, as well as his name abbreviated in larger letters. John’s exceptionalism and the varied uses to which the words of his prologue were put in the Middle Ages in general are well known but can be also linked specifically to Northumbria. The Gospel of John was special to Cuthbert, who was drawn to Melrose initially by Boisil’s love of that Gospel, the “most spiritual of the Gospels according to Augustine of Hippo.” Evidence of the Gospel of John’s difference from the other three evangelists is visible in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* portraits, where John is facing forward while the other three offer side views of them in

---


the act of writing. Scribe B, under Aldred’s direction and with his correction, also copied into Durham A.IV.19 a popular apocryphal prayer of John against poison (QVIII.1, discussed in chapter 5). Aldred would have been well aware of John’s status and his significance in the Lindisfarne legacy.

Even if Aldred copied this extended line from elsewhere, his Old English gloss demonstrates his particular interest in understanding John’s role by offering alternative readings (using vel), even violating the margin boundary to expound the meaning. Prochemio (prooemium), referring to John’s oft-recited Prologue on the Word (John 1:1–18), is given two Old English renderings: “in deigilnisi vel in foresaga.” Forasaga is a literal translation of prooemium, prologue, although in another instance it was used for translatio; however digolnes, meaning mystery or secret, is more of an interpretive gloss. The semantic range offered here touches on Aldred’s project, that of unwrapping a mystery through translation. Just as John revealed the mystery of Christ, the incarnate revelation of God, so too Aldred’s gloss unwraps the mystery of the Latin text and reveals Christ to a vernacular audience. Likewise, the unusually spelled Latin eructuauit (eructauit), literally meaning “belched forth,” is also glossed with two Old English words: “rocgetede vel gisprant.” Roc(c)ettan conveys the verbal sense of belching forth, to utter or reveal something, while gesprintan (?) is otherwise unknown but suggests an active force bursting out, like water. Both of Aldred’s glosses on eructuauit offer a strong sense of the word (verbum, word) dramatically issuing forth.

Even more unusual is the longer alternative phrase offered for the closing line of the John gloss of “deo donante et spiritu sancto scripsit” added into the margin. Even in Latin, the phrase has multiple meanings given the syntax: John wrote (scripsit) just like the other Gospel writers, but he did not receive the word from anyone else’s mouth (ex ore in the other three) but by a direct revelation given by God and through the Holy Spirit. Aldred glossed this first with “mið (ðy) Gode gisalde ond Halges Gastes” (“when God giving and the Holy Ghost”), a fairly literal translation of the Latin. But then instead of glossing scripsit simply with aurát as he had done with the other three evangelists, he added a vel gloss that goes into the margin for three lines: “mið godes geafa ond halges gastes mæht aurát iohanne,” which could be translated “by the gift

---

27. The DOE entry for foresaga glossing translatio in one of the head glosses to Luke 17:5–6 suggests translation as “transplanting” produced the foresaga gloss; in W. W. Skeat, The Holy Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian, and Old Mercian Versions, 4 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1871–87; repr. Darmstadt 1970), Luke, p. 9, head gloss 67. Aldred also included a “vel” sign after foresaga but did not fill in an alternate reading. For digolnes, secret or mystery, glossing occultus, mysterium, arcanum, secretus, the DOE suggests that this commentary gloss derives from the Apocalypse of John.

28. Bosworth and Toller, ge-sprintan, linked to Icelandic spretta, spurt out, associated with water; Bosworth and Toller note the “causative force” in the way it is used in the colophon. In the Plures fuise line in the Linsdisfarne Gospels, fol. 7rb/7, Aldred glossed eructuauit with “loceteð .ł gesprang.”

29. The ðy after mið is added below it and right above the end of verbum, changing the meaning from “with” to “when” or “while.”
of God and the power of the Holy Spirit John wrote.” The interpretive additions and the repetition of the evangelist’s name to create a complete sentence here again highlights the importance of John and his personal significance to Aldred, mirrored in the Old English colophon where Aldred’s role, like John’s, receives a greater amount of attention.

The internal structure of the Old English colophon (3) is also a series of nested fours, mapped in columns 4–7 of the chart. Two main parts are distinguished by the marginal crosses, the long vernacular (or macaronic) text and the last two Latin lines, treated separately below (3b). The mostly Old English text is itself subdivided into four paragraphs marked by the ond symbol hanging in the left margin, although the third one appears to be an afterthought, again suggesting Aldred was composing and shaping the text as he went. The overall effect is to make Aldred and John, the third and fourth paragraphs, equal to the Eadfrið, Eðilwald, and Billfrið paragraphs.

+ Eadfrið bispoc[b] lindisfearnensis æcclesiæ
he ðis boc avrát æt frvma gode 7 sancte
    gimanelic
cvðberhte 7 allvm ðæm halgym. ða. ðe
    bispoc
in colonde sint. 7 ðiðilvald lindisfearneolondinga
hit vta giðryde 7 gibelde sva he vel cuðç.
7 billfròd se onsç he gismoðade ða
gihríno ða ðe vtan ón sint 7 hit gi
hynade mið golde 7 mið gimmvm ðç
mið sylfre oferylded faconles feh:,
7 [-ic] Aldred presbyter indignus 7 misserimus
mið godes fvlvntmę 7 sancti cvðberhtes
hit oferyldesade ón englisc. 7 hine gihamadi:. 
mið ðæm ðríum dælvm. Matheus dæl
gode 7 sancte cuðberhti. Marcus dæl
ðæm bispocelum(?). 7 lvcas dæl ðæm hiorode
7 æht’ ora seovlfres mið ðo inlæde .:
—id est ferore his savle
7 sancti iohannes dæl ferore hine seolfsne 7 feover óra

30. Cod. Lind., Vol. 2, Bk 2, p. 6 notes a change in size to a more compressed text before these last two line and suggests that either they were copied earlier or were already planned.
31. Cod. Lind., Vol. 2, Bk 2, p. 6, on ond symbol. Also, the ; sign appears three or four times to end sections (as it does at the end of the Littera me pandat verses): after the first three makers are described (faconles feh:); after the description of Aldred’s role and the first three evangelists (although this one appears somewhat different, more like a colon followed by a dash rather than a comma, to inlæde ;); after the description of John that follows and that ends the colophon with Cuthbert (cvðberhtes earnunga:); and at the end of the closing coda (cvðberhto constrvxervnt ;).
+Eadfrith, Bishop of the Lindisfarne Church: he wrote this book originally, for God and for St Cuthbert and [together] for all the saints who are in the island. And Ethiluald [Bishop] of the Lindisfarne islanders, bound and covered it on the outside, as he well knew how.

And Billfrith, the anchorite: he forged the ornaments which are on it on the outside and adorned it with gold and with gems also with silver over-gilded it with pure metal.

And [I] Aldred, unworthy and most miserable priest over-glossed it in English with the help of God and St. Cuthbert. And, by means of the three parts, he made a home [?] for himself. The Matthew part for God and St. Cuthbert, the Mark part for the bishop[/s], and the Luke part for the community, and eight ores of silver for his induction.

And the St John part for himself (it is for his soul), and four ores of silver for God and St Cuthbert: so that he may gain acceptance through God’s mercy into heaven, happiness and peace, on earth, progress and increase, wisdom and prudence through the merits of St Cuthbert.32

+ Eadfrith, Oethiluald, Billfrith, Aldred this gospelbook for God and Cuthbert constructed or ornamented.33

Whether or not he was offering an accurate history of the Lindisfarne Gospels’ construction, Aldred saw himself as completing the book by adding his gloss.34 Not only did his labor get him into the community (with some silver), but part of his work was for himself in terms of his own spiritual development in direct relationship to God, paralleling John. Nees, M. Brown, and Jane Roberts have commented on the three earlier makers and their possible identification in other historical records, although they differ in their confidence in

32. *Cod. Lind.*, Vol. 2, Bk 2, p. 10 notes that the lack of punctuation after hefnum allows at least two alternative translations: 1) “that, through the grace of God, he may gain acceptance into Heaven; happiness and peace, and, through the merits of St. Cuthbert, advancement and honour wisdom and sagacity on Earth”; or 2) “that he may gain acceptance into the Monastery; and, through the grace of God, happiness and peace in Heaven; and, through the merits of St. Cuthbert, advancement and honour, wisdom and sagacity on Earth.” I have preferred here and in the chart to emphasize sets of four identified with God and St. Cuthbert.


34. The *Lindisfarne Gospels* manuscript artwork was, and is still “incomplete,” missing some gilding, coloring, and highlighting; see M. Brown, *Lindisfarne*, 284–85, 298–99.
Aldred’s veracity in his selection of these three particular individuals. However, the existence of an oral and artifactual tradition from which Aldred and others drew seems likely. Symeon of Durham, for example, described what was probably the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and named the three makers *but not Aldred*. Either Symeon was using the colophon but purposely excluded Aldred or he was relying on other sources of the tradition accessible in the tenth and eleventh centuries but no longer extant now.\textsuperscript{35}

The purpose of the present exploration of the colophon is to gain insight into Aldred and his tenth-century context. Gameson’s survey of colophon-writing scribes in Anglo-Saxon England, of whom there were very few and Aldred is a star example, highlights Aldred’s personal agenda, from which several facets of his life emerge from this section of the colophon. The text is primarily in Old English but the inclusion of Latin wording with the vernacular to make a somewhat macaronic text is a bit of a puzzle.\textsuperscript{36} However, Jane Roberts, in a brilliant bit of sleuth work, has highlighted an Old English poem embedded in the text:\textsuperscript{37}

\begin{verbatim}
+ Eadfrid bishop  dis boc avrát
  allvm dæm halgvm  de in elonde sint.
  Eðilvald bishop  hit vta giöryde
  gibelde sva he vel cudc.  Billfrid se oncre
  hit gihrinade\textsuperscript{38} mið golde 7 mið gimmvm çc,
  mið svlfre ofergylde\textsuperscript{39}  faconleas feh.;\textsuperscript{40}
\end{verbatim}

The implication of this reading is that Aldred may have accessed a now lost poem about the founders, but elaborated on it in several ways to fulfill his own pattern and agenda, the most prominent being inclusion of his own role.

The content of this third main section of the colophon reveals that Aldred saw himself as the fourth and final maker and also as parallel to John, a rather exalted position, although he styled himself an unworthy and miserable priest. He saw his vernacular glossing (*oferglöesade*) as similar in nature to the metal gilding (*ofergylde*) done by his predecessor Billfrid. The erasure of “I” (*ic*) combined with the subsequent use of a third person verb in the sentence suggests that Aldred was composing as he wrote and decided to omit the first person

\textsuperscript{36} In any case, macaronic (vernacular and Latin) writing is an Irish trait visible also in the glossator colophon in the *MacRegol Gospels*, another bit of evidence suggesting that Aldred has strong connections to Irish textual traditions.
\textsuperscript{38} Roberts substitutes with *gigyrede hit* as more metrically satisfying.
\textsuperscript{39} Roberts alters to *ofergylde*.
\textsuperscript{40} Note also that the poem ends with the same sign used to mark off sections in the main colophon (\textemdash).
with which he began the sentence, perhaps in imitation of John’s self-effacement (“the disciple whom Jesus loved”); but Aldred also added a first person note in the margin beside the erasure as a substitute.41

Aldred did the first three parts of Gospels both for the Cuthbert community and for his admission into it, repeating the dedication to God and St. Cuthbert four times. The verb he uses to describe his entrance to the community, *gihamadi*, is unknown but presumed to mean “made a home” either a variant on *gehámettan* or derived from *héman*, referring to sexual intercourse and by extension marriage.42 The marginal note (3b) in some sense complements this mention of his new home and change of *familia* by describing his birth family, whose identities are otherwise unknown. The note appears starting at the line introducing his name (where the *ic* was erased) and runs beside the description of himself and his efforts to make a home for himself:

\[ \text{.:ælfredi} \\
\text{natus} \\
\text{aldredus} \\
\text{.vocor i} \\
\text{id et tilwif} \\
\text{bonæ mulieris} \\
\text{filius eximius} \\
\text{loquer} \]

Of Alfred born, I am called Aldred; as a distinguished son of a good woman, I speak.43

The abbreviation *tilw* led early scholars to postulate a proper name (Tilwin) rather than an abbreviation for *til wif* as a gloss translation of *bonæ mulieris*; while unlikely, the existence of *Til-* names, including one in the *Durham liber vitae*, does leave open the possibility of a pun on his mother’s name.44

---

43. M. Brown, *Lindisfarne*, 104: “Aldred, born of Alfred, is my name: a good woman’s son, of distinguished fame” and glosses his mother with “.i. tilw” (abbreviation mark over the final letter *win*, presumed to indicate *til wif*; good woman); Nees, “Reading Aldred’s Colophon,” 341: “I am called Aldred, born of [son of] Ælfred; I speak as the distinguished son of a good woman.” See also Roberts, “Alfred Signs Off,” 31.
44. W. W. Skeat, ed., *The Gospel according to St John in Anglo-Saxon and Northumbrian Versions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1878; repr. Darmstadt, 1970), ix, posited “Tilwin” as a proper name citing the *Durham Liber vitae*, although he does not specify where (Tiluini, male, appears on fol. 313r5 in LVD). PASE shows several *Til-* names, none of them identifiably female.
In any case, this short marginal addition replaces the erased “I” with a longer explanation of Aldred’s identity, not unlike John’s self disclosure on this very page as the one who gives true testimony.\(^{45}\) The addition also lines up visually with the two other marginalia, the extended interpretive gloss on John in the hexameters (2), and the *Littera me pandat* poem (i) beside the Explicit, which also includes a first person pronoun (*me*). The John gloss’s extension into the margin may be accidental rather than intentional, but it is noteworthy that it again reflects on Aldred’s identification of himself with John, here credited with receiving a direct revelation of the word from God through the Holy Spirit. Likewise, Aldred is fixated on words and speech in the marginal verses, *Littera me pandat* and *Alfredi natus*, the former an attempt at hexameters and the latter apparently rhythmic. Both are in Latin, except for the *tilwif* note and are thus directed primarily at a Latin-literate audience. Both reveal Aldred in a first person mode speaking with his own voice through the written medium in the universal language of Latin rather than the local vernacular (except for his nod to the good woman, his mother).

The alternations between Latin and vernacular remain curious, particularly as they relate to oral and written literacy. The main text of the colophon is primarily in Old English and consciously chooses the third person to describe Aldred, as if the note was designed for local readers, possibly even lay patrons and community members who may not have had Latin (likewise the gloss to the “five sentences” above). The only Latin words in this vernacular colophon are common religious references: *ecclesiæ* to describe the bishop of Lindisfarne in the first line; *presbyter*, followed by the personal identification of Aldred as *indignus et misserrimus*, again stressing Aldred’s tendency to use Latin to describe himself. His identification of himself with John, however, is spelled out in Old English in the third person and with an interlinear note to emphasize that the work was done for his own soul (*id est ferore his savle*). Perhaps reflecting that personal sacrifice, Aldred’s Old English gloss of the Gospel texts switches from black to the possibly more expensive red in the Gospel of John (at 5:10) and continues in red through the colophon.\(^{46}\)

\(^{45}\) Fol. 259ra14–19:  
\[\text{ðes is ðe ðegn se ðe æt cyðnise getrymmeð of ðiem ł fro ðisv ëm ñ avrat ðas ł ða 7ve wvtvn ñrte sOd ñhic est discipulus qui testimonium perhibet de his et scribsit haec et scimus quia uerum is cyðnis hisest testimonium eius John 21:24, “This is the disciple who gives testimony about these things and who wrote them. And we know that his testimony is true.”}\]

\(^{46}\) See M. Brown, *Lindisfarne*, 96–97, Nees, “Reading Aldred’s Colophon,” 347. *Cod. Lind.* Vol. 1, fol. 220vb2; *Cod. Lind.* Vol. 2, Bk 2, p. 24, suggests the change occurred mid-verse and mid-sentence due to resumption on a new day or after a midday break, while also noting an earlier experiment with light brown, fols. 203v–220vb2, and posits that the switch to red was aesthetic, perhaps to highlight the contrast with the black main text. In Durham A.IV.19, Aldred maintains the habit of contrasting colors, usually red gloss on black, but black gloss on his red majuscule field prayers, fols. 66r–67v (QIX/X.14). Also, the earlier red
The closing coda to the colophon, marked as separate by a cross, is in Latin except for the Old English names, but has a strong parallel to the fol. 89v Old English prayer (4) naming the same four makers. Although they were written at different times, these two texts serve as bookends to the colophon materials, as displayed in the chart. The Old English prayer added on fol. 89v is in black ink and presumed continuous with the glossing of that page’s explicit to Matthew, rather than added with the 259r colophon, by which time Aldred had switched to red ink. The listing of the four makers here, although spelled somewhat differently than the closing colophon, reinforces the idea that Aldred was repeating a known tradition regarding the construction of the *Lindisfarne Gospels.*

The fol. 89v colophon reads:

\[\text{ðeu lifigiende god/ gemyne ðu/ eadfrið 7 / ðeofilwald 7 / billfrith 7 / aldred peccator/ ðas feowero/ mid gode ymb/weron ðas boc}\]

Thou Living God, remember Eadfrith and Æthelwald and Billfrith and Aldred, a sinner; these four, with God, were concerned with [devoted to?] this book.

while the last two lines of the fol. 259r colophon read:

\[+ Eadfrið . oeðilvald . billfrith . aldred .
\]

\[+Eadfrith, Oethiluald, Billfrith, Aldred this gospelbook for God and Cuthbert constructed or ornamented.\]

The four makers are listed in each, credited in the 259r colophon for their handiwork in Latin, but prayed for in Old English on fol. 89v. Cuthbert is not mentioned in the fol. 89v prayer, while the line for God and St. Cuthbert appears for the fourth time here in the fol. 259r colophon closing. In the 89v glosses in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* (listed in *Cod. Lind.*, Vol. 2, Bk 2, p. 24 note), many of them offering “vel” alternatives, suggest that Aldred went back and added these after he had made the switch to red, perhaps after finishing John and the colophon.

47. Colophons at the end of a section, such as after the first Gospel, were not unusual. *Cod. Lind.*, Vol. 2, Bk 2, p. 11 refers to the prayer as “Aldred’s signature” and compares it to other addresses to the reader found in the *Stowe Missal* and *Book of Durrow.* The glossators of the *Macregol Gospels* also added a colophon at the end of Matthew (fol. 50v) as well as after the original colophon on fol. 169v, perhaps in imitation of Aldred or vice-versa: see M. Brown, *Lindisfarne,* 96; Nees, “Reading Aldred’s Colophon,” 366; Gameson, *The Scribe Speaks!* 6, 29, and item 27, p. 44; Skeat, *Gospel according to John,* xi–xv.

48. For these alternate translations, see Nees, “Reading Aldred’s Colophon,” 340 and M. Brown, *Lindisfarne,* 104 n. 63; see also *Cod. Lind.*, Vol. 2, Bk 2, p. 10.

49. One wonders if there is some resonance between the verbs he uses to describe the earlier makers’ work, *ymbweron* in fol. 89 and then the twin Latin alternatives *construxerunt vel ornaverunt* in fol. 259r.
prayer, Aldred again uses a Latin descriptor of humility for himself, *peccator*, as he does in the colophon (*indignus et misserrimus*). To add such a word to oneself when speaking in the third person is a stylistic way of identifying the author without using “I,” although Aldred in other ways in the colophon displayed considerable *hubris* at odds with the monastic value of humility. Not only did he call himself an illustrious son of a good woman right beside the *indignus et misserrimus* line, but by implication he made himself equal not only to his three predecessors in the construction of the *Lindisfarne Gospels* but also identified himself with the Gospel writer John’s unmediated divine inspiration. In some sense, then, Aldred imagined that his vernacular gloss interpreted the meaning of the life of Christ in the same way that John’s portrait of Christ did compared to the other three Gospels.

Thus despite, or perhaps because of, the careful patterning, Aldred managed to talk quite a bit about himself indirectly and directly. This self-disclosure raises at least two questions about his life and position in the community that bear on his later work in Durham A.IV.19. The first concerns his attitude toward the *Lindisfarne Gospels* as a textual artifact and relic; the other is his relationship to and status within the Chester-le-Street community.

The most striking feature about the *Lindisfarne Gospels* to most viewers are the illuminated pages, yet the poem Aldred imbedded in his text about the original makers emphasized the writing, binding, and outer ornamentation without a clear reference to the artwork inside. The work of illumination might be included under the first maker, Bishop Eadfrith who “wrote” (OE *avrát, awritan*) the book, thought by at least some scholars to be the scribe-artist of this, his *magnum opus dei*.\(^50\) *Awritan* primarily refers to writing but can include drawing in the sense of carving or outlining; however it is not the usual way one would describe illuminated art.\(^51\) For comparison, the almost contemporaneous *Benedictional of Æthelwold*, a beautifully illuminated product of Winchester, includes a Latin colophon extolling the “frames, well-adorned, and filled with various figures decorated with manifold beautiful colours and with gold,” a fulsome description that Aldred utterly fails to match for the equally stunning *Lindisfarne Gospel* images.\(^52\) Nor does Aldred indicate any artistic interests in Durham A.IV.19, a practical book lacking illustrations other than initials and a few marginal drawings. Aldred’s colophon there is textually oriented, but without the incongruity evident in the *Lindisfarne* colophon. Three possible expla-
nations might elucidate this seeming indifference to the illuminations as a way of understanding Aldred’s mindset.

First, although appreciative of the artistry displayed in the carpet pages, evangelists’ portraits, and decorated letters, Aldred may have been unfamiliar with the craft. Perhaps the tradition he received about the makers lacked any further reference to the illuminations beyond Eadfrith as artist-scribe. There is no evidence that the Chester-le-Street community had illuminators in its scriptorium, just as they did not have Lindisfarne-trained sculptors. Instead, they relied on local artisans who merged the artistic traditions from Lindisfarne with Scandinavian and local styles. Aldred may very well represent a similar local artisan capable of exploiting a mixed scribal heritage, including Irish materials.

Second, in regards to the lack of comment on the illuminations, Aldred may have paid more attention to the external decoration: he viewed the book as a whole as a treasured relic, evident in his fixation on the binding and ornamentation of the exterior in describing the role of two of his predecessors, Ethelwald and Billfrith. This resonates with yet another colophon, in an early eleventh-century Old English version of Bede’s Ecclesiastical History relatively unadorned, CCCC 41: there the writer obsesses over the tactile experience of the book, linking the two hands of the scribe who copied it to the two hands of the reader holding the book by its cover.53

Third, his logocentrism reveals a mind oriented to words and letters as visual objects, more than images and colors.54 Aldred’s focus on the sound and visual structure of words and letters is evident in the Littera me pandat poem and in the way he structures his texts in sets of four. In this light, it is suggestive to consider how his preference for numerical textual patterns relates to the mathematically balanced carpet pages and also to the iconic representation of the Word in the opening initials of each Gospel.55 The use of awritan for Bishop Eadfrith may imply a scribe-painter similar to the MacRegol Gospels scribe, who in his colophon used the verb depinxit to describe his work.56 Like the MacRegol Gospels’ scribe, whose colophon he would have seen at some point, Aldred may have perceived letters as artistic objects in themselves and scribes as artisans. As a result, artistic designs of the kind visible in the Lindisfarne Gospels carpet pages, portraits, and illuminated initials were extensions of that scribal artistry, enhancing the inherent aesthetic of the letter and word, rather than the

---

other way around. Aldred’s persona as a scribe would naturally see Bishop Eadfrith as a fellow scribal artist, both donating their work for the love of God and St. Cuthbert.

Finally, what does the Lindisfarne Gospels colophon suggest about Aldred’s earlier training and his position in the Chester-le-Street community? Most scholars, attempting to date the colophon, assume that Aldred entered the community when he became a priest, which would be at or above the age of thirty. If he was provost by 970 (according to the Durham colophon), then the Lindisfarne additions could be dated to roughly 950–960, allowing some years for his progress in scribal skill and leadership from a new priest to head of the community.57 If, however, Aldred was both a new priest and new to the Chester-le-Street community when he did the Lindisfarne gloss, why would they have allowed someone so new to write in one of the main treasures of the house, including this detailed memo? This curious factor suggests that Aldred arrived at Chester-le-Street with some higher prestige and training compared to the other members of the community. Aldred may have already been resident in another Northumbrian community in the Lindisfarne orbit, who arrived at Chester-le-Street offering his scribal skills, and gained entry to the community through his work on the Lindisfarne Gospels. Perhaps he was brought in for this very reason, to enhance the treasured Gospel book and to revitalize a moribund scriptorium. If so, he seems to have become the leader among a diverse crew of scribes by the time of the Durham A.IV.19 additions.

**DURHAM COLOPHON:**
**PROVOST OF CUTHBERT’S FAMILY**

From the Durham colophon, we learn that Aldred had by 970 moved up from priest to provost of the community serving under Bishop Ælfsige (968–90), revealing more about Aldred and the organization of the community than we would otherwise know. Moreover, the date derived from the fol. 84r colophon not only helps establish a timeline for Aldred’s work as a glossator but also establishes some parameters for situating Chester-le-Street in relation to the larger political and ecclesiastical movements in the late tenth century. In relation to the Durham A.IV.19 manuscript itself and its additions, the colophon

---

57. W. J. P. Boyd, *Aldred’s Marginalia: Explanatory Comments in the Lindisfarne Gospels* (Exeter: Exeter University Press, 1977), 26–28, and M. Brown (*Lindisfarne*, 92, 96, 99, 101) argue that the Lindisfarne glossing and payments not only established Aldred’s credentials as a new member of the community but also paid for his ordination by the Bishop, with strong reservations about simony. Boyd dates the Lindisfarne gloss to c. 960 while M. Brown leans more to 950, assuming that as a young priest of thirty, Aldred would have taken roughly ten to twenty years to reach provost by 970; she also argues (*Lindisfarne*, 102) that Aldred must have undertaken the task of recording the makers’ names as an official act of the community rather than a personal one.
establishes the identity of Aldred and his hand as a scribal authority in the community.

The colophon Aldred included on fol. 84r of the Durham A.IV.19 additions (image 10) differs from the Lindisfarne colophon in a number of respects, revealing as it is about Aldred’s status in the community. In placement, appearance, and circumstances of copying, the colophon and subsidiary memorandum appear more informal than the colophon assemblage in the Lindisfarne. Further, the Durham A.IV.19 colophon ostensibly explains only Aldred’s acquisition of the four collects for St. Cuthbert he recorded on that page (QXI.44), rather than commenting on the entire manuscript project, as his earlier Lindisfarne colophon did. These differences may be occasioned entirely by the disparity between the two manuscripts. The Lindisfarne Gospels was a high-end, illuminated, treasured relic of the community’s early history presumably on display in the church, while Durham A.IV.19 was a composite manuscript of diverse liturgical and encyclopedic materials, probably a workbook kept in the scriptorium or even taken on travel, as Aldred may have done with at least part of it.

The isolated physical placement of the colophon (QXI.46) and memorandum (QXI.45) with the Cuthbert collects (QXI.44) raises questions about how Aldred copied the materials. They appear on fol. 84r in the middle of Quire XI (fols. 77–88), the third and last quire added to the original collectar manuscript.\(^58\) An \textit{xb’} (\textit{christus benedictus}) in the upper corner of fol. 77r at the beginning of the quire marks a new section of texts added and glossed by Aldred. Other indications, discussed in the next chapter, suggest that the extra quires (IX–XI) stood separately at some time, so Quire XI could have been written apart from the manuscript or loosely bound with the other quires. The Cuthbert collects, memorandum, and colophon on fol. 84r fall between two different sections of material he added to Quire XI. The folios prior to the colophon page, 77r–84r, contain hymns and daily office material added and glossed, for the most part, by Aldred, while the subsequent pages, fols. 85r–88v, contain “educational” texts of an encyclopedic nature added and glossed by Aldred.\(^59\) So the materials on fol. 84r stand in relative isolation, save for the two lines at the top that finish the psalms copied on the previous page (fol. 83v, QXI.43). More than likely, Aldred carried to Wessex some loosely bound quire(s), including a partially written Quire XI when he copied the Cuthbert collects and noted their acquisition on fol. 84r.

The layout of the materials on fol. 84r also suggests the texts stood by themselves apart from the other, longer, and continuously written and glossed texts Aldred added before and after in this quire. The four Cuthbert collects (QXI.44)

\(^{58}\) For codicological background, see T. J. Brown, ed., Durham Ritual, 12–17.

\(^{59}\) See chapter 3 for an explication of the copying sequence, chapter 4 for the office, and chapter 5 for the encyclopedic materials.
De sanctis immaculatis ministri qui ambulant infelix omnes.

Qui humiliae regia curisque habentur gratiae animum.

Libertatem superavit.

Hortatur intercedens beato Cuthberto parvis conditor familiae

Tuum quae sive mirabilia
tuam tue specta

Pamphilio ubi protege.

Quia regi tuoni appur
ta gloriam primum
tempestas paludam

Ne clarenres pesta fr

Ite beatum Cuthbertum

Regem qui banea

Signant Immanuel. Ke

Popula tuo integra

Placentia e sim.

Datus mundi prudam qui eubere

Sed praevia comitata

Manus benedicta

Nota novis lucibus

Novis novas monas

Novis novae capta.
are copied in two columns following the format established by the two lines of text already copied at the top. A brief, and barely legible, Latin memorandum appears at the bottom of the left column (QXI.45), while the longer, Old English colophon is at the bottom of the right column (QXI.46). The differences in language and script between the collects, memorandum, and colophon are notable, although all identifiably in Aldred’s hand. The Latin collects are in Aldred’s regular insular minuscule, the memorandum is in Latin attempted in a mixture of Greek and Roman alphabets and capital and minuscule script, while the colophon is in Old English with no experimentation in script. Aldred made no attempt to gloss the Cuthbert collects, although there is space to do so; in any case his glossing of the previous Office material had changed on folio 83v to glossing only the titles of the sections but not the psalm incipits (QXI.43). Together, these factors suggest that Aldred, sitting, as he describes it, in a tent while on a journey, was copying and composing the fol. 84r materials freely and informally, either for some purpose while traveling or as a means of transmitting them back to his community where they could presumably be transferred into a regular service book. The same might be said of other additions made to Durham A.IV.19, although the fol. 84r material is the most haphazard, if most revealing, of the texts Aldred added.

The content of the colophon is, consequently, more the product of extemporaneous speech compared to the self-consciously constructed Lindisfarne colophon. Aldred’s voice is heard directly in the right column colophon, less so in the left column memorandum. To whom or why he was writing these notes is unclear, especially given the ad hoc nature of this page of copying, even more informal than the rest of this quire’s additions.

A reconstruction and tentative translation of the left column memorandum, which may have been partially erased, reads (image 11):

Deus omnipotens et(?) Maria et Helena et sanctus Cudbertus . . . te gelanidon [Aldre]d.

God Almighty and Mary and Helen and St Cuthbert granted . . . to Aldred.  

60. T. J. Brown summarizes (Durham Ritual, 27) the observations from Ker and Cod. Lind. on the collects’ style and hand similarities to Aldred’s work on folios. 77r–84ra2 and 85r–88v as compared to his Ritual gloss. The colophon looks more formal like the Lindisfarne and Bodley 819 glosses (fol. 10r) than the less formal Ritual gloss. Brown also notes (Durham Ritual, 24) that the left column memorandum is in the same color ink as the two collects above it in that left column, whereas the colophon at the bottom of the right column is darker than the collects (noting the damage from offsetting that makes fol. 84r appear to be a palimpsest); see also Cod. Lind., Vol. 2, Bk 2, pp. 26–28 suggesting erasure, and plate 58. However, the two collects in the left column appear in a lighter and thinner stroke than the two collects in the right column, whose thickness more resembles the two overrun lines from 83v.

The odd mixture of scripts and alphabets already noted suggests that Aldred was freely experimenting with styles, perhaps while copying from exemplar(s). The content and intent of the note is in some ways similar to parts of the *Lindisfarne* colophon. Like the fol. 89v Old English prayer and the last two lines of the fol. 259r text in *Lindisfarne*, these lines are a standard appeal to saints for validation of the scribe’s work and for heavenly reward, although due to damage or erasure we do not know what he was granted, or even if his is the intended name since all that is clearly legible is the final “d” of what is presumed to be “Aldred.” The invocation of God and three saints also echoes the three and one pattern of the *Lindisfarne* colophon.62

However, the invocation of Mary and Helen is specific to the Durham colophon context, for which T. J. Brown offers two explanations, neither of them entirely satisfactory. First, he attempts to date the memorandum to their feast days in August, the Feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary on 15 August and the Feast of Helen on 18 August, but the latter date only occurs in three later calendars. Rather, Helen is associated with liturgical commemorations of the cross elaborated in the tenth and eleventh centuries, primarily the Invention of the Cross on 3 May but also the Exaltation of the Cross on 14 September.63 The August dates of Mary and Helen fall a week after the 10 August Feast of Lawrence in the right column colophon; however, as T. J. Brown notes, the ink suggests the memorandum was written at the same time or soon after the Cuthbert collects with their colophon.64 Meanwhile, Cuthbert’s feast day was 20 March and his translation was celebrated on 4 September.65 It seems unlikely, then, that the saints’ festal dates form the primary connections between the memorandum, the collects, and the colophon.

The other explanation T. J. Brown suggests is that Helen is invoked in a way similar to popular theft protection and recovery formulas known in Anglo-Saxon England: “just as Helen found the true cross, so may my lost/stolen

62. Nees, “Reading Aldred’s Colophon,” 346, n. 36.
65. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 183, gifted to Chester-le-Street by King Athelstan, contains, in addition to the lives of St. Cuthbert, office and mass for his deposition on 20 March (fols. 92v–93v). The calendar in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 63 (ninth-century Northumbria) includes Cuthbert on 20 March as well as 4 September, the date of his translation more commonly found in eleventh-century and later calendars (Rushforth, *Saints in English Calendars*, 21–22). Christopher Hohler, “The Durham Services in Honour of St. Cuthbert,” in *The Relics of Saint Cuthbert*, ed. C. F. Bariscombe, (Oxford, 1956), 155–59, notes that the translation was probably originally that from Lindisfarne to Norham in the mid-ninth century.
Although Helen has no particular prominence for the cult and community of St. Cuthbert, popular narrations of her story in relation to liturgical celebrations of the cross suggest a general cult of St. Helen going beyond theft protection. Aldred may very well have been familiar with such protective formulas often found at the end of service book or in the margins of manuscripts, since some of his other additions belong to the same genre—for example, the St. John poison prayer of Scribe B he probably commissioned on fol. 61r (QVIII.1) and the five field prayers he wrote on fols. 66r–67v (QIX.14). Perhaps the unclear verb in the memorandum invokes God, Mary, Helen, and Cuthbert for protection of his work from material risks while on the road; or conceivably the bishop with his entourage stopped at a nearby religious site dedicated to Helen and Mary where Aldred copied an inscription, attempting to replicate the style and format. Whatever their particular appeal to Aldred, at least at that time and place, he felt compelled to offer these saints thanks for some kind of favor or acknowledge their patronage. Overall, the memorandum’s unusual script and unclear status in relation to the other texts highlight the ad hoc nature of fol. 89r in the middle of Aldred’s miscellany in Quire XI.

The main colophon in the right column of fol. 84r is in the vernacular and consequently more personal voice of Aldred, although we do not know whom he expected to read it:

Besuðan wudigan gæt æt áclee
on westsæxum on laurentius
mæssan daegi. on wodnes daegi
ælfsige ðæm biscope in his
getélde alfred se p’fast
ðas feower collectæ on fif
næht áldne mona ær
underne awrat.,

Aldred the provost wrote these four collects at Oakley, to the south of Woodyates, among the West Saxons, on Wednesday, Lawrence’s feast day (the moon being five nights old), before tierce, for Ælfsige the bishop, in his tent.67

The details Aldred offered are precise enough for us to locate the date and place: 10 August 970 at Oakley Down in Dorset (map 3).68 Although the

67. T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 24, transcription and translation.
68. See chapter 1 for discussion of the date and place; T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 24–25; Cod. Lind.,
Map 3  Wessex in the Tenth Century (Julius Ray Paulo)
significance of the specific location of their tent remains mysterious—why just south of Woodyates, along a Roman road, camped near the Neolithic burial mounds—they were not far from major royal and religious sites in Wessex, including Winchester thirty-five or so miles to the northeast. Why he wanted to be so precise about the acquisition of the Cuthbert collects—or to whom—is less clear. Although the information he provided benefits our understanding of his historical context, he must have had his own reasons for documenting the moment. Whom did he envision would read these quire pages? The Northumbrian vernacular suggests Aldred is writing a note to himself and his community, rather than a universal reader as imagined in many colophon addresses. In some sense, the colophon functions like a record of a gift, but instead of a land grant or manuscript, the object is a set of prayers.

From this documentation, we learn a certain amount of historical information about the community in relation to their patron. Aldred with his authority as provost and at the behest of his bishop wrote out four collects honoring his community's patron saint, while in Wessex, where the cult of St. Cuthbert was flourishing and had attracted royal patronage. Most scholars assume he copied texts that his community hitherto did not have access to in order to take them back to Chester-le-Street, and have taken this as a sad commentary on their community that the liturgical advancement of their cult took place elsewhere such that they had to import this new liturgy. However, the language of the colophon establishing that Aldred wrote (awrat) them for the bishop leaves open the possibility that they were not necessarily new acquisitions, but that the bishop had need of them on the journey for personal devotion or in celebrating the office with others. In the colophon, Aldred seemed more concerned with establishing the liturgical calendar date rather than a year, although we are able to extrapolate the year from his references; the year may be less important if the folio served as only a temporary storage place for the collects, either to celebrate Cuthbert en route and/or to get them back home for copying into


70. Evident, for example, in Athelstan’s gifts to the community of St. Cuthbert at Chester-le-Street as well as Cuthbert’s presence in liturgical rites and calendars. See David Rollason, “St Cuthbert and Wessex: The Evidence of Cambridge, Corpus Christ College MS 183,” in *St Cuthbert*, ed. Bonner, et al., 413–24.

71. See Hohler, “The Durham Services in Honour of St. Cuthbert,” 155–91, for Cuthbert liturgies, mostly introduced from outside or developed later at Durham; and p. 158 and n. 2 on the Durham A.IV.19 collects. Hohler, and Bonner, “St Cuthbert at Chester-le-Street,” 392–94, show that three of the four Cuthbert prayers come from the contemporary Fulda Sacramentary and cite Boniface’s Wessex connections as an explanation for the transmission from Wessex to Northumbria. As noted above, CCC 183, fols. 92v–93v, contains an early Cuthbert office and mass, to which Chester-le-Street Scribe C added on fol. 96v, probably a flyleaf to the manuscript, an unusual Cuthbert sequence of Italian origin (Hohler, “The Durham Services in Honour of St. Cuthbert,” 158–59).
some other liturgical manuscript. Either way, the specificity of the feast day and moon, the visual detail of the tent and roadside location in Wessex, and the use of the local vernacular suggest that Aldred was recording for Bishop Ælfsige and his colleagues a recognizable occasion in their itinerary.

If that journey was like others Bishop Ælfsige is known to have made into Wessex as a negotiator between northern and southern interests, then Aldred may have been documenting a turning point that brought Northumbria and Wessex into alignment with one another. Yet although both men must have become aware of the (re)introduction of Benedictine monastic communal life to some large religious establishments, it seems to have had minimal effect on their community. Chester-le-Street’s *familia* remained secular clergy with perhaps a few monks under the dual headship of a bishop and a provost who administered the community on the bishop’s behalf.72 The title *praefast* (provost) that Aldred used of himself in the colophon was a common translation of *praepositus* and indicates both his authority over the community and his service to the bishop, in this case as his scribal notary.73 The absence of the title abbot in the Chester-le-Street era leaves open the question of whether Aldred or any of his colleagues took vows as monks or lived under a monastic rule.74 The liturgical materials in Durham A.IV.19 show that they at least performed the secular daily office, as examined in chapter 4, while Aldred’s additions indicate an interest in the secular grades of clergy, discussed in chapter 5.

Thus the colophon makes it clear that Aldred and Ælfsige were acting in their roles as secular clergy. Whatever else they brought back from their journey beside the Cuthbert collects and possibly some of the earlier materials in Quire XI, Aldred had in mind the scriptorium and religious services of his community back home.75 The Durham A.IV.19 fol. 84r colophon gives us a

---


74. Boyd, *Aldred’s Marginalia*, 25–29, correlates Aldred’s glosses on simony in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* to his own payments mentioned in the colophon, arguing that Aldred may have been a reformer intent on reintroducing monastic values into the community. It remains more likely, though, that Aldred and the other scribes were secular clergy, possibly married and living in their own domiciles. Later Norman sources, intent on monastic reform, accuse the married secular canons of celebrating a monastic office (Bonner, “St. Cuthbert at Chester-le-Street,” 393).

snapshot of Aldred and his bishop, away from home, but clearly working on a project relevant to their community’s textual and liturgical needs.

Aldred’s interests, evident in both the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and Durham A.IV.19 colophons as well as the additions he made to Durham A.IV.19, focused both on reforming the liturgical observances in his community in line with trends in the south as well as maintaining and enhancing a native Northumbrian tradition of spirituality inherited from Irish-influenced Lindisfarne. From the other additions by Aldred explored in later chapters, it is clear that Aldred was mainly responsible for a kind of conscious archaizing in script, textual contents, and use of the vernacular that kept alive a Northumbrian identity, a task that may explain his transfer to the Chester-le-Street community as detailed in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* colophon.

From both the Durham and *Lindisfarne* colophons, Aldred emerges chiefly as a scribal personality on a mission to rehabilitate *texts*, texts that he viewed primarily as living words served through the medium of writing. But we also see him acting not just for his own edification but in relationship to and on behalf of the spiritual interests of his *familia*. These concerns and relationships with other members of the Chester-le-Street community can be teased out from an examination of the scribes and their additions to Durham A.IV.19 explored in the next chapter.
Animal skin parchment, a writing surface, some ink, a quill, and a knife were the necessary tools at hand to write a text in early medieval Europe, but the craftsmanship needed to use these and other materials in the production of a manuscript were the result of a time-consuming process requiring a team of competent people. Some were engaged in the creation of the tools themselves, soaking, stretching, and sanding the skins or acquiring and preparing ingredients for ink and colors. The scribes themselves needed training in the use of the tools and long practice in the script or scripts they would use, much of it on wax tablets now lost to us. The whole body toils, as one ninth-century scribe noted in a popular aphorism, because the three fingers write, the two eyes see, and the one tongue speaks the words. The labor of writing included not just the formation of the letters on the page but preparing the pages with lines, mixing ink, and sharpening the quill. A

---


knife was handy not only for the latter purpose but also to erase errors; those missed were sometimes corrected in a later review, while some remained on the page for us to see. At least one person had to oversee the design of the folios, from inception in determining the size of the pages and their assembly to the layout, decoration, and binding. All of these processes suggest a hive of activity, a space where the people involved could work together. Usually that place in a medieval religious community is called a scriptorium.

The vision of a scriptorium at Chester-le-Street, however, is necessarily an imagined one gleaned from scribal notes and additions rather than the kind of direct evidence of manuscript production usually adduced. Unlike scriptoria in major centers such as at Canterbury and Winchester, Lindisfarne or Wearmouth-Jarrow, the Cuthbertine community during its century-long sojourn at Chester-le-Street has left little evidence of new manuscript production. Nonetheless, the quires added to Durham A.IV.19 suggest access to vellum and some capacity to bind components together, if only to sew booklets. The existence of multiple scribes also implies a scriptorium, whether it was a single room at Chester-le-Street set apart for that purpose and equipped with tools or whether the scribes worked in different spaces sharing the quires between them. At least in the Lindisfarne Gospels they had visual images of scribes at work, one of whom (Mark) is working at a writing desk, the earliest known portrait of a scribe doing so, but Matthew and Luke write in their laps in the way common in antiquity. From Aldred’s colophon, we know that at least he had a portable scribal kit to take on travel with the bishop. Ironically, therefore, the most revealing personal evidence from a Chester-le-Street scribe came from outside: as explored in the previous chapter, Aldred was new to the community when he did the Lindisfarne gloss and he was in Wessex when he did the Cuthbert collects and colophon (QXI.44–46). Although his contributions are in some ways unique and individual, he was working in and through the community he supervised as provost. Our understanding of the late tenth-century Chester-le-Street community—its members, relationships, aspirations—rests on the fragmentary evidence of how and what these scribes copied in Durham A.IV.19.


5. See T. J. Brown, ed., Durham Ritual, EEMF 16 (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1969), 15–16 for the complex sequence of copying that indicates the scribes were contemporaries working together on the manuscript. For comments on the state of a scriptorium in Chester-le-Street, such as it was, see N. R. Ker, “Aldred the Scribe,” Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association 28 (1942/43): 7–12, at 11–12.

6. See Saenger, Space between Words, 48. Lindisfarne Gospels, fol. 93v, shows Mark writing in a rectangular tablet or codex on a round table; Matthew, however writes in a codex on his lap and Luke on a scroll in his lap; all three hold only a quill or stylus (no knife), while forward-facing John has a scroll and no writing tools; viewable at the British Library website Turning the Pages: Pinnacle of Anglo-Saxon Art at http://www.bl.uk/onlinegallery/ttp/ttpbooks.html. See also the Eadwine Psalter scribe in Cambridge, Trinity College R.17.1, fol. 283v (http://www.trin.cam.ac.uk/index.php?pageid=1015).
In particular, an examination of the structure of the manuscript, organization of the copying, the handwriting, and linguistic features allows us to make some speculations about the relationships between Aldred and his fellow scribes in the scriptorium at Chester-le-Street. These relationships and comparisons highlight Aldred’s leadership role as well as some of his precociousness as a scribe, translator, and teacher—a philologist in the Tolkien sense of the word. Moreover, his vernacular gloss and the educational additions interpreted the received Christian tradition in a local setting, so that he acted as a “religious specialist” in relation to his own community and arguably parts of the surrounding area. Perhaps, as some scholars suggest, Aldred was an agent for religious revival, liturgical reform, and sustained “Englishness” as a means of recovery for Northumbria, but if so it was accompanied by an intentional Northumbrian archaising that may reflect a deliberate effort to define Englishness with a Northumbrian centered heritage.

The first section of this chapter examining the physical (re)construction of the Durham A.IV.19 manuscript in the hands of the Chester-le-Street scribes allows us to speculate about the community’s scriptorium and the relationships between the scribes and their tasks. The resulting codicological arguments posit Durham A.IV.19 as a composite manuscript of separable booklets while in the hands of the Chester-le-Street scribes. Consequently, the second section surveys the codicological history of the manuscript in the later medieval and modern periods. The manuscript’s fragmentation and survival at Durham through various upheavals provides unique continuity from Lindisfarne through Aldred to the present. This long history of the manuscript helps contextualize the analysis of the contents in the succeeding chapters.

IN THE Scriptorium:
PALEOGRAPHY AND CODICOL OGY

The Chester-le-Street scriptorium in the late tenth century as revealed in Durham A.IV.19 housed a team of scribes, only one of whose names we know,
Aldred, while the others are called Scribes B–f. Although lacking a “house style,” they share certain characteristics with each other compared to contemporary scriptoria in other parts of Anglo-Saxon England, especially a preference for an older style of script found in their Northumbrian heritage manuscripts.\(^9\) An examination of the individual traits of each scribe by the style and content of their work indicates complex relationships between them, under the authority of Aldred and perhaps his second in command of the scriptorium, Scribe C.

Paleography is both a science and an art.\(^{10}\) Although paleographers through long practice have developed systems for classifying script types and schools as well as fairly precise means for determining individual hands and variables affecting them, they are also wont to make generalizations and comparisons that are more interpretive. In the case of Aldred, paleographers interested in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and Durham A.IV.19 glosses, colophons, and additions debated whether it was the same hand and person involved in all (debates detailed below). N. R. Ker’s brief but definitive identification in 1942, elaborated on by T. J. Brown in the facsimile editions, established the parts that Aldred wrote here and elsewhere, whether he was writing Old English or Latin, glossing or straight text, even when he experimented with other styles of script.\(^{11}\) Ker’s most telling piece of evidence is in fact the sheer variety of styles in the *Lindisfarne Gospels’* colophon, clearly written by one person who names himself as Aldred. Scribes B–f, and later Durham Scribes M1–3, likewise had distinctive traits identifying them. But the judgment of paleographers on all the Chester-le-Street scribes (Aldred and B–F) is that they were provincial in part because they were not up-to-date with the styles current in the south of England, even compared to Scribe O (image 12) who wrote the original collector earlier in the century, nor were they consistent enough with one another to

---


\(^{10}\) The study of scribal hands involves an examination of the ink pigments, nib width, letter height, and ductus (pen strokes, letter forms and shapes), a study best conducted “hands-on” through imitation as well as with more technical forms of measurement. Lately, Anglo-Saxonists have begun to use electronic databases to analyze and compare these measures, for example, the ManCASS C11 Database Project: *An Inventory of Script and Spellings in Eleventh-Century English*, ed. Donald Scragg, Alexander Rumble, et al. (http://www.arts.manchester.ac.uk/mancass/C11database/). Other scholars are critiquing the language we use to describe differences between textual variants: does a scribe “omit” something, implying failure on his/her part to copy what another version has, or is it that his/her text merely “does not contain” that particular item? See Lauryn S. Mayer, *Worlds Made Flesh: Reading Medieval Manuscript Culture* (New York: Routledge, 2004), xi–xii, citing Elizabeth Bryan, *Collaborative Meaning in Medieval Scribal Culture: The Other Layamon* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999), xii.

suggest a common school or independent scribal tradition. While Scribes E and F were using some aspects of the newly imported Caroline minuscule, albeit with insular influences, Aldred did his glosses in an older insular minuscule found in ninth-century glossed Psalters and Northumbrian manuscripts, not the square minuscule more common in contemporary glossed manuscripts. Scribe C, and to a lesser extent Scribe D, demonstrated competence in majuscule as well as minuscule of an even older date in the Northumbrian tradition. Thus the main scribes in the Chester-le-Street additions to Durham A.IV.19—Aldred and Scribes C and D—used various styles from a century before their own lifetimes rather than what their contemporaries elsewhere practiced.

In essence, the stylistic variability in which they wrote was consciously archaic. One could argue that they were trained by the previous generation in scriptoria isolated by the viking disruptions from any newer manuscripts or scribal training from outside Northumbria. But several fragmentary bits of evidence point to a conscious choice to favor the older styles they inherited from the Lindisfarne and Wearmouth-Jarrow scriptorial legacy, including an Irish aesthetic of manuscript production that looks less “tidy.” First, the community allowed, or even specifically recruited, Aldred to gloss the *Lindisfarne Gospels* in a familiar insular minuscule that perhaps they considered more appropriate for this heritage manuscript. Second, when the newer Caroline elements do appear, they were introduced by scribes subordinate to the senior scribal authorities in the scriptorium, principally Aldred who clearly had an investment in maintaining both content and form from the Lindisfarne past. Third, the Chester-le-Street community did have access to manuscripts with more recent styles, including the original southern English collectar, as well as manuscripts donated to Chester-le-Street by King Athelstan c. 934, who was possibly accompanied by scribes using the newer minuscule. In Durham A.IV.19,
however, no effort was made to coordinate or impose a house style other than this preference on the part of the senior scribes for styles found in manuscripts predating these gifts. Rather, the loose collection of texts added at Chester-le-Street reflect the styles and interests of the scribes who wrote them. Hence, a portrait of each scribe is the best way to form a beginning sense of the scriptorium and of Durham A.IV.19’s additions.

Aldred was the chief scribe both in terms of quantity and overall ability, demonstrating his leadership in the Durham A.IV.19 additions (images 13–16). His contributions included both the copying of Latin additions and vernacular glossing of his own and some other scribes’ Latin texts, in addition to the Lindisfarne Gospels gloss and his Latin gloss to Bede’s Commentary on Proverbs in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 819 (image 20). In the original collectar, he added an Old English gloss (fols. 1r–61v10) continuous, save for one break (fols. 53v–54r), as well as supplied two missing Latin rubrics and numerous decorated initials. He also began a similar Old English gloss on some of the first additions to Quire VIII (fol. 61r11–61v10) and made a number of corrections there and in the earlier portions of the original collectar. In the added quires (IX-XI), he copied Latin prayers, hymns, texts for the daily office, and compiled educational materials, also mostly glossed in Old English (fols. 66r–67v5; most of fols. 77r–88v), and of course added the Cuthbert collects, memorandum, and colophon on fol. 84r (image 10). Overall, his output was considerable, suggesting a significant investment of time committed to glossing over the course of his career at Chester-le-Street and offering us a longer view of a scribe’s development.

Aldred’s expertise was an Anglo-Saxon minuscule more common in eighth- and ninth-century Northumbrian texts. It closely resembles, for example, the Book of Cerne, a Mercian manuscript with some Irish-derived texts. His ability to write this form quickly and cursively indicates this is the style he was originally trained in, developed extensively glossing the Lindisfarne Gospels, and then used with ease and relative consistency in the Durham gloss. That the later Durham gloss is in a more informal cursive hand than in Lindisfarne may also indicate a hierarchy of scripts based on the status of the manuscript and

17. See image 13 for both Aldred’s gloss to Scribe O’s work in the original collectar and his gloss and corrections to Scribe B in the first addition.
19. T. J. Brown (Durham Ritual, 26–27), based on Ker and others, gives as one reason the Lindisfarne Gospels were done earlier than the Durham A.IV.19 gloss, is the stabilization midway through the Lindisfarne Gospels of his use of “v” for both “u” and “wyn,” evident in Durham A.IV.19. Aldred’s work in Bodley 819 was done between the Lindisfarne Gospels and Durham glosses (see Cod. Lind. Vol. 2, Bk 2, p. 33).
the task at hand. The majority of his Latin texts in Durham A.IV.19 are in a formal minuscule, where he also uses Latin abbreviations typical of eighth- and ninth-century Irish texts, again indicating his immersion in and respect for Northumbrian manuscript traditions.

Despite his clear Northumbrian preferences, he also engaged in considerable script experimentation. Many of his texts included enlarged and decorated initials in various formats, such as Caroline “a,” which are hard to distinguish in some cases from the decorative initial “d”s, found especially in the texts he added in Quire XI. On the colophon page (fol. 84r; image 10), both the Old English colophon (QXI.46) and the Latin collects for St. Cuthbert (QXI.44) are in Aldred’s regular minuscules for those languages. However, the initials (one “O” and three “Ds” in the collects) experiment with different decorations and forms. Meanwhile, as discussed in the previous chapter, the memorandum (QXI.45) is in Latin done in a mixture of Greek and Roman alphabets and capital and minuscule script, perhaps copied from a monument or artifact he encountered on the journey. The irregular lines on the page may be the result of writing on a portable writing surface.

A similar experimentation in script is evident in the Latin of the field prayers on fols. 66r–67v5 (QIX/X.14, image 13), where he attempted to use an insular majuscule which, in the judgment of paleographer T. J. Brown, wanted a wider pen; by fol. 67r14 he had reverted to minuscule. More than likely, he was copying an exemplar, not just the script but also careful formatting and alignment of the text. His experiments imitating a script he was not trained in here and in the fol. 84ra memorandum, along with variation and influence of other styles throughout his writing, glossing, and decorating initials, show Aldred’s adventurous side and his adaptability to the task at hand. Overall, though, his writing style is competent; whether he was trained elsewhere or not, in part self-taught, his style reflects older Northumbrian traditions.

20. Parkes, Their Hands before Our Eyes, 130–32. Cod. Lind. Vol. 2, Part 2, pp. 21–24, notes how his gloss to Lindisfarne started out bolder in style and size, but became more attenuated, perhaps to avoid the appearance of competing with the main Latin text; they also note the phases of “dilapidation” where Aldred’s hand looks tired, both in the bottom right corners of pages where the hand lacks support but also in longer sets of passages that may indicate cold temperature or illness.

21. T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 29. See for example, fol. 80va lines 6, 15, and 23. Also, in the Lindisfarne Gospels colophon, he used Caroline “a” for his name in two places as well as in Eadfrid’s name in one place. For further discussion of “a” in relation to Scribe B’s difficulties with the letter, see chapter 5.

22. Aldred made no attempt to gloss the Cuthbert collects, although there is space to do so; his glossing of the previous liturgical material had changed on folio 83v to glossing only the titles of the sections but not the psalm incipits.

23. T. J. Brown (Durham Ritual, 39) suggests this is a pattern similar to the ninth-century Northumbrian Book of Cerne, but it is also visible in Scribe C’s stint 4 mixing majuscule and minuscule script at the end of Quire VIII.

24. Ruling of the text box and lines is clearest on fol. 66r; in two places he aligns text to the right (66r11, the last line of the first prayer and 66r22, the last line of the page); at the end of the last prayer, he centers the concluding words.
More significant, he had no imitators among the Chester-le-Street scribes, suggesting that while Aldred headed a school or a scriptorium of some sort, he did not train the other scribes in Durham A.IV.19, although he corrects them. Rather, the others have distinctively different traits. Scribe C appears as the main scribe after Aldred, with B, D, E and F adding selections between C’s in such a complex pattern that it is clear they must have been working together at the same time. The contrast between “clumsy” B’s one contribution and C’s prolific and skilled contributions shows the range of expertise in the scriptorium, while Scribes D, E, and F added a handful of texts in mixed script forms suggesting experimentation. This in itself tells us something about the community and its interests that they were willing to take precious parchment and use it to experiment with, and reflect on, different texts.

Scribe C wrote most of the additional liturgical texts in a skilled hand that varied between Anglo-Saxon majuscule and minuscule with apparent ease (images 17, 19). His is an insular style even older than Aldred’s, harking back to eighth-century Northumbrian exemplars, a sample of which is found in the binding sheet (fol. 89, QXI.56).25 He copied Latin benedictions, hymns, memorials, mass prayers, and collects in eight stints identifiable by changes in ink and form, interspersed with contributions from other scribes.26 Like Aldred, Scribe C was a Northumbrian as evidenced by one phrase he wrote in Old English, but his scribal training was clearly different from Aldred’s. Perhaps raised and trained at Chester-le-Street from before Aldred’s arrival, Scribe C became a reliable scribe for copying large chunks of Latin text, but seemingly without the panache of Aldred.

Nonetheless, Scribe C, despite his obvious competence, made some copying errors that may indicate haste or that the work was unplanned and transitory enough that corrections and signe de renvoi redirecting the reader were acceptable.27 Scribe C committed at least four page-turn “errors” or interpolations discussed in greater detail in chapter 4’s examination of the liturgical content: a cross blessing in the middle of a milk and honey blessing (62v18–63v4, QVIII.3), with other corrections by Aldred; cross memorials alternating with Vespers materials (68r17–v30, QIX/X.17–19); more prayers for the dead added at the bottoms of fols. 71r, 71v, and 72r below Masses for the Trinity, One Confessor, and Martyr, but undoubtedly belonging with the previous Memorials for the Dead (70r15–71r7, QIX/X.22); and a Gospel passage from Matthew copied several pages later (fol. 75v) that belongs with the mass prayers for One

26. Scribe C’s hand also has been identified on an end folio (singleton) of CCCC 483 where he added a Latin sequence for St. Cuthbert in majuscule and musical notation, discussed below.
27. Scribe C’s work is corrected by Aldred on fols. 62v24–63r18 (see T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 29); later Durham Scribe M3 added materials to his work on fol. 68rv, showing the continued use of these texts after the move from Chester-le-Street to Durham.
Confessor on fol. 72r3 where he provides an Old English note directing the reader to the later folio. Further, as he neared the end of the memorials in Quire IX/X, he apparently ran out of red ink for doing the rubricated titles. These compilation issues, combined with the interruptions in his work from the other scribes, are the strongest evidence for the Durham A.IV.19 additions constituting a workbook of some type, although that label should not cause us to devalue the relevance of the texts.

The other scribes at Chester-le-Street (B, D, E, and F) were clearly working under Aldred and Scribe C, supplementing their work or perhaps being assigned copying tasks as part of their training or advancement.

Scribe B’s Anglo-Saxon minuscule text (QVIII.1; image 12) is inexpert enough to suggest inexperience if not youth, as well as a weak grasp of written Latin. He has several copying, possibly oral/aural, errors as well as variations in his letterforms, some of which he caught and others of which Aldred corrected when he glossed the text, using his red ink. As explored in chapter 5, these corrections, and the fact that his gloss runs over into Scribe C’s work on the verso for ten lines or so, suggest that Aldred’s corrections were probably coterminous with Scribe B’s work as part of an instructional exercise. The position of Scribe B’s text right after the end of the original collectar in the half page left blank (fol. 61r) suggests he was allowed to use this otherwise unused space to copy what was a favorite insular text, a prayer for poison based on an apocryphal story of John. Thus Scribe B, with Aldred’s assistance, likely added his standalone text after the other additions to Quire VIII.

Scribe D, on the other hand, exhibits very similar traits to Scribe C’s older Northumbrian style and may have been trained along with him at Chester-le-Street or elsewhere in Northumbria (images 17, 18). He added benedictions on fols. 63v5–64ra between C’s contributions, in a majuscule mixing more into minuscule as he went along (QVIII.4–7). Scribes E and F, however, wrote in the Caroline minuscule style introduced in England circa 950, although the insular habits intruding in their hands suggest prior training in the older style and hint at the predominantly insular character of the Chester-le-Street scriptorium and manuscript library. Scribe E, whose large hand resembles that of contemporary liturgical manuscripts in the south, added general prayers on fol. 64r9–17 (QVIII.8; image 18), but also copied a Passion hymn over erasure in the original collectar (fol. 53v), a hymn copied by Scribe C in the additions on fol. 64v (QVIII.9), right after Scribe E’s brief contribution on fol. 64r. In addition, Scribe E filled in some Advent materials on the back side of the colophon page (fol. 84v, QXI.47)—after Aldred’s return since he seems to have

---

28. At fol. 74v22 (QIX/X.23g).
punched a hole through while erasing a mistake, marring one of the Cuthbert collects. Scribe F, meanwhile, copied in two widely separate places antiphons, versicles, and responds for lections from Old Testament books and apocrypha (image 19). He may also be identified with the hand adding the poem honoring King Athelstan to the Durham Gospels (Durham Cathedral Library A.III.17), discussed below.

The sequence of copying hints at some odd working relationships among the scribes that requires some complex codicological guesswork regarding the assembly of its quire booklets. Analysis of Durham A.IV.19 reveals that its quires have been much disturbed, both in the tenth century and later. Quires with different numbers of bifolia, lost folios, damage to the remaining folios, and additions in the new ones mean that the manuscript probably was only loosely bound or even disbound during Aldred’s time when the scriptorium was working on parts of it separately. Moreover, its quires might not have been bound into a single manuscript at Chester-le-Street but remained as sewn booklets until a later period at Durham. For example, fol. 47 is a singleton inserted in quire VII that would have been loose if the manuscript were disbound; significantly, this folio has texts similar to some of the additions, is marked by Aldred with an xb’ sign in an upper corner, and has extensive marginia by Durham Scribe M3 as well as in the additions with comparable texts. The xb’ (christus benedictus or christe benedic) an Irish-imported sign commonly used to signal a new writing phase, occurs four times in Durham A.IV.19, three clearly by Aldred. Two of those mark new quires (fol. 66r, QIX and fol. 77r,
QXI), while the one on the heavily marked fol. 47v might have served as a linking or finding aid when collating materials from different parts or booklets of the manuscript.

In another instance showing quire separation, Aldred’s one break in glossing in the original collectar occurs precisely at the break between quires VII and VIII (fols. 53v–54r); and it is exactly here that E copies a hymn over erasure, a hymn duplicated by C in the additions (QVIII.9). Either Aldred stopped glossing at the quire break in order to accommodate this erasure and E’s addition or because it had already taken place. Curiously, the erased page contained the remains of a nuptial mass, apparently of less interest to the community than the ordeal materials that preceded and followed it.

The codicology of Durham A.IV.19’s additions is complex and leads to the conclusion that the parts were moveable both during production and later. The original collectar produced in southern England and received at Chester-le-Street had nine quires, but the first is now missing, as are several other pages throughout the manuscript, as shown on the Quire map in the appendix. The last quire, now numbered Quire VIII, offered almost five blank folios where the Chester-le-Street scribes made a series of additions in different hands and formats. Quires IX–XI in the present manuscript binding were produced by the Chester-le-Street scribes on similar, although more variable, quality membrane as the original collectar, but were not necessarily bound together until later.38 Quires IX and X (reversed in the modern bindings) through folio 75 form a single booklet of material that does not necessarily follow from Quire VIII. Quire X is four singletons rather than folded bifolia.39 The first three singletons contain material continuing from Quire IX but ending on fol. 75v, leaving room for a later scribe (M1 at Durham) to add what appears to be a coda ending a booklet or even the manuscript, at least at that time. The fourth singleton of Quire X, fol. 76, much worn on the verso, contains material independent of the previous singletons in Quire X and therefore may have been located elsewhere in certain periods. Quire XI can stand separately as a booklet, as when it traveled with Aldred and Bishop Ælfsige to Wessex, and could have been placed right after Quire VIII, since it ends with hymns and Aldred started Quire XI with hymns, albeit of a different calendar sequence.

Moreover, the binding sheet taken from an eighth-century Northumbrian lectionary (fol. 89, QXI.56) contains scribal evidence not only of its presence

---


38. T. J. Brown, *Durham Ritual*, 12–13. It is unclear where or how the vellum was produced; perhaps Chester-le-Street acquired some of it from the same source as the original collectar.

39. The first three singletons contain material independent of the previous singletons in Quire X and therefore may have been located elsewhere in certain periods. Quire XI can stand separately as a booklet, as when it traveled with Aldred and Bishop Ælfsige to Wessex, and could have been placed right after Quire VIII, since it ends with hymns and Aldred started Quire XI with hymns, albeit of a different calendar sequence.

Moreover, the binding sheet taken from an eighth-century Northumbrian lectionary (fol. 89, QXI.56) contains scribal evidence not only of its presence
with these folios in the tenth and eleventh centuries but of movement in relation to Quire X, although it presently follows Quire XI. The binding sheet is cut and quarter-turned with pen trials on both sides. On fol. 89r, a hand has added a segment from M1’s fol. 75v verses in a Caroline hand, done therefore either by M1 himself as a pen trial or after by someone else; either way, it potentially occurred at a time when the binding sheet stood next to fol. 75. However, at the top of the other side of the binding sheet, fol. 89v, an earlier, tenth-century hand, now upside down, has added an Old English phrase, with some similarities to an abcedarial pen trial on fol. 76. This suggests that the binding sheet moved around in the tenth and eleventh centuries with or in relation to the Quire X singletons and supports the contention that the organization and binding of the additional quires took place later, at Durham.

Comparing the Chester-le-Street scribes’ contributions in relation to the quires and codicology shows that Scribe C controlled most of the additions to Quire VIII and into Quires IX and X. Aldred’s glossing and oversight disappear after the beginning of Quire IX, but he reappears in full control of Quire XI. The following analysis attempts to narrate a possible scenario that explains the relationship between Aldred and the other scribes as they copied materials into these quires. This storyline suggests they viewed the manuscript not as a whole or a uniform set of texts, but as a collection of booklets or even singlets for scribal experiments, textual collation, educational study, and spiritual reflection.

In Quire VIII, on the remaining blank pages of the original collectar, Scribe C started out in charge of copying, with additions—arguably even interruptions—from scribes D and E, all of them with materials that complemented rather than duplicated the original collectar. He starts fresh on the top of fol. 61v, leaving blank the remaining space on the recto later filled by Scribe B’s text (corrected and glossed by Aldred, who continues for a few lines onto Scribe’s C’s text on the verso). Beginning here, Scribe C completed the first two of his eight writing stints copying benedictions (to fol. 63v4), with some corrections by Aldred. At that point Scribes D and E made contributions with similar benedictional material that finish on fol. 64r17, where Scribe E’s large letters and widely spaced lines take up much of that page in stark contrast to both C and D’s neat and tight styles. Scribe E probably added these two generic prayers on fol. 64r before D, since D’s text finishing at the top of 64r is tightly crammed in compared to the wider spacing he was doing on 63v following C’s lineation. On the verso (fol. 64v), Scribe C introduced a new type of material, hymns, using an imposing majuscule. He copied there a Passiontide hymn that Scribe E also copied on an erased page in the original collectar (fol. 53v, end of Quire VII).

Why the same hymn (QVIII.9) was copied twice by two different scribes using slightly different abbreviations and punctuation is unclear, other than
the fact that it is a hymn found in Anglo-Saxon and German hymnals but not in the Frankish.\textsuperscript{40} That Scribe E also did another of his only three entries right before Scribe C copied this hymn suggests the work of copying the hymn in both places may have been done at around the same time, with both Scribe C and E working side-by-side or together, either copying from the same exemplar, from dictation, or one copying from the other. This would require the manuscript to be in an unbound state, allowing one or the other scribe to put the two pages side-by-side for copying or comparison, along with an exemplar.\textsuperscript{41}

Moreover, after this one duplicate hymn on fol. 64v, Scribe C’s hymns resumed only after Scribe F has copied lectionary antiphons and versicles (QVIII.10), which he did in triple column below the hymn on fol. 64v and then continued in double column on fol. 65r. When Scribe C began hymns again in the remaining right column (QVIII.11–13), he did so in a smaller majuscule than he had used on the first hymn, until the verso, where he reverted to the single column full-width style but in minuscule. He probably tightened his lines into a minuscule hand in order to finish the hymns at the bottom of this last folio in the original collectar’s Quire VIII. These scribal alternations in Quire VIII suggest that while Aldred or Scribe C might have been in charge, not everything went according to a preconceived plan. Rather, we can imagine the group of scribes interacting with each other, taking turns copying material in the same quire, either passing it around or working at different times. Given that the scribes were more than likely secular canons, they undoubtedly had other duties that broke up the work.\textsuperscript{42}

The work might very well have ended with finishing out quire VIII in the original collectar. Instead, the scriptorium produced at least three more quires of texts, a few of them found also in the original collectar but most of them different. In these, Aldred took on a greater role beyond a few corrections and a bit of glossing by copying Latin texts, alongside continuing contributions from Scribes C, E, and F (B and D thus drop out). Wear and tear at the boundaries between these added quires indicate they were bound only loosely to one

\footnotesize{
40. Inge B. Milfull, \textit{The Hymns of the Anglo-Saxon Church: A Study and Edition of the 'Durham Hymnal'} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 21, 23, 58. Milfull points out that the Anglo-Saxon hymnal is composite from different sources, with this one (Hy 68) coming from Germany.

41. Fol. 53v where Scribe E made his copy of the hymn is the end of Quire VII, while Scribe C’s is in the later half of Quire VIII. Although some abbreviations differ, both scribes have “morte morte” rather than, as occurs in other hymnals, “morte mortem.” Both Durham copies of this hymn also differ from the other hymnals in having a full doxology at the end. Another curiosity is that Scribe E’s first word of the hymn on fol. 53v, \textit{Auctor}, is written over probably by an early modern hand who also corrected the first three letters (\textit{inlitus} erroneously for \textit{inclitus}); on fol. 64v the same hand added “Auctor” in the margin above the start of C’s copy of the hymn. See Milfull, \textit{Hymns}, 280.

42. Malcolm Parkes notes a similar pattern of "portio communis" work by secular canons on a set of Rheims manuscripts under Hincmar (\textit{Their Hands before Our Eyes}, 88–90) as well as at Exeter (11–12); see also Jerome Bertram, ed. and trans., \textit{The Chrodegang Rules: The Rules for the Common Life of the Secular Clergy from the Eighth and Ninth Centuries. Critical Texts with Translations and Commentary} (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), 15–16.
}
another and the original collectar or circulated as separate booklets. Nonetheless, Quires IX and X through fol. 75 form a unit, with a continuous text copied from the end of IX into X, despite the fact that a modern binder reversed them—unfortunately still misbound today, although T. J. Brown’s EEMf facsimile restores the correct order and renumbers the folios accordingly. Aldred took the lead briefly in Quire IX by copying a unique set of texts beginning in an unusual script for him, a red majuscule, which he subsequently glossed in black. Perhaps the exemplar from which he copied these field prayers—probably of Irish origins—was in majuscule and he decided to try his hand at it; he may also have been inspired by Scribe C’s use of majuscule and minuscule in the hymns he copied at the end of Quire VIII. In any case, his experimental use of script may indicate that the texts were highly valued.

Scribe C begins his contributions in Quire IX right after Aldred’s field prayers with similar, but identifiable, liturgical exorcisms and protective prayers (fol. 67v6–68r16, QIX/X.15–16), some of them duplicates from the original collectar, unlike his additions to Quire VIII intended as a continuation. Quire IX/X was then a portable booklet that duplicated some of the original collectar, but done after its acquisition as a supplement. The initial set of blessings he copied in Quire IX are followed by Vesper prayers and various Memorials, reform elaborations on the daily office not found in the original collectar, that continue onto the first three singletons of Quire X. Scribe C’s tight lines left little room for a gloss, which Aldred does not attempt in any case, whether he was present to do so or not. On folio 76, the fourth singleton currently bound in Quire X, Scribe C copied on the recto, in a separate writing stint, eight collects for canonical hours, unrubricated (QIX/X.24). On fol. 76 verso (QIX/X.25), very worn and almost illegible now, Scribe F offered antiphons and versicles similar to his other contribution at 64v17–65rb17 (QVIII.10).

The Quire IX–X booklet thus presents a puzzle. The existence of singletons suggests a mode of production involving assembly as you go with binding concerns relegated to later (when fol. 76 may have been stuck with the other three). Scribe C seems to have added the first three singletons of Quire X in order to complete the task he began in Quire IX (there is no break in text or writing stint from the end of IX to the beginning of X). One wonders if he would have been able to complete this set of materials within Quire IX if Aldred had not added his field prayers at the beginning.

Quire XI, on the other hand, seems to be Aldred’s quire, as compared to C’s dominance in Quires VIII–X, while the other scribes mostly filled leftover

43. T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 16.
44. The numbering followed here, although the older numbering is indicated in brackets since it is used in the ASM facsimile guide.
45. There is a break in his writing stints 6 and 7 at 71r7 between the memorials and masses (QIX/X.22–23); T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 30.
or intervening spaces with shorter materials. Theoretically, Aldred could have worked on Quire XI separately or even at the same time that the community worked on the additions in Quires VIII–X. Aldred’s contributions to Quires VIII–X were minimal: at one point amid the additions in Quire VIII, he glossed and corrected Scribe B and a bit of C; he then copied and glossed the field prayers at the beginning of Quire IX but made no other contributions to quires IX and X. Notably also, Scribe C’s blessings (QIX/X.15–16) copied right after Aldred’s field prayers are duplicates of materials in the original collectar that Aldred had already glossed.46 But Aldred may very well have left on his journey while further work on these quires took place, taking Quire XI with him. He may have already started the glossed hymns and office materials at the beginning of that quire, or may have done some of them on the road: the hymns end short on the verso of fol. 77 (space filled by later scribe M2), then Aldred picked up on fol. 78 in double columns, a format that might have been easier when copying on a portable writing surface and which he continued with the Cuthbert collects and colophon in the middle of the quire while in Wessex. Then he presumably brought the quire back to Chester-le-Street partially complete, finishing it with the very different encyclopedic material that he also glossed. Since E’s addition of Advent antiphons (QXI.47) occurs on the back side of the isolated colophon page (fol. 84) and scratches a hole in the Cuthbert collects, it had to have been done at some point after the 970 journey, unless of course Scribe E was with the traveling party. Probably, then, the materials Aldred copied in the remainder of Quire XI occurred after his return.47

Although this scenario is purely speculative, it is hard to imagine that Aldred hauled the entire volume of the original collectar and additional quires with him, adding only to quire XI but not finishing or continuing his glosses and corrections in the earlier quires.48 It makes more sense that the main manuscript, the original collectar with the additions to Quire VIII and the folios that

46. Also, some of Scribe C’s lines on fols. 68–70 (QIX/X.18–22) are so narrow and tight as to leave little room for glossing.

47. T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 17, thinks that Aldred did all of the material in quire XI in one writing campaign except for leaving blank most of fol. 84 between the liturgical material and the educational material, later filling it in with the Cuthbert collects, memorandum, and colophon (QXI.44–46), but why it would be left blank is unclear.

48. For the view that Aldred had Quire XI in Wessex not bound with the original collectar, see Thompson, Rituale, xii; Corrêa, Durham Collectar, 77 and 120; and T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 17, who suggests that it was carried in the bishop's bag. Other scholars assume that Bishop Ælfsige and Aldred acquired the southern English collectar in Wessex while on the journey noted in the Quire XI colophon: Bonner, “St Cuthbert at Chester-le-Street,” in St. Cuthbert, His Cult and Community to A.d. 1200, ed. Bonner, David Rollason, and Clare Stancliffe (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1989), 393; M. Brown, Lindisfarne Gospels, 98, David Rollason, Northumbria, 500–1000: Creation and Destruction of a Kingdom (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 271–72; and Richard W. Pfaff, The Liturgy in Medieval England: A History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 65. Although it remains possible that they brought the collectar back with the Quire XI booklet attached after the blank folios, that sequence makes it more difficult to explain how and why the Chester-le-Street scribes would then begin adding to the end of the blank folios in the original collectar’s Quire VIII and into the Quire IX–X booklet.
became Quires IX and X, remained in the community where the scribes whose handiwork we see could have been done in the absence of Aldred, which would account for the inconsistency and then disappearance of his contributions as the work went forward. Admittedly, Aldred’s Old English gloss to the original collectar and his own texts could have been added at any point after the Latin texts, long after his return from the 970 journey even. But the presence of his corrections and glosses only at the beginning of the additions in Quire VIII seemingly continued straight on from the gloss to the original collectar suggest he was there at the onset of the additional work but not later. It is also possible to imagine that he had begun the hymns in Quire XI as a continuation of those Scribe C copied at the end of VIII, took the quire with him to Wessex, leaving Scribe C to do other things now found in Quires IX–X, although Aldred had already added his field prayers at the beginning of Quire IX, leaving Scribe C with the rest of it for his use.

What does all of this say about the Chester-le-Street scriptorium, the relationships between the scribes, and their use of manuscripts? With his gloss to the main manuscript and his contributions throughout the additions, Aldred the Provost was clearly the overseer of the scriptorium at Chester-le-Street, under the authority of the bishop. Scribe C may have been in charge of the scriptorium during Aldred’s absence, coordinating the additions by his contemporary Scribe D, and the adaptable Scribes E and F. The manuscript evidence does not quite tell us whether they all got along, but it appears they at least occasionally competed with one another for use of resources and opportunities to practice their craft. The Chester-le-Street community had what could be described as a scriptorium, in that it had scribes and materials such as ink and vellum, possibly in short supply. But it is not evident that they had the means or need to bind full volumes. Instead, they focused on adapting and adding to existing manuscripts. On the other hand, we do not know what has been lost—such as other service books from or into which they copied other materials.

Earlier, contemporary, and later scribes who undertook similar work at Chester-le-Street or at Durham confirm this picture. The Durham Gospels, held at Chester-le-Street but unmarked by Aldred, contains a rather crude inscription by one Boge with his own name, along with the name of his bishop, another Aldred (Bishop of Chester-le-Street, 944–68); it also has a poem of c. 927 honoring King Athelstan, possibly in the hand of Scribe F.49 Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 183, the gift of King Athelstan to the Chester-le-Street

49. Durham Cathedral Library A.II.17 (incomplete gospels s. vii/viii, Northumbria; poem on King Athelstan, fol. 31v, s. x/xi; Boge hand, fols. 80, 80v, 106, c. 968); Ker 105, Gneuss 220–221; The Durham Gospels, together with fragments of a Gospel Book in Uncial, Durham Cathedral Library Ms. A.II.17, ed. C. D. Verey, T. J. Brown, E. Coatsworth and R. Powell, EEMF 20 (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1980), 51–52 on Boge and 63 for discussion of its fragmentary state and rebinding; see Nees, “Reading Aldred’s Colophon,” 363–64 and M. Brown, Lindisfarne, 92, fig. 46.
community in 934, containing primarily Cuthbert materials, also has an encyclopedic set of texts of a type similar to, but completely different from, Aldred’s in Quire XI, discussed in chapter 4. CCCC 183 also has an added singleton, fol. 96, that is blank on the recto while the verso contains texts of three different hands and eras: Scribe C writing a majuscule Latin sequence for St. Cuthbert with musical notation, *Hodiernus sacratior*; a list of kitchen and church items in a tenth- or eleventh-century hand, partially matching Athelstan’s gifts; and a land grant by Bishop Walcher, clearly an eleventh-century Durham contribution. T. J. Brown notes the similarity between Scribe C’s text and his contribution to Durham A.IV.19 on fol. 76r, also a stand-alone singleton, so perhaps the CCCC 183 flyleaf fol. 96 should be considered in relation to Durham A.IV.19, complementing its office texts and Aldred’s Cuthbert collects.  

Further evidence of scribal additions to Durham A.IV.19 by scribes M1–3 after the move to Durham demonstrate that the work of the Chester-le-Street scribes, particularly Aldred’s, was valuable for continuity with their historic past even amidst major changes in the community. Although the Durham scriptorium maintained and added to Durham A.IV.19, CCCC 183, and other manuscripts transferred as part of their community’s heritage, along with more high-status manuscripts such as the *Lindisfarne Gospels*, these scribes belonged to a new generation. Their southern-influenced styles demonstrate a break with the older Northumbrian styles retained by the Chester-le-Street scriptorium.

Scribe M1, writing a pure Caroline script, added in some blank space on the bottom of fol. 75v a set of verses honoring Bishop Aldhun (990–1018), perhaps commemorating the move of the community to Durham in 995 (QIX/X.23M1). The location suggests that at some time fol. 75 was the end of either the manuscript or a booklet, followed by the binding sheet where a portion of his text also appears (fol. 89r, QXI.56, as discussed above). Scribe M2, writing in a Caroline-inflected Anglo-Saxon minuscule, also found space to commemorate the bishop with an episcopal benediction he copied on fol. 77v after Aldred’s hymns (image 14; QXI.32). He also produced an entry on a folio insert in the *Durham Liber vitae*. Scribe M3, who betrays a southern dialect and

---


style, entered several interlinear corrections and two marginal texts, but only on one page of the original collectar (fol. 47) and in Quire IX of the additions, which may have once been contiguous. One of the insertions, for example, was their patron saint Cuthbert’s name in an All Saints memorial copied by Scribe C (fol. 69v28). On the singleton and much marked fol. 47v, he contributed some Old English instructions and Latin text for a house blessing (QIX/X.160M3), while on 68rv he added corrections and verses in a memorial to the Cross with Vespers (QIX/X.17–20), material right after Scribe C’s closely similar house blessings which M3 did not mark; this conjunction suggests the possibility that in Scribe M3’s day, the singleton fol. 47 was loose and conceivably placed between fols. 67 and 68 overlaying the redundant work of Scribe C.

This attempt to map the personal relationships among the various scribes at Chester-le-Street and at Durham, although ultimately impossible, is nonetheless a fruitful exercise for helping us imagine a sense of the community and their interests. In addition to the virtual dismantling of the manuscript through paleographic and codicological analysis, another way of understanding Durham A.IV.19 and the lost scribal community it represents is to trace its later history as a manuscript. In part, this is a story of what is missing, but often realizing what could be missing is a way of understanding what remains. This longer manuscript history also serves to remind us of the cumulative value of scholarship, in the tenth century as well as in the twenty-first.

**MEDIEVAL SURVIVAL AND MODERN ANTIQUARIANS:**
**THE LATER HISTORY OF DURHAM A.IV.19**

In the 1930s Kenneth Sisam argued for a return to the *fontes vivi* of manuscript studies in imitation of Humphrey Wanley, rather than a passive reliance on catalogs and facsimiles. Wanley was well known not only for his observational skills but also for his ability to replicate Old English scripts himself, a habit all paleographers would do well to develop. What follows is a recognition of the shoulders on which modern paleographic work rests, with Wanley figuring at the center of Durham A.IV.19’s long history. Examining the later and post-medieval history tells us much about the manuscript as well as the community of St. Cuthbert after the move to Durham, where the manuscript has remained down to the present. In essence, Durham A.IV.19 constitutes a “self-authenti-

---

54. Corrêa dates M3 to the Chester-le-Street era, while T. J. Brown assigns him to after the Durham move. Scribe M3’s changes (T. J. Brown, *Durham Ritual*, 35): 68r20–27, 28 (clemente miseratone repelle. per); 68v4, 15, 23–27; 69 at top (predicamas); 69v7, 24; 69v11, 32; 69v17 (ael memoriam), 28 (cuthberht), 29 (quesumus); 70t4, 18, 24; 70v24; 71r16; 72v16. M3 also added to CCCC 183 on fol. 91rv (T. J. Brown, *Durham Ritual*, 36).

cating witness,” an artifact whose materiality and textuality testify to the activities of those who made, marked, and manipulated its folios. Durham A.IV.19 as a tangible artifact connects us to a chain of scholars back to Aldred.

Just as the previous section deconstructed the manuscript into separate booklets and scribal intentions, this section deconstructs the paleographic and codicological enterprise itself. This broader view of Durham A.IV.19 points to the different ways the manuscript has been read, understood, and studied. Marks left on the pages as well as gaps in the manuscript’s quires and its history are quite revealing about what this manuscript meant, first to the community in Northumbria and later to scholars desiring to understand that community, their language, liturgical life, and scribal habits.

All the handlers of Durham A.IV.19 have in common some sense of intimacy with the manuscript gained through their interactions with it, but we often divide them by the chronological labels of medieval and modern into two categories of primary and secondary sources. First are the “original creators” who were involved in the processes of manuscript production—addition, modification, and subtraction—in the case of Durham A.IV.19, primarily in the tenth and eleventh centuries. Second are the “scholars” who study the static object, mostly from the seventeenth century to the present, as something “other” from the past. Between these two groups—from about 1200 to 1700—lies a no-man’s land in terms of evidence for the manuscript’s physical location and handling.

These three phases in the history of Durham A.IV.19 reveal a distinct difference between the value and treatment of its texts (Latin and Old English, verbal and written) and the manuscript as a physical object, both its vellum and its status as a relic or artifact. In the first phase, from c. 900–1200, Durham A.IV.19’s constituent parts, both textual and material, were remade and reused not only at Chester-le-Street but also in Durham, as detailed in the first part of this chapter. In phase two, from c. 1200–1700, Durham A.IV.19 virtually disappears from the evidentiary record into storage areas, its texts no longer of use, but its vellum valued and reused. The third phase begins with the reappearance of Durham A.IV.19 in the hands of antiquarians around 1700 and continues to the present day, with both the texts and the manuscript studied and manipulated as a single artifact.

The first phase, c. 900–1200, began with the original southern English collector copied by Scribe O, followed by the additions made at Chester-le-Street.

56. Gary Frost, University of Iowa Library preservationist and participant in the summer 2008 Obermann Center workshop on Materialist Readings of Medieval Manuscripts, reminded us that the manuscript—not the text in any other format whether facsimile or critical edition—is the only authentic witness.

57. For the artificiality of the medieval/modern divide and its implications for historians of the Middle Ages, see Kathleen Davis, Periodization and Sovereignty: How Ideas of Feudalism and Secularization Govern the Politics of Time (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008).
by Aldred and Scribes B–F in the original intact nine quires and several additional quires, booklets, or singletons as outlined above. After the community moved to Durham in 995 under the episcopacy of Aldhun, the work of Scribes M1, M2, and M3 demonstrates that these surviving parts of Durham A.IV.19 continued in the possession of the bishop and that the materials had some value as part of the community’s heritage. This generation of scribes may have been the first to bind the additional quires (IX–XI) to the original southern English collectar, perhaps because of their common associations with Aldred and the Chester-le-Street scriptorium.

Durham A.IV.19 may have survived the eleventh-century monastic reconstitution of the community in connection with the building up of the cult of St. Cuthbert on the foundation of its historic Lindisfarne records and relics, as described in the HSC and Symeon of Durham, a Northumbrian identity further solidified in the twelfth century. At the same time, the Durham Liber vitae, relatively untouched during the Chester-le-Street era, was recompiled at Durham as part of an effort to solidify the monastic history of the community. Its composite construction, with a core original text dating from the eighth century, included blank folios, added folios, and later erasures and additions, including one by Scribe M2. Durham A.IV.19 might have been refurbished in similar ways for the same reasons.

Increasingly, however, over the late eleventh and into the twelfth century, marks made in the manuscript’s pages were more pen trials—a name, an alphabet—although one hand updated some Psalm incipits from Roman to Gallican. This combination suggests the manuscript came to reside in a pedagogical setting and that the vellum was becoming more valuable than the texts. A new cathedral was built circa 1093–1133 by the bishop, William of Calais, who brought in both monks and books from Wearmouth and Jarrow, possibly reorganizing the collections. Durham A.IV.19 is not mentioned in the surviving twelfth-century Durham Cathedral library catalogs, unless perchance it is the “Collectarium antiquum” mentioned along with some other vaguely titled service books. Durham A.IV.19 is today counted as one of

58. Lawrence-Mathers, Manuscripts in Northumbria, 12–26 and 260–61. In the twelfth century, the cult was further enhanced by Hugh du Puiset, Bishop of Durham 1153–95, and Reginald of Durham, the ‘Little Book about the Wonderful Miracles of Blessed Cuthbert which were Performed in Recent Times’, ed. J. Raine, Reginaldi monachi Dunelmensis Libellus de admirandis beati Cuthberti virtutibus quae novellis patratae sunt temporibus, Surtees Society 1 (London: J. B. Nichols and Sons, 1833).


60. Psalms 70 and 35 altered on fols. 83va7 and 83vb5. At fol. 47v7 is a Caroline hand copying from the gloss. The name Ricardus on fol. 78r (image 15) may be from the twelfth century (T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 36).

an estimated forty-seven pre-1100 books surviving from Durham, thirty still residing there.  

In the post-1200 second phase down to about 1700, Durham A.IV.19 disappears from the surviving records, although it bears the marks of handling, mostly of physical loss and damage. A few unidentifiable vaguely early modern hands appear: a word overwritten (Auctor), some initials (IM), and a name (Ricardus). A possible sixteenth-century numeration visible on two early pages indicates that the first folio of the original collectar now missing was intact sometime in the sixteenth century, but by the end of the seventeenth century it was gone, along with other random folios, presumably removed for use as binding materials; similar pagination and marks in the corners and edges are no longer extant, probably cut off by later binders. If it had acquired a pressmark or desk locator similar to those found in other Durham books of this era, it would have been in the missing first quire. Thus, it may have been stored for a time in the area where binders could easily cut out pages for use as binding strips, a common fate of old service books in the later Middle Ages as well as after the Reformation. But if so, what remained was eventually rebound and found its way into storage somewhere in the Durham collection, albeit uncatalogued. The survival of Durham A.IV.19’s early medieval flyleaf (fol. 89 discussed above) is remarkable considering the loss of other folios and the jumbling of the Quire X singletons in relation to Quire IX without regard for their textual contents. The manuscript also shows water damage to the upper corner from fol. 22 on that occurred after the transposition of Quires IX and X.

The greater question, then, is how what does remain survived the vellum recyclers both before and after the Reformation. Manuscripts were kept in several locations in the medieval cathedral at Durham—in the areas for novices, in cupboards, recessed, and locked storage areas along the north and east cloister walks, the Spendement, and the church itself (fig. 5). But in the course of the


63. The Auctor occurs in both copies of the same hymn, one by Scribe E over erasure in the original collectar on fol. 53v and again in the additions on fol. 64v copied by Scribe C (QVIII.9). The IM initials on fol. 91 T. J. Brown (*Durham Ritual*, 36) describes as a secretary hand of the sixteenth or seventeenth century and the Ricardus as twelfth century, although it could be later.

64. Thompson (*Rituale*, xliii–xliv) notes the Arabic number 13 on page 3 and a number 14 on page 5 in his numeration of the folios; T. J. Brown does not mention or date these page numbers. See also *Early Medieval Palimpsests*, ed. Georges Declercq (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 20–22 and Yitzak Hen, “Liturgical Palimpsests from the Early Middle Ages” (pp. 37–54) on the reuse of liturgical manuscripts in the early Middle Ages not so much because of parchment shortage but obsolescence, versus post-medieval mutilation as binding material.


fourteenth century a main library developed that was moved and renovated several times in the fifteenth through seventeenth centuries under the direction of bibliophile bishops and enhanced by local antiquarians who left their mark on other Durham manuscripts. For example, a new library build circa 1414–18 by Prior Wessington above the parlor off the east cloister walk incorporated books from the Spendement and cloister; one Thomas Swalwell (d. 1539), a Durham monk at Oxford in the 1470s, was noted for his interest in old books,

"1. Later described as a prison, but probably originally a strongroom for books and valuables, below the early dormitory.

9. During the twelfth century a recess in the wall was probably used to store psalters needed by the monks for services; during the fifteenth century the eight cupboards against the north wall of the cloister were supplemented by a ninth, which has been wrongly known as the `new cupboard' through a misinterpretation of `nono' as `nouo.'"

annotating them and making lists of contents, marking them with a letter and number.67 Where Durham A.IV.19 stood or whether it passed through their hands for good or ill is unknown. (image 21 cloister)

The 1540 Dissolution with its royal commissioners and inspections brought even greater threats of destruction, particularly the 1550 Act against Superstition,Books and Images by Edward VI.68 Yet simultaneously, a move began to preserve medieval manuscripts as a means of establishing the roots of a distinctly English heritage, sometimes by valorizing the Anglo-Saxon past as “proto-Protestant.”69 Durham Cathedral fared better than some during these upheavals. Two of the Durham see’s moderate bishops in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries stand out as possible preservationists of manuscripts like Durham A.IV.19. Cuthbert Tunstall (appointed 1530), who on principle refused to consecrate Matthew Parker in 1559, maintained historic books and monuments, unlike his successor James Pilkington, who purged superstitious books.70 Still, the Durham library survived the civil war and interregnum. Bishop John Cosin (1660–71), despite years of exile amid destruction to the see, rebuilt and enhanced the Durham library; he urged more book acquisitions and cataloging, as well as involved himself in the details of binding, lettering, shelving, and presses.71 After the Restoration, Dean Sudbury moved the library from above the east cloister into the former Refectory (image 22).72 Perhaps at this point Durham A.IV.19 was moved into a location where it might eventually come to the attention of Anglo-Saxon scholars.

Surprisingly, Durham A.IV.19 apparently went unnoticed by those initial great collectors—Matthew Parker, Sir Robert Cotton, or any of their associ-


69. Lapidge, Anglo-Saxon Library, 74–77, notes the preference of Tudor and Elizabethan antiquaries like Leland, Bale, and Parker for monastic libraries and the history of Britain over classical sources.


72. The Library was moved again in the mid-nineteenth century to its present location in the former Dormitory. See the Durham Cathedral Library website history (http://www.durhamcathedral.co.uk/library/history).
ates—although the manuscript’s Northumbrian vernacular gloss would have been particularly useful to their language projects. Other Durham manuscripts were catalogued and some sent south, as happened for example with the Lindisfarne Gospels and a Durham copy of Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies, but Durham A.IV.19 appears to have missed both the cataloging efforts and the export of manuscripts to Oxford and Cambridge. If Durham A.IV.19 was rescued from further damage, it was by local antiquarians who held onto it, for whatever reasons, before it came to the attention of Anglo-Saxon catalogers.

Durham A.IV.19’s third phase of life began when it was catalogued as a paleographic and codicological artifact. Its first appearance is due to the indefatigable work of Humphrey Wanley, initially in a brief mention in the 1697 catalog of Edward Bernard, whom Wanley assisted. Subsequently it received a complete description in Wanley’s own catalog of 1705 attached to George Hickes’ monumental work. Wanley actually borrowed Durham A.IV.19 and put it beside the Lindisfarne Gospels in the Cotton library, arguing that the “Dano-Saxonica” gloss to both was by the same hand, although he erroneously dates it into the reign of Alfred. By his time, it was already missing the first quire and other folios, with Quires IX and X reversed, an error he notes but that was never corrected in subsequent rebindings. Wanley catalogued the manuscript as AA.III.i; but Thomas Rud, whose description relies on Wanley’s despite visiting Durham in 1708, labels the manuscript A.IV.19. This may indicate some reshelving and renumbering of the manuscripts after Wanley’s cataloging efforts brought it to light.


74. Durham A.IV.19 lacks this kind of cataloging trail found in CUL Gg. 3.28 x/xi, Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies, 2nd series, with Latin and Old English prefaces and final prayer (Ker 15). In that manuscript, a press mark at the top of fol. 1 indicating “1a 81 1” shows it was kept in the late medieval Durham library on the first half of the eighth desk, although the Durham ex libris on the first page was probably cut off. The manuscript belonged to Leonard Pilkington in the sixteenth century and was given to Cambridge in 1574 by his brother James, bishop of Durham. It has been identified as the “Omeliaria uetera duo” in the medieval Catalogi, p. 5.


Nineteenth-century paleographers and editors of Durham A.IV.19 reflect the work of the Surtees Society established by James Raine and named after the historian of Durham.\(^7^8\) In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the manuscript was catalogued by these local Durham scholars and the Palaeographical Society, primarily for its liturgical and philological interests.\(^7^9\) This generation focused more on the fragmentary nature of the texts, finding them disappointingly incomplete as an early witness to Anglo-Saxon rituals. Interestingly, John Lingard’s impression in the mid-nineteenth century was that Durham A.IV.19 was not a “continuous work” but “made up of fragments of liturgical books” possibly torn up at the time of the Reformation, and originally used for private devotions comparable to a Breviary.\(^8^0\) Although this is not entirely accurate, it is suggestive: the shape of the manuscript folios in his time may have been more uneven than its presently bound form and the booklets more readily apparent as portable units.

These paleographers redated the additions but also debated Wanley’s identification of the same gloss hand in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and Durham A.IV.19. Several agreed with the identification, including the first editor of the Durham Ritual for the Surtees Society, Joseph Stevenson, who was attracted to the ancient rites of “cultivated” and “learned” Northumbria but somewhat taken aback by the superstitions.\(^8^1\) The weight of opinion, however favored three hands: the Lindisfarne gloss, the Durham Ritual gloss, and the Cuthbert collects and colophons. W. W. Skeat did an extensive analysis, published in 1878, based on his own observations working with James Murray’s and Henry Bradshaw’s collations.\(^8^2\) Sir Edward Maude Thompson, who wrote an entry for Aldred in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, asserted that Aldred may have only done the John gloss in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* while other scribes did the rest under him so “there is no reason to believe that he wrote the whole of them

---

\(^7^8\) Robert Surtees (1779–1834), *The History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham*. James Raine (1791–1868), headmaster at Durham, became librarian to dean and chapter, and “used his opportunities to ransack the records as they had never been ransacked before,” in order to assist Surtees with his History of Durham; see the *Victoria History of the Counties of England, A History of Durham*, vol. 1 (London: University of London Institute of Historical Research, 1905; repr. Dawsons of Pall Mall, 1968), 383–84.


himself.” The new Surtees edition by U. Lindelöf with an introduction by A. Hamilton Thompson likewise isolated the two manuscripts’ glosses from each other.84

Not until 1942 was the paleographic uncertainty resolved by N. R. Ker’s definitive identification of Aldred’s single hand for both manuscripts’ glosses, colophons, and the Cuthbert collects, validating Wanley’s early methods of analysis and paleographic skill.85 Subsequently, the facsimile editions of the Codex Lindisfarne (1956–60) and the Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile Durham Ritual (1969) developed Ker’s identification based on a detailed analysis of letter forms and added the Durham A.IV.19 memorandum (fol. 84ra23–26; QXI.45) and the Oxford Bodleian Bodley 819 Latin glosses.86 As a consequence, Durham A.IV.19 became of great interest to scholars of the more famous Lindisfarne Gospels as well as to linguists interested in Aldred’s Northumbrian dialect, evident in the Aldrediana series of linguistic analyses, Alicia Corrêa’s 1992 critical edition of the original Latin collectar, and Michelle Brown’s study of the Lindisfarne Gospels to accompany the new facsimile.87 These are all invaluable resources for the present study; indeed, my own examination and transcription of the Durham A.IV.19 additions and gloss along with the Lindisfarne Gospels’ colophon served to solidify the identification of Aldred’s work. Yet, since the most recent critical edition of the Durham A.IV.19 additions and glosses is that done by Lindelöf and Thompson in 1927 operating under the assumption of multiple personalities for Aldred, there is a clear need for a synthetic treatment of Aldred and his scribal community which this volume endeavors to address, along with a more sympathetic assessment of the contents as something other than “out of date” or “superstitious.”


84. Ker 106; Ker, “Aldred the Scribe,” 8–9 notes obvious similarities between the Lindisfarne Gospels’ gloss and that in Durham A.IV.19 in regard to his four styles of the letter a, as well as Aldred’s unique habitus evident in the long strokes of the letters b, h, l, d; minims in the letters m and n; finials on l, t, f, p, and s; and links to letters following r and g. The differences in appearance he accounts for as occasioned by formal and informal contexts as well as the size of the space available in relation to the style and size of the Latin text being glossed: “Aldred tried to make his script worthy of the occasion” (p. 9), enlarging in the Lindisfarne Gospels beyond his normal cursive minuscule. The Durham Ritual gloss’s distinctive features are also found in the most informal parts of the Lindisfarne Gospels’ gloss (pp. 10–11).

85. Cod. Lind., Vol. 2, Bk 2, 25–33; T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 23–29, who also notes the more extensive use of abbreviations in the Durham gloss compared to the Lindisfarne Gospels’ gloss.

Still lingering, however, are some codicological mysteries that may not be solvable until the manuscript is unbound. Analysis of Durham A.IV.19’s structure began in the mid-nineteenth century with Henry Bradshaw and James Murray, whose slips are still bound into the manuscript today. 88 Their collation descriptions and diagrams do an admirable job of distinguishing singlets within the quires, hinting at the composite nature of the compilation as currently bound. The nineteenth-century binding was still intact in 1927 when Lindelöf and Thompson re-edited it for the Surtees Society. 89 The present, overly tight, binding was done after Ker’s 1957 Catalog, but before Brown’s 1969 EEMF edition. All these modern rebindings persist in retaining the reversal of Quires IX and X despite the fact that every editor since Wanley has recognized the textual discontinuity. When it is next rebound, the evidence of earlier sewing stations might shed light on Durham A.IV.19’s pre-modern binding history and suggest different links between the quire booklets.

Dismembering Durham A.IV.19 into quire booklets and tracing its history through various vicissitudes reminds us that our present sense of it as a single manuscript is an illusion, albeit a powerful one hard for us to shake. 90 Durham A.IV.19 probably never existed at Chester-le-Street as a single hardbound manuscript. We have no idea what else is missing—other quires or booklets in which these scribes did similar work now lost. All that binds these quires together are the scribes at Chester-le-Street whose handiwork their Durham heirs down to the present recognized and identified in varying ways. The marks on the manuscript and in print left by those who have handled and studied Durham A.IV.19 are all part of a continuing story emerging from the manuscript artifact to which this volume hopes to add some insights, at least for the Chester-le-Street era of the community of St. Cuthbert. The additions made by the generation of scribes in the late tenth century were multifarious and multipurpose, when they were written, when they were studied, and when they were performed. The devotional and pastoral aspects of this service book are explored in the following chapter (4) and linguistic, encyclopedic, and didactic elements in chapter 5. Together, these texts show us the processes of writing, reading, teaching, and praying as combined and overlapping activities in the religious community where they were studied—and preserved for us to study. Durham A.IV.19 as a fragmentary material artifact provides us an excellent opportunity to reflect on the continuities and discontinuities of human history and religious practice.

88. I have a transcription available.
89. Rituale, xliii; T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 13. Ker 106 dates the binding at his time (1957) to the nineteenth century, but T. J. Brown notes that it has been bound “since then.”
90. See R. I. Page, Mathew Parker, 46, for a similar observation about the need to shift our thinking about the integrity of a bound book.
Image 13  Durham Cathedral Library A.IV.19, fol. 66r, by permission of Durham Cathedral Library. Aldred, field prayers, red majuscule with black gloss.
Image 14 Durham Cathedral Library A.IV.19, fol. 77v, by permission of Durham Cathedral Library.

Aldred hymn text and gloss (lines 1–18), Scribe M2 episcopal benedictions (lines 19-25).
Incipit capitulum Aleph

Psalmus. Qui tecum est...
Vespamun, chie elemtiae pietatis, etsi quae
partis huius peces ad adest communione consecratio
salutis et praedam praeceptum comun na divinae
temporationis incipiens urbi q; etsi abime de supr.
bene tue et inquibus libet necessarius utiliter
hauria aque usus tibi sit cuius utilitas eae
meae diutem de praebentur urbis singulis pescatorem
salutemque omnium suis gratias agsiturum.

Prece seruorum tuorum deus:
missor exaudi: quinunus
et regnas: per omnes saecula
saecularum: Amen.

Exaudi quernus domine pre
ce seruorum tuorum:
et perducnos ad regna caelorum.
quinunus et regnas: deus per
omna saecula saecularum: Amen.
Image 19  Durham Cathedral Library A.IV.19, fol. 64v, by permission of Durham Cathedral Library.
Scribe C (lines 1–16) and Scribe F (lines 17–27).
Sex sunt quae oportet de testaver

Sunt quae suprema, plentur quaeque, orbis quasi oculi

Pustulando inundata, quod una anima divina et humana

Non perspicuum inquit, etsi non humani

Oculos sustulat: lingua mendace aut

Effundentes inanum sanctum, cor

Archimandritae dictiones, pedes

Veloce ab urbe domi proprio

Teo mendace, testes per laem et tertium qui

Semina interpres discordia

Gumbat et caput sua, quattuor omnes

Sed, non est universum. Itud non est et

Quia praelat pars, quam sint, suum et

Praepost et quilibet odior, instantem scolastici

Lingua mitteri homilium sollemnat mala proximo
Conserva filium preceptum nostrum et tuet eum.

Dimittas legem nostram et tuam.

Nunc subadultus sit multis praesentibus ab auditu.

One hospes, I curtum titus a indigentia.

Licea incordia tuo incideret circuisti

Prudenter di qua tuae et circundat

Cunamque alius gradantur e tecum.

Doloreri custodiant te et eum illum.

Loqueris cumuis, tanta est ubi meditato.

Te cum uigilant etiam opabatur, hanc sedula

Mente necolas cum domum securum, inhigur monopulc.

Altius, non est ut pulchrum est secus coram

...
Image 21  Durham Cathedral Cloister, author photo (December 2007)
Image 22  Durham Cathedral Library in the former dormitory, author photo (August 2007)
The first thing one notices upon opening Durham Cathedral Library A.IV.19 or its facsimile is its well-worn character. This was a manuscript used, and in some people’s view, abused, over several generations. Its original vellum pages were ordinary and rough to begin with, some with holes in the animal skin patched and whimsically decorated by the artful scribe. Whatever binding it began with is long gone, and the missing pages, the wearing at junctures, and its disordered current state testify to several stages of rebinding during which materials were lost and others added. The travel-worn pages are stained by human handling as well as spills, rendering parts of the manuscript illegible. Despite these limitations, its ordinariness and used quality make it of particular interest for understanding everyday religious life, as compared to the pristine illuminated manuscripts carefully preserved on altars and in libraries. Even if it was never actually used in the regular performance of religious rituals, this service book—and especially the alterations made to it—are a valuable resource for Anglo-Saxonists and liturgists.

Anglo-Saxon studies is an interdisciplinary field wherein scholars in literature, art, history, archaeology, and religion rely on one another’s expertise to build a picture of early England out of the fragments of material and textual evidence that remain. In the last decade, those working across these disciplines have paid increasing attention to the role of liturgy in relation to other aspects of medieval life, amid a general “back to the manuscripts” movement to reconsider the material context of texts. In particular, manuscripts containing copies of texts previously
evaluated only in relation to their supposed exemplars and judged according to their lack of “errors,” are now read as witnesses in their own right to the interests and needs of the scribal community.¹ This chapter and the next draw on these historiographical trends to analyze the content of the additions Aldred and Scribes B–F made in Durham Cathedral Library A.IV.19. Although the original collectar of the manuscript has recently been thoroughly edited and sourced, the additions have not received the same attention. The current critical edition in HBS by Alicia Corrêa edits only the Latin text of the original collectar. The earlier Surtees edition by Lindelöf includes the additions and the gloss, but is out of date in its analysis. The editors of the facsimile editions, T. J. Brown in EEMF and Sarah Larratt Keefer in ASM, provide lists and identifications of the additions by incipit, but not an explication of the full texts, which are often hybrid. The present volume attempts to source the additions, but in the absence of a searchable database for whole liturgical texts and not just incipits, that task is necessarily incomplete.

The codicological map and critical edition of the additional texts in the appendices form the basis of this chapter’s analysis of the types of liturgical materials added at Chester-le-Street, their significance for the community of St. Cuthbert, and their relevance to pastoral care and devotional life. For comparison, these texts are placed in the context of other service books and prayer books containing similar materials as well as the broader sweep of liturgical reform in the tenth and eleventh centuries.

Although it began as a basic service book in the original collectar, the additions made to Durham A.IV.19 at Chester-le-Street made it into something more hybrid, which in turn reveals a community actively involved in liturgical experimentation and study. If members of the community implemented these elaborations on the daily office, then their days and nights were filled with devotional prayer and worship, both individual and corporate, in line with the Benedictine reform in the south, even if they remained primarily secular canons. Moreover, the benedictional materials indicate that they engaged in pastoral care on their estate and in the surrounding communities. While it is unknown what other service books they possessed, this “workbook” in Durham A.IV.19 is a sign of their commitment to full religious services under their patron, St. Cuthbert.

This chapter first examines the generic label of service book in order to establish how Durham A.IV.19 fits, and does not fit, into any of the various types that fall under this label. The second section analyzes materials added to Durham A.IV.19 that enhance the daily office for clerical members of the reli-

¹. See, for example, Alice Rio, Legal Practice and the Written Word in the Early Middle Ages: Frankish Formulae, c. 500–1000 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 170–75 regarding scribal freedom to use variable Latin, as well as mix old and new.
gious community, while the third section addresses communal services, rituals and blessings for the community inside and outside its walls, including laity.

**SERVICE BOOKS**

Liturgy is both textual and performative, with the result that service books stand at an important nexus for orality and literacy in the Middle Ages. The term service book refers to a wide range of manuscripts used by religious specialists in the performance of rituals for their communities and lay constituents. These books include instructions, prayers, and readings for: the hours of the daily (or divine) office for monastic or secular clergy living communally; the liturgy proper with masses designed around the calendar cycle (Temporal and Sanctoral); other sacraments such as baptism and rites for the dead; ecclesiastical rites conducted by bishops, such as church dedications and ordinations; psalms, lections, hymns, antiphons, and other supplementary materials for church services; exorcisms to purify elements and blessings of everything from houses to travelers, as well as penitential and judicial rites to meet the needs of their congregations. Although the technical meaning of “liturgy” refers to just the mass, with the more obscure term “synaxis” covering all of the other public rituals offered by the church, common usage applies “liturgy” to both. The word “proper” in reference to the liturgy designates rites specific to an occasion in the liturgical calendar: the Temporal annual cycle around the life of Christ, anchored at Christmas to a specific date and at Easter to the lunar cycle, hence a “moveable feast”; and the Sanctoral sequence of saints’ days linked to specific dates throughout the year. Other rites are occasional, for specific events not linked to the calendar. Durham A.IV.19 has materials sequenced in the Temporal and Sanctoral calendar as well as other benedictions and masses for special

---


occasions; the additions made at Chester-le-Street include similar generic office material, benedictions, and special prayers for various occasions, along with the encyclopedic texts discussed in the next chapter.

What defines a service book is that the materials were intended for public performance, although, as we shall see, the line between public and private is easily breached. Since service books were designed for use by a trained priest or monastic, most of them provide mainly prompts for specific types of services addressed to someone who knows their way around the books and is familiar with the basic pattern of the rituals. Much of the daily repetition of the same components in the mass or office (“ferial” materials as opposed to “proper”) are not included in service books or are obliquely referenced; the books that do contain them are educational, for teaching novices or candidates what they will need to know by heart through practice in oral performance. Thus the canon of the mass may appear at the beginning of a Missal or Sacramentary, while the rest of the book contains proper prayers for the day to incorporate into that basic order of service. Similarly, the Benedictine office is laid out in rules and in pastoral letters, but the service books needed in the actual performance of the daily hours assume knowledge of the basic format and memorized texts, such as the psalms, canticles, and regular prayers, and therefore only include the daily prayers and readings, generally taken from the mass of that day. The original collectar in Durham A.IV.19 assembled primarily prayers (“collects”) from the mass to use in the daily office, but also included at the end some material adaptable to various days and occasions (Commune Sanctorum, exorcisms, daily prayers, and blessings); the Chester-le-Street scribes added more of this generic type.

As a result, in most service books, the text of a prayer, reading, or psalm may be indicated only by an incipit or an abbreviated opening phrase that recalls a full text already memorized or located in another service book, such as the Pater noster or the abbreviation “per” to indicate the standard Trinitarian closing formula, through God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The additions made at Chester-le-Street often use such abbreviations, but in a significant number of cases they spell out the whole formula or text, perhaps indicating a pedagogical function.

Service books of various kinds emerged in the ninth and later centuries for different purposes, borrowing and reassembling material with reference to other books. A religious community would need a set of service books not only to adequately perform the proper order of service for particular dates, but also to have prayers conveniently assembled for the daily office, and to have the appropriate textual readings at hand. Ælfric, for example, assumed that secu-
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lar canons as well as individual priests would perform the daily office and also listed the books a priest ought to have, as does the *Penitential of Egbert*, mostly Lectionaries (books of readings used in the performance of services) such as the Psalms, Gospels, Epistles, and Saints' lives, as well as a Missal, Manual, Penitential, and a Computus for calculating the liturgical calendar. Whether or not an individual priest would actually have each of these, similar lists of books occur as owned by various religious houses. Durham A.IV.19's original portion was designed primarily for a religious house to put in one place the collects or prayers derived from the mass for use in the daily office. The additions made at Chester-le-Street seem to serve multiple other purposes, as indeed many early medieval service books did.

Three caveats, therefore, are needed about this broad category of service books in order to understand the hybrid nature of Durham A.IV.19 in its late tenth-century incarnation. First, “service book” is a catch-all label for a highly technical set of liturgical terms, most of which are hard to apply to the early medieval period since they had not yet evolved as separate books. The categories, as they emerged later in distinctive form, can be divided into books for monastic services, books a priest would need for the mass, episcopal books with rites for bishops, and miscellaneous texts. Monastic books (and similar books for secular canons) came to include Breviary, Collectar, Psalter, Antiphoner, Hymnal, and Lectionary (book of readings, such as the Bible and homilies), as well as Martyrologies and the Rule of St. Benedict for reading at the chapter office, when the religious community assembled in the chapter house after the morning office or mass. Massbook types evolved into Missal and Sacramentary, Gradual and Troper for musical sequences, and Lectionaries for readings from the Gospels and Epistles. Episcopal books included Pontifical, Benedictional, and Manual (or Ritual), although rites performed by priests were also included. Other texts that stood alone or were incorporated into other books were liturgical calendars, Consuetudinaries (containing liturgical instructions), and

---


Confraternity books (Liber vitae list of community members and benefactors). Durham manuscripts surviving from the Chester-le-Street era of the community are few, but Durham A.IV.19 was presumably a supplement to a larger collection of service books owned by the community. Out-of-date service books were commonly reused in the early Middle Ages through erasure (palimpsests), or in later eras as binding strips. That Durham A.IV.19 survived the initial phases of reuse without erasure may indicate that Aldred’s gloss and/or the appended materials were valuable enough to preserve at Durham, at least until the later medieval or early modern period when portions of the original collector began to disappear, as detailed in the previous chapter.

In the late Anglo-Saxon period, separate Missals containing the proper masses were only just beginning to emerge through a process of adding materials to Sacramentaries, books containing only the prayers for the celebrant for each occasion. Likewise, for the daily office, the Breviary containing all the texts for each hour did not evolve until later, but various office books in late Anglo-Saxon England began to combine materials. At least one Anglo-Saxon manuscript attempted to bind the office materials (psalter, collectar, canticles, hymnal, calendar, litany, and private prayers) into one volume, the eleventh-century Portiforium of Wulstan, while another, the mid-eleventh-century Red Book of Darley, is so complex a composite that it is also listed under multiple categories. Psalters, of which there are many that date from the Anglo-Saxon period, contained the bulk of the texts chanted in the daily office, the psalms with their collects and various canticles, but might supplement these with other office materials (calendar, litanies, other prayers). The psalms were in theory memorized, so Psalters were mainly for educational, scholarly, or devotional use and privately held.


11. Gneuss, “Liturgical Books,” 114 speculates that Psalters glossed in Old English were for education purposes; Anne Lawrence-Mathers, Manuscripts in Northumbria in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), 23, notes the absence of surviving pre-Conquest Psalters at Durham and specu-
Chapter 4

The probable base text for the later Breviary is the Collectar, sometimes called a Capitulary, a derivative and ordinary book that consequently did not survive in large numbers. A Collectar primarily contained chapters (short Scriptural lessons) and collects (closing or summary prayers) for the daily office taken from the mass prayers of the day as found in a Sacramentary or other massbook, but Collectars often included other office texts as well as some blessings for specific occasions, including materials used by clergy for the laity. The original southern English portion of Durham A.IV.19, similar to the Leofric Collectar, is just such a hybrid in combining Collectar materials with other texts. Indeed, the original collectar in Durham A.IV.19 and the marginal additions of liturgical material to Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41 are the earliest fragments of service book materials for late Saxon minsters, but as Richard Pfaff notes, evidence for the secular daily office for these cathedral communities is sadly lacking. However, the additions to Durham A.IV.19 made at Chester-le-Street do provide such evidence: they not only supplemented the original collectar with more collects and chapters, blessings, masses, memorials, hymns, and psalms, but some of the additions, as detailed below, reflect reform “accretions” for both corporate and private prayer. Thus, Durham A.IV.19’s additions may anticipate a Breviary, while others, particularly the vernacular glossed texts, may have served devotional and educational functions.

The second caveat is that not only are the Anglo-Saxon and early medieval materials mixed in a variety of different configurations not exactly matching these later service book labels, but a number of other types of books not usually considered as service books include similar material, such as the margins of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41 noted above. Specifically, medical, scientific, and private prayer books, as well as manuscript marginalia, may include prayers and rituals normally associated with service books. These types of books were produced in scriptoria with access to service books, allowing for such copying. This, then, causes us to ponder whether private prayer, medical practice, and scientific theory may have in turn influenced the development of services that they were personally owned by the secular clerks rather than passed down in communal ownership. See also Philip Pulsiano, “Psalters” in Liturgical Books, ed. Pfaff, 61–85, at 79–84 and 72 for private use; and Corrêa, “Daily Office Books,” in Liturgical Books, ed. Pfaff, 55 on the Harley Psalter containing office material for secular use.


at least local ritual practice. Private prayer books contain public prayers and, vice-versa, private prayers occur in liturgical books, some with vernacular texts or glosses. Early private prayer books, *libelli precum*, and collections of private prayers found in liturgical books call into question the relationship between public and private prayer. Much is revealed about devotional life in religious communities in the “private” prayer books of ninth-century Mercia (Book of Cerne, Book of Nunnaminster, and the Royal Prayerbook), the eleventh-century Winchester Ælfwine Prayerbook, and the glossed prayers in the Eadui or Arundel Psalter. Moreover, the Benedictine reform evident in the *Regularis concordia* specifically added prayers said both corporately and individually, so it is hard to separate public from private in these office books. Thus some of the quire booklets added to Durham A.IV.19 could have functioned as portable prayer books for public and/or private use.

A third dynamic to consider with the term service book is the tension between local traditions and practices in relation to broader movements of liturgical codification on the continent and in the English monastic reform. The ninth-century Carolingian renaissance—under a royal court distinctly influenced by insular intellectuals—promoted the idea of uniform liturgical practice to unify disparate regions, a concept subsequently taken up by English monarchs and church leaders in the later ninth and tenth centuries. By the late tenth century, work on the Romano-Germanic Pontifical (RGP) at Mainz synthesizing and standardizing liturgical and synactic ritual was under way on
the continent but was not imported to England until the late eleventh century; in any case, the development of the RGP did not inhibit the maintenance and development of local variations and the recycling of liturgy. In England, the royally sponsored Benedictine reform under King Edgar initiated changes in the communal life of English minsters as well as introduced new rituals for saints and patrons. New service books could replace old in the major centers, with the old often recycled through erasure, producing sometimes visible palimpsests, or by addition and modification for other uses, as appears to be the case with Durham A.IV.19. The additions in Durham A.IV.19 evidence awareness of the newer practices in southern England and on the continent, as well as reflect older, local Northumbrian practice influenced by Irish traditions. Aldred copied collects for their patron saint Cuthbert, whose cult had taken on national and international proportions outside of Northumbria, as well as new hymnal materials and sung texts (antiphons, verses, responses), while other scribes copied updated prayers, benedictions, and lections for ritual services. Yet some of the materials added at Chester-le-Street are distinctively older and local, including the John poison prayer and the field prayers, not to mention Aldred’s Northumbrian dialect vernacular gloss and educational materials discussed in the next chapter.

Last, but not least, Durham A.IV.19 is not a single service book as is evident from the codicological and paleographic analysis in the previous chapter, but a compilation of several booklets bound in different ways at different times in its long history. The content of the liturgical additions made by the different scribes bear this out as examined in this chapter, as do the so-called educational additions treated in the next chapter. The texts added at Chester-le-Street must be understood by liturgical use, if not by service book type, in conjunction with the way they were copied into the manuscript in association with one another. Although this chapter reviews some of the same terrain as the previous analysis of the scriptorium, it does so by organizing the texts first by content type. Within and between these categories treated below—daily office materials (prayers, readings, hymns) and other communal services (memorials and blessings)—certain features and larger conclusions emerge: that different purposes were served simultaneously in the effort of copying, collating, and instructing; that purpose and use varied between Aldred’s and the other scribes’ activities; that private devotion and public performance merge into one another inextric-
cably; and that educational and devotional exercises are bound up with orality and literacy as well as bilinguality.

**Office Materials**

The composite manuscript Durham A.IV.19 has been labeled both a Collectar and a Ritual, but it is neither and both, including as it does material for office services primarily for secular canons as well as liturgical services performed by priest or bishop. The “original” portion of Durham A.IV.19 contains prayers and readings divided into Temporal and Sanctoral seasons through fol. 45, followed by miscellaneous prayers, blessings, and exorcisms useful to a priest in a community to fol. 61r.21 The texts added or appended to Durham A.IV.19 by Aldred and Scribes B–F are harder to categorize in any systematic way according to their use in services. The sequence in which they occur in the manuscript as it now stands may not reflect the sequence in which they were copied, much less used; rather, as noted in the previous chapter, Scribes E and F copied material relevant to their tasks (whether prayers, hymns, or lections) but in widely different places, while Scribes C and D copied similar benedictions together. Those additional texts that can be classified by season, hour, or function still appear fragmentary and are difficult to contextualize in relation to one another or to comparable material in other service books. Many, but not all, of the liturgical texts are of the miscellaneous or generic sort found at the back of service books, similar to (and sometimes overlapping with) the end of the original collectar. Since the last item done by Scribe O ended without closure and with remaining blank folios,22 the Chester-le-Street additions in Quire VIII are a continuation, while the added quires complement and in some cases duplicate.

While these added materials may have supplemented what was lacking in the original collectar or other liturgical books in the community with an eye toward reform, the possibilities remain open whether these items were copied here for direct use in service or for transitioning them into a more formal collection, either for reference or study. Given the disbound state of the quires while at Chester-le-Street, the parts could have been carried elsewhere to use in a service, to copy, to teach from, or for personal reflection. The fact that the community after its move to Durham continued to make additions for their bishop, Aldhun, and possibly bound these quires together with that in mind, suggests that it became an episcopal service book, at least for reference

22. Keefer, ASM 14, 38.
purposes. Similarly in its earlier years, it may very well have functioned as a book or set of booklets in the service of Ælfsige, who became bishop at Chester-le-Street two years before the 970 journey he made with Aldred noted in the colophon on fol. 84r (QXI.46). If these additions found in Durham A.IV.19 were made for his use, we can look at the texts not only through the eyes of the scribes who copied them but also that of the bishop and his provost, Aldred, both of whom might have found the texts useful for reference in conducting or revising services, for educating clergy under their care, or for personal study and devotion.

The bulk of the texts added at Chester-le-Street are relevant to the performance of the daily office for a secular community of clergy as well as for public services. Some of them are prayers and hymns written out in full, while others are reference lists of lections, lection prayers, and sung verses for different hours and seasons. Some of the longest sets of prayers are memorials to enrich the office, in addition to shorter blessings for particular occasions or items. Nonetheless, any of these materials could also be used for private devotion or study by members of the community, especially those glossed in Old English by Aldred, a feature unnecessary for performance purposes. Overall, though, two trends stand out in the office additions. First, most of the materials are “generic” in that they are not for a specific date in the calendar or saint, but are for ordinary days or a type of saint and therefore could be adapted to suit a particular occasion or need. Second, many if not all of the materials are similar to the so-called accretions to the daily office notable in the Benedictine liturgical reform underway in the south. This suggests that the Chester-le-Street community was either part of the reform initiative or at least reacting to early hints of it.

**Prayer in the Divine Office**

Although the base of the daily office is often identified with the recitation of the psalms, the central activity of the hours is prayer, whether prompted by a psalm, hymn, or reading. Several kinds of prayer (oration) occur in the office as well as the mass, labeled depending on their place in the service and varying according to hour, day, and season. The main elements in a service of the daily office include both sung portions (antiphons, versicles, and responses chanted with the psalms and readings, hymns and canticles) as well as spoken parts such as the short “chapter” (capitulum) reading from the Bible, lessons, litanies, the Lord’s Prayer, the collects, and blessings. Over time, some of the offices added various creeds, penitential psalms, special devotions, and memorials.23 The col-
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lects are concluding prayers and form the base for office service books named after them, along with the chapter readings.

Religious communities, both monastic and ostensibly secular by this era, participated in eight daily “hours” or services of prayer, with slight variation in the times between summer and winter: Nocturns (the night office, also called Vigils and later Matins) on the eve of the day; Lauds (or Matins) at dawn; Prime at the first hour of the day after sunrise, followed by or incorporated with chapter meeting; the daytime services or “Little Hours” of Terce, Sext, and None at 9 a.m., noon, and 3 p.m.; Vespers in the early evening; and Compline at bedtime.24 Special occasions and Sundays have distinctive collects and other materials for some hours, hence the need for service book compilations. For ordinary weekdays, the collects for the daily hours would be more regular, but might differ locally, hence a variety appear in the surviving Collectars and other prayer books for private devotional use.25 For example, the original collectar in Durham A.IV.19 ends with a set of five prayers for canonical hours followed by six miscellaneous prayers (fols. 60r7–61r10).26 These would be basic collects used during the week, whereas the earlier part of the manuscript offered the collects without reference to the hour of the day but specified for distinct occasions in the liturgical calendar.

Since the office collects are often drawn from the relevant mass, we can search for these prayers in a range of service books—other Collectars, Sacramentaries, and Missals. However, the texts of prayers can vary once we get past the incipit and indeed common phrases can be mixed and matched in a variety of ways.27 A sense of the standard and variable language of prayer can be gathered from examining the indices of liturgical forms found in critical editions of service books, such as those published by the Surtees Society and Henry Bradshaw Society, where the same opening phrases occur so frequently that in order for additions in the Regularis concordia; for special devotions, see Sally E. Roper, Medieval English Benedictine Liturgy: Studies in the Formation, Structure, and Content of the Monastic Votive office, c. 950–1540 (New York and London: Garland, 1993).


26. There is no collect for the night office, and in most cases Terce, Sext, and None use the same collect as Prime (Corrêa, Durham Collectar, 4). See also the original collectar fols. 18r–19r, now missing sections. For comparison, see the later breviary compilation by J. B. L. Tolhurst, The Monastic Breviary of Hyde Abbey, Winchester, vol. 6, HBS 80 (London: Harrison and Sons, 1942).

27. See, for example, the tracking of the QIX/X.14 field prayers in Jolly, “Prayers from the Field” as well as collects accompanying Aldred’s capitella (QXI.34a and 39a); see also Pfaff, Liturgy in Medieval England, 150.
to distinguish them from one another the index has to go further into each prayer beyond, for example, “Da nobis omnipotens deus” (“Give us, omnipotent God”), to more specific language. However, variations and combinations can lead to frequent misidentification, either because the opening sentence is followed by a different prayer but also because some prayers do not start with a recognized incipit but can be identified only through a full text search.\(^{28}\)

In Durham A.IV.19’s additions, some of the basic vocabulary of prayer is evident in the two short collects added by Scribe E on fol. 64r9–17 (QVIII.8; image 18). These prayers, written in a large, widely-spaced hand similar to southern liturgical manuscripts of the late tenth century, appear disconnected from what precedes and follows in the manuscript. Neither are traceable in liturgical forms indices, probably because they are not specific prayers but generic phrases. Scribe E writes here in a large clear Caroline script suitable for a liturgical manuscript, but with some insular traits.\(^{29}\) Also notable are slight differences in abbreviation between the two prayers, none in the first, several in the second, which may indicate either that he was copying from two different exemplars or simply practicing his letter forms.\(^{30}\) The words of both “prayers” are virtually identical if in a different order, short choppy phrases of the most generic type usually found in longer or more elaborate sentences in collects or blessings:

Praeces seruorum tuorum deus./ miserator exaudi. qui uiuis. / & regnas. per omnia saecula / saeculum. AmeN: .
Exaudi quesumus domine præ/ces seruorum tuorum . / & perduc nos ad regna caelorum. / qui uiuis & regnas deus per omnia saecula saeculorum. Amen: .

Both briefly ask God to listen (exaudi) to the “prayers of your servants” (praeces seruorum tuorum), a placeholder phrase into which more specific names could be added. The first asks for mercy (miserator), the second to be led into the heavenly kingdom (perduc nos ad regna caelorum), both standard phrases. Both conclude with standard doxologies (qui uiuis et regnas, per omnia saecula saeculorum, Amen), phrases often just shortened to one word (per), but in this case fully written out both times, although with minor abbreviations in the second.

One wonders, then, if these additions served as devotional exercises of some kind that linked writing process and oral performance. Or perhaps the generic quality and the enlarged Caroline hand indicate an instructional text view-

28. In the absence of a complete database of liturgy, this requires multiple searches through volumes and not just indices; recently some older volumes such as the Surtees have appeared scanned into Google Books, so a search there of non-incipit prayer language sometimes turns up random results.
29. T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 33. In two places, for example, his more regular Caroline “a” is replaced by an insular majuscule “å.”
30. Note in the second prayer “ç” for “ae” in praeces, saecula, and saeculorum; oma for omnia; am for amen. A stylish Amen with a large “A” and uncial “n” ends the first prayer.
able by a group of pupils, derived from a contemporary liturgical manuscript.31 Theoretically, they could have been adapted to be blessings of the type Scribe D later copied immediately before Scribe E’s two generic prayers (fol. 63v–64r8; QVIII.4–7).32 In any case, these two prayers are not full or specific collects of the type usually found in service books or elsewhere in the additions to Durham A.IV.19 by Scribes C and Aldred.

Both Scribe C and Aldred copied in the additional quires a selection of collects for the daily office dissimilar from the set at the end of the original collectar, more than likely because these quires constituted separate booklets for individual or corporate use. These office materials are generic enough to be adapted for different occasions or are designed as additions to the standard hours, perhaps in response to reform initiatives. The verbs throughout are plural, “we” rather than the “I” as might be found in private devotional prayers. This plurality reinforces the notion that these are communal spiritual exercises, although conceivably they could be adapted to private devotions as well, fulfilling the instruction in the rule for individuals to recite psalms and prayers while they worked and as spiritual preparation for the communal services.

Scribe C in Quire IX on fol. 68rv copied two sets of three prayers each for Vespers amidst cross memorial prayers and antiphons (sung verses), all in the same writing stint.33 The texts, not found in the original collectar, include useful signals to the various parts (“Or” for oration, “A” for antiphon, and “V” for versicle), while later Durham Scribe M3 has corrected and added to this section, showing that the texts were read and used. The first set of three Vesper collects on fol. 68r17–28 (QIX/X.17a–c), possibly for Sunday, is followed at the top of the verso with two untitled cross memorial prayers (QIX/X.18a–b), three prayers labeled “alia” but identified as for Vespers (QIX/X.19a–c), then three more cross memorial prayers (QIX/X.20a–c). The Vesper prayers are comparable to similar sets in other service books, such as the Leofric Missal, Sacramentary of Ratoldus, and Portiforium of Wulstan.34 However, Scribe C’s Vesper prayers are not part of a series of daily prayers for the various hours as found in these other service books, but are integrated with a memorial to the cross, an unusual feature that may be tied both to his inclusion of a cross prayer in the middle of the milk and honey blessing (QVIII.3) and his sequence of

31. Pfaff, Liturgy in Medieval England, 92–93, suggests that the large hand used in the early folios of the Canterbury Benedictional (BL Harley 2892) might have accommodated the failing eyesight of Bishop Æthelnoth.

32. Scribe E’s two prayers are followed on the verso by Scribe C’s copy of the same hymn that E copied over erasure at the end of Quire VII (fol. 53v); see QVIII.9.

33. This section begins stint 6 after the house blessings in a distinctly different size of hand, closer but not identical to that found on fol. 76r where his other set of collects are (QIX/X.24). The nib width on fol. 76r is slightly narrower than that found from fol. 68r17ff.

34. LM 2647–52; Ratoldus 2170–78; Port. Wulstan 1355–1367; Deshusses 1504–06. Of the first set, the third prayer, Deus lumen aeternum, I have not located, although Scribe M3 found it worth adding to at the end.
Passiontide hymns (QVIII.9, 11–13) in Quire VIII. In this case, the Vespers prayers seem to be introducing a memorial service discussed in greater detail below with the subsequent memorials Scribe C copied.

In another place in the additions, on fol. 76r (QIX/X.24), Scribe C does add a set of daily prayers similar to comparable service books, but without Vespers. There, Scribe C copied eight prayers for the hours of Prime (2), Terce, Sext, None, and Compline (3), three of which are also found in the original collectar; missing are collects for Lauds, as well as Vespers (Nocturns does not usually include collects). Since fol. 76 is a singleton only superficially associated with the end of Quire X; it may have earlier pages now lost. Scribe C may have compiled his collects on fol. 76 not as an addition or supplement to the original collectar but as part of a portable set, perhaps to accompany Aldred’s Quire XI hymns and other materials for the same hours.

Aldred copied and glossed daily office materials in the first part of Quire XI, more than likely as a separate, portable booklet. From the start of the quire with hymns on fol. 77r to the top of fol. 84r, Aldred incorporated texts for the daily office hours of Prime, Terce, Sext, None, Compline, and Vespers, although not necessarily in a complete sequence. The first set of hymns on fol. 77 cover Prime, Terce, Sext, and None, followed by a hymn for Sunday Vespers. In a separate writing stint beginning at the top of fol. 78r in double columns (image 15), Aldred wrote and glossed chapters and collects for Prime (possibly for Sunday), chapters for Terce, Sext, and None, followed by Vesper prayers and chapters, then a sequence of Compline materials, beginning with a hymn and then chapters and collects. The section concludes with incipits of special psalms for Prime, Terce, Sext, None, Vespers.

35. The first prayer on fol. 76r ([24a] Lumen splendoris) is unlabeled, but the next prayer is labeled Alia ([24b] In hac prima diei hora) and is clearly for Prime, implying that the previous prayer is also for Prime; however, Lumen splendoris is a Vespers collect in Ælfwine 73.190. The three prayers of Scribe C found in the original collectar are: In hac prima diei hora for Prime, copied on fol. 65v7–9 by Scribe O, untitled (see Corrêa, item 657, in a section she labels Horae Canonicae) and on fol. 76v4–5 [24b] by Scribe C (also found in the Leofric Collectar, 69); Domine iesu christe qui nos redemisti copied on fol. 60v8–10 by Scribe O (Corrêa item 662, which she labels miscellaneous) and on fol. 76r24–26 [24g] by Scribe C (also found in Ælfwine 73.193); and Illumina domine tenebrosa corda for Compline, copied in the original collectar at fol. 18r18–19 (Corrêa, item 245) and by Scribe C on fol. 76r17–19 [24f], and is also in Ælfwine 73.193; Leofric Collectar 515; Port. Wulstan 325; and LM 2617. Scribe C’s first collect, [24a] Lumen splendoris (fol. 76v3–5) is also in Ælfwine 73.193; the other four I have not located in other service books.

36. Fol. 79vb3 labels the collect for Sunday Prime; the prayer is found also in the original collectar (fol. 14v13–21), with some minor differences. Although both are glossed by Aldred, the one here in Quire XI includes a full doxology, a trait also noticeable in the hymns.

37. On fol. 80va22–22 is a secret prayer for the beginning of Vespers, a title unusually glossed by Aldred, followed by chapter suffrages (fol. 80va23–82ra5) comparable to those for Prime, Terce, Sext and None on the earlier folios. Some of them, known as the Celtic Capitella discussed below, have individual headings: pro rege nostro, pro aepiscopo nostro, pro fratribus nostris absentibus (T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 49).

38. Absent in Aldred’s office materials as well as Scribe C’s are Nocturns and Lauds, which often merge into one another, although as noted below, some lectionary materials for Nocturns are added by Scribes C, E, and F. See Hughes, Medieval Manuscripts, 66.
The focus of Aldred’s additions seems to be the daily regimen of Prime, Terce, Sext, and None which share certain similarities during an ordinary week, along with some evening materials for Vespers and Compline. These additions are similar to earlier sections in the original collectar containing basic prayers for ordinary times: the canonical hours and miscellaneous prayers on fols. 60r–61r and the daily prayers on fols. 18r–19r; similar sets can be found in other service books. The difference may be, however, that Aldred, along with the other scribes, is enhancing the daily office with reform materials, such as the daily addition of the seven penitential psalms at Prime and the addition of memorials (capitella or suffrages) for the saints, the dead, royalty, and benefactors, as described in the Regularis concordia for corporate and individual use. This hints at the tantalizing possibility that at least some of the additions by Aldred and Scribe C were aimed at adapting the nascent monastic liturgical reform for a primarily secular community.

The bulk of Aldred’s daily office prayers in Quire XI are capitella, which he labels capitula, but unlike “chapters” of readings from the Bible, these are litanies of psalm verses accompanied by “suffrages,” or intercessory prayers for specified groups inside and outside the community. These capitella seem to form the core of each hour added to the community’s daily regimen as part of a monastic reform impulse that extended into the secular office as well. Aldred copied four sets of capitella, three of them traceable to the main Gallican liturgy: for Prime (QXI.33 and collects QXI.34–35); for the Little Hours of Terce, Sext, and None (QXI.36); and for Compline (QXI.41). However, the Vespers set (QXI.38), is identified as Celtic, with four of the prayers showing a rare congruence with the Bangor Antiphoner and Rule of Columbanus. These addi-
tions to the daily office offer prayers for patrons and the community at large, a function long established for religious houses but extended further by monastic reform in the tenth century. This combination reinforces the notion that Aldred is merging local, Irish-based traditions with contemporary reform ideas brewing across England. The significant variation in format, titles, and incipits, making it difficult to identify some of the prayers, also suggests that Aldred is himself compiling, perhaps from multiple sources, and arranging appropriate collects for some occasions.

The special psalms listed for the day hours (fols. 83–84) also reflect a reform addition geared toward private devotion for individuals, with rubricated title instructions glossed in Old English. The seven penitential psalms specified for Prime (QXI.42) are ubiquitous in office manuals and private prayer books, but Aldred also prescribes additional psalms in the hours, some of them labeled for specific issues (QXI.43).44 The format on these differs from the preceding penitential psalms, with only the titles glossed (black on red).45 After listing eight psalms for Tierce, he specifies five psalms for tribulations and temptations at Sext,46 and eight for tribulations when feeling abandoned by God, at None.47 But after one has received peace and prosperity, three psalms are given for Vespers.48 There follow two other glossed rubrics not specified for a particular hour, the first recommending the hymn of the three boys from Daniel for all times of prosperity, perhaps a continuation from the theme at Vespers,49 and the second the singing of Psalm 118 to practice divine praises.50 These would presumably be psalms said by individuals before or after the hours as a form of spiritual preparation, a practice recommended in Carolingian and Anglo-Saxon reform rules. Since the psalms are only given incipits, the presumption is that they are known in Latin to the reader and have less need of a vernacular

Corrêa, Durham Ritual, 79 n. 12; Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 6, 19–30; and Roper, Medieval English Benedictine Liturgy, 11–14.

44. *Regularis concordia* chapters 16, 17, 19 prescribe the seven penitential psalms [6, 31(32), 37(38), 50(51), 101(102), 129(130) and 142(143)] daily before Nocturns and after Prime; see Gretsch, *Intellectual Foundations*, 15. Ælfwine includes near its end daily prayers for sinners, collects for the daily hours, and devotions based on the penitential psalms (items 73–74).

45. Some of the initial letters of psalm incipits are also in red, suggesting that he put the rubrics in first along with the leading letters in order to space it out, and then filled in the gloss and rest of the psalm incipits in black later. This would explain the heavy abbreviations at the end of lines as he endeavored to keep each incipit to one line.

46. QXI.43a, fol. 83rb22–23, “these are eight psalm prayers for the third hour,” is unglossed. QXI.43b, fol. 83vb9–12, “These five psalms for diverse tribulations or temptations for the sixth hour sing in praise of God.”

47. QXI.43c, fol. 83vb18–23 “If in tribulations you sense you are abandoned by God, with compunction of heart sing these psalms in praise of God at the noon hour.”

48. QXI.43d, fol. 83vb9–12 “After receiving peace and prosperity, sing these psalms at Vespers in praise of God.”

49. QXI.43e, fol. 83vb16–19 “And in all times of prosperity, always sing in praise of God the hymn of the three boys”; note that the last line, *in laudem dei decanta*, is not glossed.

50. QXI.43f, fol. 83vb22–23 “When you want to practice, sing in praise of the divine . . . ” Psalm 118(119), the longest psalm.
prompt. The inclusion of a gloss on the rubrics in a dark contrast ink highlights the instructions for the use of these psalms in the devotional practice of his community. One potential audience would be novices who knew the Latin psalter but would have difficulty following Latin instructions, hence the vernacular aid and the suggestion to “practice” (exercere) in the last set of instructions recommending a notoriously long psalm.51

Aldred's office texts are thus organized somewhat by type (hymn, collect, chapter, psalms), but also with sequences for a single service (Vespers, Compline).52 If someone tried to perform a particular hour with reference to this booklet, it would entail a certain amount of page flipping, as indeed it would in most service books of the time, a problem only resolved with the Breviary.53 Each of the sets of office materials has at its core the capitella. With Prime, the Little Hours, and Vespers, one could start with the relevant hymn from fol. 77, move to the capitella section for that hour, and then turn to the back for special psalms and close either with collects Aldred includes or those listed by Scribe C on fol. 76.54 Compline at bedtime entails less page flipping since the hymn, capitella, and collects occur in sequence (QXI.40–41).55 Although some of these materials could be seasonal or specified for Sunday, the overall impression is of relatively generic material for an ordinary day, repeating in each hour standard formulas (incipit prompts for the Pater noster, Creed, and Gloria), while glossing virtually every word, including “amen.”56

Similarly, the addition of a vernacular gloss to the generic devotional material that follows in QXI.42–43—the seven penitential psalms for Prime, and incipits of special psalms—suggests pedagogical and reflective functions. Thus the most common explanation for the office additions here in Quire XI and earlier is that the materials were copied for reference or educational purposes, in the midst of liturgical reform, perhaps even while Aldred was traveling with Bishop Ælfsige.

51. I have not located a comparable set of instructions to these, which sound as if derived from a rule.
52. Some of the rubrics are confusing. At fol. 79va6 after the chapters for Prime he has noted “here follows prayers for Prime” (postea sequitur oratio ad primam); and at fol. 80v10–11 after the chapter headings for Terce, Sext, and None, he wrote “look below for three collects” (require infra collectiones tres, glossed in Old English), although what follows is a collect and chapters for Vespers, then two collects labeled only as following prayers (sequitur orationes). He also left a blank line (fol. 82ra18) between the two collects, so there may be a missing rubric. Brown, Durham Ritual, 49, speculates that the reference to three prayers at fol. 80v10–11 refers to the preceding prayers for Prime on fol. 79v, but see n. 90 below for an alternate explanation.
54. Both sequences by Scribe C and Aldred start somewhat unusually with Prime rather than Nocturns, although curiously so does Ælfric in his Letter to the Monks of Eynsham, chapter 2 (ed. Jones, 151), a departure from his source, the Regularis concordia.
56. See, for example, fol. 78r9 (QXI.33).
Another possible comparison, however, is with the proto-Breviary developments visible in a few eleventh-century manuscripts that experimented with different ways to put together a template for the ordinary days and offices, as Pfaff labels it, a “sample week.” The glossed additions by Aldred in Quire XI do not constitute a sample week, but might be a sample day (possibly a Sunday), experimenting first with sorting by type of material and then attempting a sequence. The inclusion of capitella interceding for brethren in the community as well as the bishop and king suggests public services, while the vernacular gloss suggests private prayer and reflection; perhaps the booklet was multipurpose in different contexts. Aldred, the bishop, or other members of the community might have taken such a booklet with them while traveling to other churches or outlying estates for reference and instruction as well as personal devotional usage. Since many of these additions are accretions of the type notable in the Regularis concordia, it is possible to imagine Aldred or Bishop Ælfsige traveling to or in Wessex, using this booklet as a mechanism for exploring the reform of services underway in the south, not just as passive recipients of texts new to them but perhaps as active participants in the discussion. Quire XI in particular may be their reform workbook on the road.

In this context, it is noteworthy that Aldred’s office materials in Quire XI continue in the same double column format up to and including the Cuthbert collects (QXI.44; image 10), which may form part of this collection even though copied under separate circumstances in Wessex. Also, Scribe C’s addition of a Cuthbert musical sequence on a singleton in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 183 (fol. 96v) might be placed here in relation to Aldred’s collects as stray pieces of a missing puzzle regarding the services for St. Cuthbert at Chester-le-Street. Although the additions made in the other quires, particularly the number of lections for Nocturns discussed below, indicate a secular office matching the original collectar, the piecemeal nature of the additions allows for the possibility that other parts might have explored an extended monastic office. And although Aldred is assumed to be a secular canon, he and Bishop Ælfsige may nonetheless have had in mind reform office material that would sustain that elusive group of monks hovering around the body of St. Cuthbert that Symeon of Durham insisted survived the tenth-century era at Chester-le-Street.


58. For comparisons of the collects to other service books, see Fulda 41; Hohler, “The Durham Services on Honour of St Cuthbert,” 158. Hohler notes that Cuthbert was celebrated on Thursdays, as well as daily at Lauds and Vespers.

59. The addition of the Cuthbert collects suggests this reform context, perhaps added as a complement to CCCC 183 (on which, see Milfull, Hymns, 63–64).
Readings

Included in the daily office, primarily at Nocturns, are lections, generally from Scripture and assigned seasonally or for the occasion. These readings are accompanied by blessings and sung verses called antiphons, versicles, and responses that frame the reading. The “chapters” in the original collectar of Durham A.IV.19 appear to be transitional between an “old” and a “new” Lectionary, which means that by the late tenth century it was out-of-date with practices in the south of England.\(^{60}\) Additions made at Chester-le-Street specifically for the Lectionary are scattered and fragmentary, but readings were also incorporated within other services, most notably the memorials, discussed below, that Scribe C copied with full text of the scriptural passage, useful presumably for the lector who does not have the biblical texts at hand. The apparently random addition of isolated lection blessings by Scribe C in Quire VIII and sung verses for readings scattered in Quires VIII, X, and XI by Scribes E and F effectively add components for Nocturns otherwise absent from the other daily office materials copied by Aldred and Scribe C.

In Quire VIII at the outset of the additions (fols. 61v1–62v18), Scribe C added benedictions for the lections or the lector at the night office, which Aldred started to gloss and then abandoned (QVIII.2). The comparable set in Leofric Missal A (c. 900) are labeled *incipiunt benedictiones ad lectorem*, blessings for the reader at Nocturns; the Durham A.IV.19 label, *Incipiunt benedictiones ad lectionem* which Aldred glossed *onginnad bloedsvangas to rede*, is more ambiguous as to whether it blesses the reader, the reading, or both.\(^{61}\) The prayers are listed by occasion with some experimentation in format, perhaps to aid the cantor: initially Scribe C marked crosses with titles and started blessings on a new line but limited them to two lines, sometimes struggling to get the amen to fit; but beginning with the daily prayers at fol. 62r5 he kept the blessings to a single line with the amens adjusted to the right margin forming a column, a pattern he abandons on the verso with the untitled post-Nocturn commendations.\(^{62}\) This sequence of blessings, nearly identical to the first pages of Leofric Missal A (c. 900), is clearly for secular canons with nine lessons at Nocturns for

---

61. See Orchard, *Leofric Missal*, vol. 1, 30–31; Tolhurst, *Hyde Abbey*, vol. 6, 9 notes that the blessing of the lector occurs in the first nocturn after the psalms, anthems, and versicle, before the three lessons with their responds, although shortened in the summer.
62. They are not all labeled in Durham A.IV.19, but matching them with the Leofric Missal they appear in this sequence: in the Temporal, nine for Christmas (untitled), Epiphany, three for Resurrection at Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, and Advent; then a set of nineteen daily (*cotidianis diebus*), followed by four post-Nocturn commendations (untitled, but commemorating the Virgin, peace, and the Trinity); then a series for the Sanctoral (or for the Commune Sanctorum), commemorating Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors (untitled), and three for All Saints. At fol. 62v15, he starts the line with “A malis cunctis” as if this is the start of a new prayer, but it is actually the last two words of the previous prayer and the first word (*Cunctis*) of the next.
high feasts and three for secondary feasts.\textsuperscript{63} These blessings for the reader and/or the reading are further evidence of episcopal ownership since such lists are normally found in bishop's books.\textsuperscript{64}

The other Lectionary related materials are also sung verses, added in seemingly extra space between unrelated materials by Scribes E and F. Scribe F added responsories, versicles, and antiphons for lections in two places. In Quire VIII at fols. 64r17–65r17 (QVIII.10; image 19), he interrupted Scribe C’s Passion-tide hymns with sung verses for the Old Testament readings of Tobit, Judith, Maccabees, and “Minor” Prophets, lections generally assigned to late September through November in the new Lectionary.\textsuperscript{65}

On the back of the singleton fol. 76v1–29 (QIX/X.25) and virtually illegible due to wear, Scribe F also added sung verses for the Old Testament readings of Kings, Wisdom (Solomon's books), and Job, which may have figured earlier in August and September, although the historical books—including Kings—were dropped from the new Lectionary. Scribe F copied these short incipits in triple or double columns with rubrics identifying the lection along with R, V, and A for responsories, versicles, and antiphons. Scribe E, on the verso of Aldred’s Cuthbert collect and colophon page, added an incomplete set of responsories, versicles, and antiphons for the first four Sundays in Advent (Nocturns and Lauds) using single-column continuous text unrubricated (fol. 84v1–35, QXI.47).\textsuperscript{66} The fourth Sunday is incomplete, probably because he ran out of room—whether he continued elsewhere or not is unknown. These reference texts, set for a secular community’s readings at Nocturns, would clue in a cantor on which texts to sing on these occasions.

If the texts the scribes copy are for themselves rather than just a scribal task undertaken for the bishop under Aldred’s orders, then we can guess at their clerical rank. Scribes E and F might have been clergy in training, possibly cantors who would need to know the text and tone set by the antiphon for the readings during the night offices, while Scribe B’s position copying the John poison prayer may be that of exorcist. Scribe D’s primarily blessing materials places him in clerical orders, perhaps a deacon or priest. Aldred and Scribe C, by comparison, added materials for the celebrant of the day offices: Aldred predominantly for ordinary days and exclusive of seasonal collects (i.e., in the fall after Pentecost and before Advent); and Scribe C more generic forms of

\textsuperscript{63} Orchard, \textit{Leofric Missal}, vol. 1, 30–33. Two sets of prayers are reversed in order compared to LM A: the set on fol. 62r13–14 are found in LM A 76 and 75, while the set on fol. 62r19–20 are found in LM A 82 and 81.

\textsuperscript{64} See Hughes, \textit{Medieval Manuscripts}, 60–62, 286.

\textsuperscript{65} Although the last section is labeled “de minoribus prophetis” in fact the lessons listed are drawn from Isaiah and Daniel, major prophets whose readings fall later in November or in December. See Palazzo, \textit{History}, 150; and \textit{Ælfric’s Letter}, 74 (ed. Jones, 146–47).

\textsuperscript{66} See Tolhurst, \textit{Hyde Abbey}, vol. 1, fo. 2–14 for a later compendium of this breviary material, correlated in my annotations to the text (see also Thompson, \textit{Rituale}, xi).
special occasions, in addition to the daily collects on the floating singleton (fol. 76). Scribe C’s concerns are more directly related to adding in Quire VIII material to supplement the original collectar, while Aldred’s office materials are more basic and therefore educational in function, at least in part, if not also devotional.

Hymns

Hymns, verses sung in praise of God, formed part of worship services both in the monastic and clerical offices, and were seasonal in the liturgical cycle (Temporal and Sanctoral). The Anglo-Saxon repertoire of hymns—162 in Inge Milfull’s masterful edition and study, built on Gneuss’ work, of the main surviving liturgical hymns—is a composite borrowed from various regions of the continent; evidence exists for use of “Old Hymnal” collections extant into the eighth century, the intermediary Frankish Hymnal, and then the “New Hymnal” developed in Francia in the ninth century. The New Hymnal spread rapidly elsewhere on the continent by the tenth century and offered a richer variety, but also more stable set of shorter hymns. In England, the New Hymnal emerged at the major centers of the tenth-century Benedictine reform, Winchester and Canterbury, from which we have five surviving monastic hymnals, as well as one for secular canons at Exeter. These complete or nearly complete Anglo-Saxon hymnals are primarily eleventh century (one late tenth–early eleventh) and are found not as stand-alone manuscripts but as part of a service book with a Psalter, calendar, computistical material, a Collectar, or with an instructional book for novices (the *Expositio hymnorum*). Consequently, many of these hymnals, not to mention the more numerous psalters, are glossed in Old English, primarily as an aid for novices for whom learning the psalms, hymns, and canticles by heart was a first step in liturgical life and Latin. Individual and sets of hymns also appear in other manuscript contexts, including Durham A.IV.19.

Although Durham A.IV.19’s additions constitute neither a hymnal nor a monastic office book, its eleven hymns copied by Scribes C, E, and Aldred offer

---


68. Milfull, *Hymns*, 9–15; the Winchester and Canterbury hymnals overlap and differ from each other, as does the mid-eleventh century Exeter secular hymnal from both.

69. Despite its name and current location, the Durham Hymnal (Durham Cathedral Library B.III.32) is not a Northumbrian product but of Canterbury provenance, early eleventh century. Keefer, *ASM* 14, 59 notes that the first part of the Durham Hymnal with the hymns and canticles may have been self-contained at one point; it was bound with the other part, containing Ælfric’s Grammar, as early as the eleventh century (Milfull, *Hymns*, 28–29).

70. See Milfull, *Hymns*, 41 and 66, and also in general her discussion of the manuscript transmission, 26–69.
evidence of the early evolution of the New Hymnal in Anglo-Saxon England, whether monastic or secular is unclear. Scribe C’s Easter hymns (QVIII.9, 11–13; image 19) are not in the Old Hymnal except for his last one, Hy 70, which is found in both the Old and the New Hymnals as well as the Frankish intermediary. Four of Aldred’s hymns (QXI.26–31, 40) can be found in the Old Hymnal as well as the New: Hy 7, 9, 11, and the fragment of 72, an Easter hymn found in the Old, Frankish, and New Hymnals. The other three, Hy 1, 8, and 10, are not found in the Old Hymnal.

If Durham A.IV.19 was produced by or for a secular community’s daily office, it does not anticipate any of the differences found in the one surviving secular hymnal, the Exeter hymnal (London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D.xii): all except one of Aldred’s hymns are found in this mid-eleventh-century hymnal for secular canons (and the one missing, Hy 72, may be caused by lost pages in the Easter section of the manuscript). One of Scribe C’s hymns (Hy 55, QVIII.11), is assigned in the Exeter hymnal to Candlemas, whereas in the monastic manuscripts of the New Hymnal and in Durham A.IV.19, it is associated with Easter. Another of Exeter’s deviations from the monastic New Hymnal is in placing Hy 68 at Vespers instead of Lauds, as it is in the monastic hymnals as well as Durham A.IV.19 (QVIII.9). The hymns in Durham A.IV.19, therefore, may be excerpts from a no longer extant New Hymnal of an earlier date or may represent an effort on the part of the Cuthbert community to collate the Frankish or New Hymnal material, but if so with a more monastic orientation than that found in the later secular hymnal of Exeter.

The format of most of these hymns suggests either a performative or educational context, while private study may explain some of the non-performative elements. Aldred and Scribes C and E use few abbreviations and generally write out the doxologies rather than just giving an incipit of a standard formula as found in most hymnals, a habit recurring in the collects and capitella of Aldred and also in some of Scribe C’s other office materials. Both Scribes C and E wrote out the hymn Auctor salutis (Hy 68, QVIII.9) in wide clear hands and included a Trinitarian doxology, whereas Scribe C’s later hymns do not. These factors would make the hymns easy to sing from the text, perhaps for instruction. However, other elements in Aldred’s hymns might inhibit performance. In Hy 7 (QXI.26), Aldred included a composite doxology that would have

---


72. See Appendix I in Milfull, Hymns, 473–74 for a chart comparing Old Hymnal to New Hymnal.

73. See Milfull, Hymns, Appendix II, 475–78 for the hymns found in the Exeter secular hymnal (Milfull, ms H).

74. Milfull, Hymns, 280.
been difficult to sing. In Hy 9 for Sext (QXI.28, fol. 77r23), his substitution of *concordiam* (glossed *efneheortam*) for *cordium* (heart) as found in other hymnals, would affect the meter. Also unsingable is the vernacular gloss, suggesting a private devotional or communal study context. For example, in Hy 8’s doxology (QXI.27, fol. 77r18), Aldred glosses *presta pater piissime* with a vocative *gionn la fæder arwyrdêta*, which he does again at fol. 80ra4 glossing *la god on deus*.77 The vocative adds an element of emotion to the vernacular not sung in the Latin but suggesting the possibility of a reader speaking the vernacular ("O God"), a trait found also in Anselm’s more individualized private devotional prayers.78 If not Scribe C’s, then at least Aldred’s glossed hymns may have been used more for study and reflection than performance.

Scribe C copied his Passiontide hymns at the end of Quire VIII, with one seeming interruption, in a section unglossed by Aldred (QVIII.9, 11–13). These four (or five) hymns fall in the season from Lent to Easter (Hy 68, 55, 67 in two parts, and 70).79 The first one he copied, Hy 68 (QVIII.9), is set off from the others by a number of factors. Hy 68 is a hymn found in Anglo-Saxon and German hymnals but not Frankish; it was also copied by Scribe E on an erased page earlier in the original collectar; as noted in chapter 3, minor differences aside, the copies by Scribes C and E share a unique similarity in word order that suggests they worked together, either both from a common exemplar or one copied from the other.80 Scribe C copied it in single-column width in a generous majuscule on fol. 64v1–16, but did not include a title or a final “amen,” added later by another hand. His hymn falls between Scribe E’s two unlabeled generic prayers (fol. 64r9–17, QVIII.8) and Scribe F’s addition of

76. The substitution, possibly a copying error, is understandable since the earlier part of the sentence has to do with ending discord (*litium, giciidana*). Milfull, *Hymns*, 131: *Extingue flammas litium, aufer calorem noxium, confer salutem corporum veramque pacem cordium*; “Extinguish the flames of discord and banish the hurtful heat, grant us the health of our bodies and true peace in our hearts.”
77. Hy 10 in the Durham Hymnal also has a vocative “ó/ela þu god” glossing *deus* in the first line of the hymn (Milfull, *Hymns*, 132). At fol. 78va22 (QXI.33) Aldred renders the more usual *Agnus dei (qui tollis peccata mundi) as Agne dei*.
79. Hy 67 and Hy 67*, a hymn by Venantius Fortunatus, most hymnals assign to Vespers and Matins, although in the Collectar found in the Exeter secular hymnal, the whole was assigned to Vespers, while the second half was also assigned for Lauds of the Invention and Exaltation of the Cross (Milfull, *Hymns*, 275, 278).
80. Milfull, *Hymns*, 3, 23, 56, notes that Hy 68 is one of the hymns found in Anglo-Saxon England and in Germany but not France and posits transmission from Germany through Lotharingia; she also notes, p. 280, that this Passiontide hymn was sung at Lauds, or in ms H (the Exeter hymnal for secular canons), at Vespers.
unrelated material in triple and double column (fol. 64r17–65r17; QVIII.10). Hy 68 thus stands apart from the rest of Scribe C’s hymns, perhaps copied from a different exemplar and in the context of some kind of copying exercise with Scribe E.

After Scribe F’s “interruption,” Scribe C copied his other three/four hymns on fol. 65r18–65v29 (QVIII.11–13), reverting to single-column width as soon as he could, but not as widely spaced as Hy 68 on fol. 64v and getting more crowded by the bottom of 65v as he neared the end of Quire VIII. As with Hy 68, Scribe C’s set of hymns are untitled, except for one label, *ymnis infra quadragesima*, probably added by another hand at the top of fol. 65v; several corrections and additions may also have been done by other hands. Nothing in any of the other material added to Quire VIII, mostly benedictions of everyday objects copied by Scribe D, provides any context for the inclusion of this set of Easter hymns here. The community may have lacked a complete hymnal in its other service books, but the formatting—the absence of titles and the fullness of text, and the later corrections—suggests a compiling endeavor amidst a possible pedagogical setting.

Aldred’s hymns for daily offices are separated from Scribe C’s both seasonally and in the current binding of the manuscript. However, as suggested in chapter 3, these two sets may once have been contiguous: conceivably at some point in its early history Quire XI beginning with Aldred’s hymns could have been placed after Quire VIII ending with Scribe C’s hymns. Unlike Scribe C’s Passiontide set, Aldred’s seven hymns in Quire XI are presented as part of daily office materials during ordinary time. He copied them in two places, six in an initial group for the hours (QXI.26–31) and one later incorporated with the Compline section (QXI.40). All are titled and glossed in red (aspects of the Old English gloss are explored in chapter 5). Aldred’s seven hymns (Hy 7–10, a verse from Hy 72, Hy 1, and then Hy 11) are for daily use in the office, similar to Scribe C’s collects on the singleton fol. 76r (QIX/X.24). Excluding the odd verse and doxology from Easter Hy 72 (QXI.30), the other six of Aldred’s hymns closely match two similar collections or lists, one in an early ninth-century Carolingian set of eight hymns (Cologne, Dombibliothek 106) and the other in the Latin and Old English Benedictine office found in Oxford, Bodleian Junius 121.81 Of particular interest is that the latter, an Anglo-Saxon manuscript dated to the third quarter of the eleventh century, has a sequence similar to Aldred’s, placing Hy 1 after the sequence Hy 7–Hy 10.82 This evidence


82. The sequence in Cologne, Dombibliothek 106 is more complicated since the hymns were added in
tentatively suggests that Aldred’s hymns come from a reform effort to regularize the hymnal in the daily office and therefore implies some contact either with continental hymnals or with the monastic reform movement underway in the south.

The group of six hymns beginning Quire XI.26–31 (Hy 7–10, Hy 72 verse, and Hy 1) Aldred copied in single-column width on both sides of fol. 77, somewhat worn on the recto because of the quire break; the verso ends with space filled later by Scribe M2 (image 14). The first four hymns are for ordinary days of the week in the office at the intermediate, daytime Hours of Prime, Terce, Sext, and None. In the New Hymnal, the daily hymns had some seasonal variation: Hy 1, 3, 4, and 12 were assigned for winter and Lent, alternating with Hy 2, 5, 6, and 11 used in summer from the octave of Pentecost until Nov. 1. Whether Aldred was aware of such a system emerging, as detailed later in the Regularis concordia and by Ælfric, is unclear, but it is curious that the first set of four hymns on fol. 77rv falls between these two seasonal groups: Hy 7 (Prime), Hy 8 (Terce), Hy 9 (Sext), and Hy 10 (None), are assigned in the New Hymnal year-round with some substitutions at Lent and Pentecost for Hy 8, 9, and 10.

Immediately following Hy 10 on fol. 77v, Aldred copied two other hymn items that occur elsewhere in the New Hymnal. The first (QXI.30) is the last stanza and doxology from a long Easter hymn for Lauds (Hy 72, stanza 11), labeled as such (ymnus de resurrectione iesu christi domini nostri) but perhaps included here as a regular rather than Easter Sunday observation of the Resurrection. The second item (QXI.31) is Hy 1 specified by the Regularis concordia for first Sunday Vespers (Saturday night) for the short days in winter, with Aldred’s version shortening it further to just the first two verses and no doxology. Combined, both hymn portions may have functioned together on Saturday evening in preparation for the morrow’s celebration of the Resurrection, though not necessarily sung together as one hymn since they have different meter.

This section of hymns finishes with blank space at the bottom of fol. 77v into which Aldred could have fit, and may have planned, more verses or another hymn (image 14). Instead, Aldred begins a new section at the top empty space by Scribe O on the bottom of fol. 44r (for Prime, Terce, Sext, and None) and then on space at the bottom of fol. 46rv (two for Vespers, two for Compline); see Jones, “Cologne MS. 106,” 33.

83. Palazzo, History of Liturgical Books, 125, gives a simple outline of these four intermediate hours conducted similarly.
84. Milfull, Hymns, 24.
86. See Milfull, Hymns, 58 for a discussion of this oddity.
87. Regularis concordia, chapter 28.
88. Hy 1 is in Ambrosian iambic dimeter (Milfull, Hymns, 110) while Hy 72 is in rhythmical Ambrosian hymn verse (Milfull, Hymns, 292). Also, the doxology is on the first item (Hy 72) and absent from the second (Hy 1).
89. The “amen” at the end of verse 2 of this hymn (fol. 77v18) could have been added later. The blank lines at the bottom of fol. 77v scribe M2 later filled with episcopal benedictions (QXI.32).
of fol. 78r (image 15), switching to double column, except for the title, but continuing to gloss.90 The collects and chapters for Sunday Prime, Terce, Sext, None, and Vespers discussed above continue with Compline, where Aldred includes his seventh and last hymn: Hy 11 (QXI.40, fol. 82rb12–va3) for daily Compline, normally designated for summer usage, followed by two collects to complete the Compline office. Why he embeds this hymn in the relevant office and not the others is puzzling, but as suggested earlier with Aldred’s office material, these may be part of his experimentation in compiling proto-Breviary material.91

Thus Quire XI in some ways resembles a private prayer book—its daily prayers, hymns, and other devotional pieces such as the seven penitential psalms combined with its tribute to Cuthbert and even the glossed “educational” texts—are comparable to something like the Ælfwine Prayerbook. The fullness with which he copies what should be texts familiar from years of daily observance, plus the addition of a vernacular gloss, suggests either teaching or meditative study. And yet the inclusion of corporate prayers and prayers for the community and various leaders in the capitella point to communal, if not public, performance. In that light, it bears remembering that lay persons also attended services in the church and would be included in the “we” of the communal prayers in the daily office and the mass.92

**COMMUNAL SERVICES**

Other services performed by the community attached to or outside of the daily office are for specific occasions and situations that relate more directly to the lay population. The first type of materials involves the community of the saints, memorials and prayers copied by Scribe C and Aldred as enhancements to the daily round of prayers. The second type are protective blessings for homes, fields, and produce, copied primarily by Scribe D in Quires VIII and XI, with the addition of Scribe B’s St. John poison prayer and Aldred’s field prayers. Together, these materials give us a better sense of the Chester-le-Street community both inside and outside its walls.

---

90. The title on fol. 78r, *Incipiunt capitulæ ad primam*, spans both columns and is glossed, uncommon for Aldred. At fol. 80vo10–11, he gives a directional rubric, *require infra collectiones tres*, glossed in Old English, telling the reader to look below for three collects, the first of which is immediately below (fol. 80va12–22) titled *Oratio secreta ante initium uespertinae laudis* also glossed; the other two collects appear after a lengthy set of capitula for Vespers, at fol. 82ra6–b11, labeled *oratio sequitur* (unglossed); Hy 11 then follows.

91. Keefer, *ASM* 14, p. 45, notes that this section from fol. 78rat to the top of fol. 84r “form a suite of related devotional material” while Milfull, *Hymns*, 58, notes the appropriateness of the collects between the six hymns and the last one.

Community of the Saints: Memorials for the Living and the Dead

In the Quire IX–X booklet, the bulk of Scribe C’s additions on fols. 68–75 are memorials designated for individuals and groups associated with the community, comparable in some ways to Sanctoral and Commune Sanctorum sections in other service books as well as prayer books. Nonetheless, Scribe C’s items complement rather than duplicate the original Durham A.IV.19 collector’s Sanctoral and Commune Sanctorum materials. Indeed, their addition may reflect liturgical reform anticipating some of the new materials added to the office in, for example, the Regularis concordia. These memorials are generic in the sense that they are not for a specific calendar date but can be adapted for a particular saint or occasion, in many cases as an attachment to one of the daily hours. However, unlike an “office” or a “mass,” the term memoriae as used to describe this section of Durham A.IV.19’s additions is one applied by modern scholars, not by early medieval churchmen, to label commemorations of the living and the dead in the Commune Sanctorum: saints universal and local, benefactors, royalty, and members of their community or sister houses. Increasingly in the ninth and tenth centuries, religious houses devoted considerable time on a daily basis to such remembrances, also called suffrages, as part of a network crossing geographic and temporal boundaries. These prayers and sung texts, drawn in part from the relevant mass texts, could have variable application in different offices or even be used in private devotions. For example, in the memorial for St. Paul at fol. 69v17, later Durham Scribe M3 has added “vel memoriam” above “natalitia” to indicate that the prayer can be used at other times than the celebration of Paul’s feast day.

Between fols. 68v and 71v7 Scribe C, concluding his sixth writing stint, copied memorials for the Cross with prayers for Vespers (QIX/X.17–20), specific saints (QIX/X.21), and finally memorial prayers for the dead (QIX/X.22). These memorials differ from the chapters and collects for these occasions found in the original collector’s Sanctoral section, although some of the prayers are similar. The memorials include sung portions (antiphons, versicles, and responses) and were probably intended as additions to certain daily hours, either corporately performed or possibly as private or individual devotional exercises, and fit with accretions attributed to the tenth-century Benedictine

93. Sanctoral (Corrêa, items 290–494, fols. 21r14–38v); Commune Sanctorum (Corrêa, items 495–574, fols. 39r–44v); the latter falls at the end of Quire VI, with pages missing at the beginning of Quire VII, which picks up on fol. 45 with cross prayers.

reform, evident also in Aldred’s capitella (suffrages) in his office material discussed earlier.

The Regularis concordia specifications, reiterated by Ælfric in his letter to the monks of Eynsham, add to Lauds and Vespers, after suffrages for royalty and benefactors, antiphons to the Cross, the Blessed Virgin Mary, and the local patron saint; also added were the Office of the Dead at Nocturns, Lauds, and Vespers and of All Saints at both Lauds and Vespers.95 Scribe C’s additions may indicate contact with or awareness of these elaborations on the office, since he includes, among other things, memorials to the Cross, Mary, a Confessor (into which later Durham Scribe M3 has inserted Cuthbert’s name as patron), and the Dead. For example, Scribe C’s cross memorial prayers, many associated with the Easter season, were interwoven with Vespers material (QIX/X.17–20) and elaborated on by later Scribe M3, suggesting experimentation with how to incorporate these additional rituals into the existing office structure.96 Similar material addressing the cross is incorporated into private prayers at Vespers and for the Invention of the Cross in the Portiforium of Wulstan and the Ælfwine Prayerbook; however, in the Durham A.IV.19 prayers, first person plural is used throughout as opposed to singular.97 The various saints’ memorials that follow (QIX/X.21) are fairly standard, although St. Michael occurs twice (QIX/X.21a and c) with the Blessed Virgin Mary between (QIX/X.21b).98 While some of the prayers are also found in the saint’s calendar day in other service books, including the original collectar, here they combine to form a special memorial or set of suffrages added to the daily office at different hours.99

The memorials for the Dead (fols. 70r15–71r7, QIX/X.22) illustrate even further the problems of trying to identify the use to which the community

---


96. See notes to the texts, QIX/X.17–20, for parallel items in other service books, mostly associated with Passion week. The original collectar in a section of various blessings on fol. 45r1–21 has a different set of six prayers to the cross (Corrêa, items 575–580), some of which are found in LM A 1945–49, a mass in honor of the cross in a section of memorial masses.


99. See notes to the texts for identification of prayers found in the original collectar, Leofric Missal, Leofric Collectar, and the Portiforium of Wulstan, where the hours are specified.
put these memorial prayers, whether in the Office of the Dead at Nocturns, Lauds, and Vespers, as a commemoration at the Chapter office after Prime, or as part of a Mass for the Dead. In all masses, the dead as well as the living were named in prayer during the Eucharist.100 Specific masses for the dead occurred not only at the time of death and burial and on anniversaries but also in special votive masses involving alms for the sick in a reciprocal exchange among the living family and the religious community; for example, the prayer for many dead in QIX/X.22a includes a reference to almsgiving (eleemosyna, fol. 70r21).101 Reformed monastic practice, as noted above in the Regularis concordia, incorporated an Office of the Dead into Nocturns, Lauds, and Vespers. But also from the ninth century, religious communities commemorated the dead from their community and other communities in their network at the Chapter meeting after Prime, hence the development of Martyrologies to remember the anniversaries of saints and necrologies, Confraternity and other memorial books (libri memoriales) with the names and dates of the departed for use at mass or in the Chapter meeting.102

What complicates the case of Scribe C’s memorials for the dead as office material is that he subsequently appended similar prayers in the next sections of memorial prayers drawn from masses.103 At the bottoms of fols. 71r, 71v, and 72r, he copied prayers separated from the main text by a line or short bar; these lines in the bottom margin must have been added after the memorial mass materials on these pages had been completed.104 In his edition, Lindelöf included these as part of the mass prayers copied on those folios (Holy Trinity, Confessor, Martyr, QIX/X.23a–c), but all three added texts are identifiably prayers for the dead, although labeled with mass rubrics “+post communion” (71r28), “+ad complendum” (71v27), and “alia” (72r27) in a way not found in


102. Palazzo, History of Liturgical Books, 162–67. Although it lacks commemoration dates, the Durham Liber vitae, placed on or by the altar, could serve such a function, but it is unlikely it was in use at Chester-le-Street in Aldred’s day.

103. In the texts, I have numbered them accordingly, with QIX/X.22 as items k, l, and m rather than as part of QIX/X.23.

104. The memorial mass texts begin stint 7 distinct from the preceding collection of memorials in stint 6. The added prayers extend the number of lines to 29 or 30, more than is usual in comparison to other folios in this section; and they are in the smaller sized minuscule Scribe C has used to set off verses in the main text done in majuscule. Also, the mass rubrics to the prayers for the dead are in the left margin and could have been added later, although the hand looks like Scribe C’s and is similar to marginal rubrication he included throughout this section.
Scribe C’s main portion of the memorials for the Dead. The main texts for Holy Trinity, Confessor, and Martyr mass sets already have post communion prayers, so these would be duplicates, and unlikely ones since the content in praying for the dead would not be appropriate for the end of any of these mass prayers. Scribe C clearly marked off these prayers as separate from the main texts on these folios, not only with a line, but with a signe de renvoi to point the reader of the main text onto the appropriate continuation on the next page.

Thus the prayers added to the bottom margins of fols. 71r, 71v, and 72r are more likely intended as a belated continuation of the memorials for the Dead that Scribe C copied before the masses, fols. 70r15–71r7, but with the added rubrication for use specifically in commemoration of the Dead. He may have located these later in his source or found them in a different source. Indeed, one prayer occurring twice shows significant variation in language. The version at fol. 70v26–31 (QIX/X.22h) in the main body of the memorials for the Dead has added phrases not found in one of the bottom margin additions (fol. 72r27–29, QIX/X.22m); the latter, shorter version appears in the Leofric Missal, but the added phrases have not been located in any other service book version. This suggests that Scribe C had more than one source from which he was compiling these memorials and that the main one he used initially represented a local tradition not found in the extant Gelasian or Gregorian sacramentaries, or the emerging Romano-Germanic pontificals. Scribe C may have set himself the task of finding and compiling these variants as they came to hand.

With the new, seventh, writing stint at fols. 71r8–75v23 (QIX/X.23), Scribe C continued to compile memorial prayers for use in the office, but this set is derived from specific mass texts combined with Lectionary readings and sung texts, first for the Holy Trinity (23a), and then various for the Commune Sanctorum, generic services adaptable for local use: birth of one Confessor (23b), one Martyr (23c), many Martyrs (23d), one Virgin Martyr (23e), vigil of one Apostle or Martyr (23f) and common (birth) of one Apostle or Martyr (23g). Some of these may be derived from votive masses of the type

---

105. Both ad complendum and post communion designate the same prayer at the end of the mass, the former was commonly used in the Roman texts and the latter in Gelasian texts, but there is considerable overlap in usage, as here.

106. The interrupted text of the Holy Trinity mass set has a signe de renvoi at fol. 71r27 above the line separating it from the added text; another may be at fol. 72r after the last word above the curving bar setting off the added text below. The lectio from Ecclesiasticus interrupted at the page turn of 72r–v has a semicolon-like sign after the last word, intellectus, a punctuation mark not necessitated by the text, which continues on the next page.

107. LM A 2186 has the shorter, marginal QIX/X.22m; the longer version (QIX/X.22h) does not appear in the RGP (ed. Vogel, et al.), the Gregorian Sacramentary (ed. Deshusses), the Gelasian Sacramentary (The Gelasian Sacramentary: Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Ecclesiae, ed. H. A. Wilson, see 304–5), or the Red Book of Darley (CCCC 422) masses for the dead.

specified by Alcuin. Although most of the prayers can be identified in other service books, they are more often found in a specific saint’s day than in the comparable generic mass; overall the materials have much in common with the Ælfwine Prayerbook with its readings and “private” devotional prayers, often of the same generic quality as Scribe C’s memorials here. Since these prayers are adapted from the mass for use in the daily office, Scribe C copied only the opening collect and completing prayer (ad complendum), but not the mass Preface, the text said by the celebrant before the Eucharist beginning Vere dignum. He also included the Scripture lections, similar to a Collectar or Lectionary, writing out the full passage of the text and not just the incipits. The first five sets (from Holy Trinity through Common of a Virgin Martyr, QIX/X/23a–e) include sung portions written out in minuscule versus the majuscule or mixed majuscule and minuscule of the prayers and readings, but the sung portions drop out with the last two masses (Vigil and Common of Apostle or Martyr) so they only have the two prayers and the two readings.

Titles of the texts are rubricated until the last mass for the Common of Apostle or Martyr (QIX/X.23g), which is in black but with a cross in the left margin to indicate the start of a new text. Either Scribe C ran out of red ink or he ceased to be interested in differentiating texts by color and style. This may reflect the shortage of parchment as he added onto singlets.

Another indication of the compiling challenges Scribe C faced in this section is the note with cross in the mass for a Confessor at fol. 72r3 directing readers in Old English and with a cross signe de renvoi to “+look below for the Gospel reading.” Although the text of Matthew 24:45–47 follows almost immediately (hence with little need for elaborate directions to locate it), the Scripture the note actually references is a longer passage, the parable of the talents from Matthew 25:14–21 which Scribe C added belatedly three folios later on fol. 75v (the third but probably final of the four singletons in Quire X): this is the sole text on this page other than a later Durham addition at the bottom and it is labeled in the top margin with another signe de renvoi cross and “matheum.” This Gospel text is not, as Lindelöf and others place it, part of the preceding mass for the common of Apostle or Martyr, which already finished on the recto with its Gospel passage from John and its closing prayer, but belongs to the mass for a Confessor on fol. 72r as the note there indicates. Scribe C found it necessary to add this long text here, on what may have been his last singleton in this set, after copying the other masses, and to include a

110. For identifications and parallels in Ælfwine, see notes in the texts of QIX/X.23.
111. See T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 30, for discussion of this mixture of majuscule and minuscule.
112. Fol. 76, as noted earlier, stands alone, leaving fol. 75 as the actual end of this writing stint and content. The cross on fol. 75v has a top hook, similar to the one on fol. 72r but unlike the one marking the start of the common of one apostle or martyr mass on fol. 74v.
signe de renvoi with a vernacular explanation. Moreover, the Matthew 24 passage he has miscopied on fol. 72r in the Confessor mass is from the middle of a pericope found in the mass for Vigil of an Apostle or Martyr on fol. 74v, where he incidentally mislabels it as from the Gospel of John. The error in copying the wrong pericope into the Confessor mass could be the result of a page turn error from his source. \(^{113}\) But another possibility is that Scribe C was compiling from multiple sources and had difficulty extracting the correct Gospel reading, either from a Lectionary or a Gospel book. \(^{114}\) Whether Scribe C is compiling it himself or he is copying from a single source, the result is an unusual hybrid service book set of materials that combines prayers for the celebrant, sung portions for the cantor and choir helpfully set off in smaller font, and the full reading for the lector with red titles (until the red ink runs out).

Despite the incongruities making it hard to imagine how these texts were used, later Durham Scribe M3 seems to be on board with his predecessors’ project, correcting and adding to the memorials between fols. 68r and 72v (QIX/X.17–22). Significantly, he stops at the end of the bifolia in Quire IX and does not make any contributions to the appended singletons (fols. 73–76), although Durham Scribe M1 does put his coda honoring Bishop Aldhun at the end of fol. 75 (QIX/X.23M1). Scribe M3 added in the margin of fol. 68v an antiphon and two versicles for the memorial of the Holy Cross (QIX/X.18), marked by a signe de renvoi, as if for someone who would actually need to work out how to perform the service; he also added the Old English directions to one of the house blessings on the original collectar’s singleton fol. 47v, which as noted in the previous chapter may have been placed nearby (see QIX/X.160). Two other of M3’s additions are indicative of the usage to which these rituals were put, at least at Durham: at fol. 69v17 in the memorial for the Apostle Paul (QIX/X.21i), Scribe M3 added “vel memoria” above “natalitia” to indicate the transference of this feast day prayer to a memorial that could be celebrated at other times. Also on fol. 69v28 (QIX/X.21k), he inserted their patron saint’s name, “cuthberhti,” in the memorial for a confessor above the generic “pontificis N[omen].” So, while the Chester-le-Street community of scribes may have been copying generic material applicable to a variety of occasions, at least one later member at Durham followed through on adapting them to the community’s needs.

\(^{113}\) Thus if the source for the Confessor mass ended at the bottom of one page with the Gospel title and standard incipit “In illo tempore, dixit iesus discipulis suis [hanc parabolam] . . .” with the actual Gospel passage started at the top of the next page, Scribe C could have turned over two pages, finding at the top of the second a likely enough passage from Matthew that had actually begun on the previous page as part of the mass for Common of Apostle or Martyr.

The generic nature of the items copied by Scribe C fits with a lot of the office materials copied by Aldred that are common rather than proper, adaptable to any occasion rather than for a specific date in the Temporal or Sanctoral. The inclusion of antiphons, versicles, and responses in the memorials with the collects and Scripture readings but not prefaces for the masses suggests these texts benefited the members of the community participating in the daily office, secular or regular, but especially novices or new clergy, more than the celebrant conducting the services.\textsuperscript{115} While certain elements incorporated into the \textit{Regularis concordia} are not present in the Durham A.IV.19 additions, such as the \textit{Trina oratio} and Gradual psalms, others do appear in the extensive memorials and suffrages added by Scribe C and Aldred. Since the \textit{Regularis concordia} was discussed and produced around the same time as Durham A.IV.19’s additions, it cannot be a source, although one wonders about the reverse: is Durham A.IV.19 an early witness of a reform conversation of which the \textit{Regularis concordia} is the official record?\textsuperscript{116}

\section*{Community Service: Blessing Things}

Another form of public service for the community, both the canons and their dependants on the property as well as those in the surrounding area, are benedictions: blessings of various objects and even relationships in daily life.\textsuperscript{117} These benedictions represent ways of purifying or sanctifying the material world, sometimes in response to perceived threats. Into this category fall benedictions over marriages, monastic dedications, vestments, and tonsure and beard shaving; blessings of crops, fields, houses, vessels, food, and drink; cures for illnesses; and prayers exorcising and sanctifying objects or ingredients for use in other rituals, such as palms for Palm Sunday, salt and water for aspersions, or hot water and iron for the ordeal. Such miscellaneous prayers, blessings, and exorcisms are found at the end or in separate sections in many service books, as well as some private prayer books.

The original collectar of Durham A.IV.19 includes a fairly representative set of such blessings on fols. 45–60 (referenced by Corrêa’s edition numbers).\textsuperscript{118}

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{115} See speculations by Corrêa, \textit{Durham Collectar}, 77–79.
\item \textsuperscript{116} See, for example, the discussion by Kornexl, “The \textit{Regularis Concordia} and its Old English Gloss,” 96–97.
\item \textsuperscript{117} For an overview of benedictions in the context of medieval religious culture, see Derek A. Rivard, \textit{Blessing the World: Ritual and Lay Piety in Medieval Religion} (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2009).
\end{itemize}
The initial sets are primarily for use within the religious community itself and its members: blessings of palms (581–82) are followed by various prayers for barbering those in religious orders (583–88) and blessings of vessels, particularly older ones in need of consecration for sacred use (589–91). Then comes a series of agricultural blessings (trees, fruit, new bread, 592–94) ending with two generic prayers for “whatever you will” (595–96) and two residential blessings (597–598) that could be used within the religious compound (one of them is repeated later at 653 with blessings of salt and water for asperging). These last four items, the two generic and two house blessings, occur on fol. 47v, a page marked by Aldred with an *xb* (Christus benedictus) and later at Durham by Scribe M3, who added in the margin Old English directions for asperging with holy water and salt accompanied by sung verses with neumes (see QIX/X.16).

On a new folio (48r), Scribe O continued with the first of two sets of judicial ordeal materials (599–604), here for the ordeal of hot water; this is followed by various benedictions for female religious professions (605–623) and two more generic blessings (624–625), the second apparently for a meeting or convent (*super hanc conventionem*). What follows these blessings for religious, and before another judicial ordeal procedure begins on fol. 54r, are some blessings for marriage (626–630). The last, however, is interrupted by the erasure of fol. 53v overwritten by Scribe E with his hymn (QVIII.90). Whether more marriage blessings followed after the completion of item 630, or other miscellaneous blessings are now missing cannot be ascertained from the surviving folios; the erasure may have more to do with the convenience of a quire end than problems with the content. The hot iron ordeal begins on fol. 54r, the start of Quire VIII, which Aldred does not pick up glossing until mid-sentence on the verso, as if he too avoided the quire closing and opening, all suggestive of a disbound state.

The hot iron ordeal and the benediction materials that Scribe O copied near the end of his work in Quire VIII (fols. 54r–60r) bring into view a wider, lay population, in addition to the religious community. This ordeal, unlike the earlier one, includes an Old English oath. The next several items are labeled by Scribe O in Old English addressing various ills and accidents: for a man with a speaking problem (635), for sore eyes (636), a blessing of drink (637), plus another for a vat fouled by a rodent (638), for game (639–641), and hallowed water aspersions and protective blessings of house, barn, fields, animals, and food, somewhat confused (642–646).

---

119. See chapter 3 for more analysis of fol. 47v and Scribe M3’s interventions; the *xb* might have functioned as a way of noting the connection between the two passages of similar material.

120. The rubric “in thalamo” before 627 should precede 626, which is clearly for marriage.

121. Possibly it included some items such as those found in LM A following the *ad sponsas benedicendas* (2440–2446): for sterility in women (2447–48) and reconciling heretics (2449).

122. Confusions between title and content include items 639–41, blessings and aspersion for hunting, but with nets as well as game with an Old English title preceding 639 and a Latin title preceding 641 that
feast blessing invoking the wedding at Cana but titled “to read over vat fouled by a rodent,” a label that Christopher Hohler used to poke fun at English liturgical practices.\(^{123}\) The remainder of the miscellaneous blessings (647–656) have Latin titles but arguably secular uses: prayer for an infant, exorcisms and blessings of salt and water for various purposes, followed by a prayer for asperging a house, including a prayer repeated from the earlier section, possibly in this context for a residence outside the religious community.\(^{124}\)

The blessings copied at Chester-le-Street in Quires VIII and IX supplement but also duplicate those found in the original collectar. These materials were added by Scribes B, C, D, and Aldred, although as discussed in chapter 5, Aldred only glossed Scribe B’s one contribution and his own set, both of which are anomalous in having apocryphal and Irish connections. Scribe B’s somewhat shaky addition of the prayer attributed to John for protection from poison (QVIII.1; image 12) is found in Irish and Anglo-Saxon private prayer books and medical texts.\(^{125}\)

Aldred’s five field prayers on fols. 66r1–67v5 (QIX/X.14; image 13), opening Quire IX, are unusual from a paleographic as well as textual perspective, as detailed elsewhere:\(^{126}\) Aldred wrote the texts in red with black glossing and initially attempted a majuscule that reverted to minuscule; the texts themselves are nowhere found with this complexity, only in a shorter form in one Mainz service book of approximately the same era or in more generic form in the Romano-Germanic pontificals; and the inclusion of the angelic name Pan-

---

\(^{123}\) Christopher Hohler, “Some Service Books of the Later Saxon Church,” in \textit{Tenth Century Studies}, ed. David Parsons (London: Phillimore, 1975), 71–72: “And among the few apparently indisputable contributions of England to the Latin liturgy is the formula, to be read over the cask by the priest, to improve the quality of beer in which mice or weasels have got drowned. It was not that the English were alone in wishing, for gastronomic or economical reasons, to drink such beer; the penitential embedded in the Romano-Germanic pontifical expects the priest specifically to ask at confession whether his German penitent has drunk beer flavoured in this way. Admission of the offence involved forty days penance. But in England the view was different; and, by calling in the priest first, it was possible to indulge in this recondite vice with impunity.” On this sin in ninth-century Saxony, see “The Life of Liutbirga” (27), where the devil reminds the saint of a girlhood incident where she laughingly pulled a dead mouse by its tail out of her drink and then consumed the beverage; Frederick S. Paxton, trans. \textit{Anchoress and Abbess in Ninth-Century Saxony: The Lives of Liutbirga of Wendhausen and Hathumoda of Gandersheim} (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2009), 104.

\(^{124}\) The \textit{oratio ad infantes consignandos} (647–48) includes signing with the cross and gender alternatives, but whether it is for baptism or confirmation is unclear. Item 655 (\textit{alia, after 654 oratio quando aqua in domo asperritur}) is identical to item 597.


\(^{126}\) Jolly, “Prayers from the Field,” 95–147.
chiel, an Irish spelling of Paniel, points to a Northumbrian tradition peculiar to Aldred’s community. The prayers request divine assistance in clearing from the fields birds, vermin, as well as demonic other malicious threats to the crops (vikings, perhaps). Some of the references, such as the archangel Raphael and his demonic opponent Asmodeus, are from the book of Tobit, more commonly invoked in eye remedies and marriage blessings; but much of the language of these prayers is identifiable in other service book blessings, including prayers found in the original collectar and in Romano-Germanic pontificals.

Thus, despite their seeming irregularity and local roots, both Scribe B’s John poison prayer and Aldred’s five field prayers fall into this category of blessing found at the end of service books and private prayer books, including the original collectar and the additions by Scribes C and D. The blessings added by Scribe C and D fit with those found in the main collectar and other service books by both by adding and by duplicating. The additions were made, unsurprisingly, on the remaining blank pages of Quire VIII in the original collectar, while the duplications are in Quire IX as part of a separate booklet.

In a new (second) writing stint beginning mid-page on fol. 62v (QVIII.3), Scribe C copied a blessing labeled for milk and honey but including fonts, a relatively rare type found also in the Leofric Missal and the Egbert Pontifical, but with some differences. This text continues from fol. 62v18 through fol. 63v4, but includes an interpolation of a cross blessing in the middle (fols. 62v22–63r20, QVIII.3b). The phrase before this interpolation, \textit{tu enim domine (pro)}, is marked by a cross in the margin and the phrase is repeated when it picks up at the beginning of fol. 63r21 with a capitalized “T.”

127. QIX/X.14a has language found in the hot iron ordeal adjuration in the original collectar, fols. 54r19–55r1; QIX/X.14b has similarities to the \textit{B. ad omnia quae volueris} on fol. 47v and the \textit{In thalamo} on fol. 53r; QIX/X.14c has similar language to the blessing of beer in the original collectar on fol 56v, and the fol. 57v \textit{B. aquae ad uenationem et salis}, titled \textit{waeter halgunc to don ilce}; the last two, QIX/X.14d–e, have no currently identifiable sources. QIX/X.14c is the only one of the five field prayers with a close parallel outside of Durham A.IV.19, found in Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Codex latinus 1888, fol. 6, a late tenth-century copy of a no longer extant mid-tenth-century liturgical compilation from St. Alban's in Mainz. Otherwise, more generic versions without the archangel Panchiel are found in later Romano-Germanic pontificals; see RGP, vol. 2, 363 (CCXIV) and Franz, vol. 2, p. 11 (Jolly, “Prayers from the Field,” 119–22).

128. Scribe C, as discussed above, copied various benedictions for lections in Quire VIII, on the other side of fol. 61 where Scribe O stopped mid-page and Scribe B copied his poison prayer.

129. Egbert Pontifical in \textit{Two Anglo-Saxon Pontificals}, ed. H. M. J. Banting, HBS 104 (London: Boydell, 1989), 137; LM A 2401; see Orchard’s discussion in \textit{Leofric Missal}, vol. 1, 89–91; one difference in content from LM A is the sentence near the end (fols. 63r26–63v4), unidentified. For blessings of milk and honey, see Ratoldus 1063; RGP, vol. 2, item 410; Franz 1598–601; Dusslbes, 4355.

130. Hohler, “Some Later Service Books” in \textit{Tenth Century Studies}, ed. Parsons, 72, identifies it as a blessing for an altar cross; see RGP, vol. 1, items 100–101 (\textit{Ordo LX}), pp. 158–59 (see also PL 158: 1030c), but this accounts only for the middle section of the interpolation, fols. 62v26–63r15; the introduction (fol. 62v22–25) and the transition before the resumption of the milk and honey blessing (fol. 63r16–20) have not been identified, nor has the conclusion to the milk and honey blessing (fol. 63r26–63v4), none of which are in LM A’s version.

131. No clear evidence of a matching cross in the margin, unless it is down in the gutter. The word “pro” occurs next in both texts, so it may have been the point at which Scribe C skipped from one to the other.
has heavily corrected Scribe C’s work here in the interpolated cross prayer, although he has declined to gloss Scribe C’s work after stopping part of the way through the lections on fol. 61v.\footnote{132} He, or Scribe C, must have realized the mix-up, probably caused by a page turn error, and added the \textit{signe de renvoi} cross and possibly modified the initial T when the blessing of milk and honey resumed. Nonetheless, the transition passages currently unidentified in QVIII.3 (fols. 62v22–25, 63r16–20 and 63r26–63v4), suggest the possibility that Scribe C, perhaps with Aldred’s assistance, also attempted to integrate concepts of sweetness and purity between the milk and honey blessing and the cross blessing.

After Scribe C finished the milk and honey blessing at the top of fol. 63v, Scribe D picked up with a series of blessings of grapes, new bread, fruit, apples and nuts, and a well (fols. 63v5–64r8, QVIII.4–7; images 17–18).\footnote{133} Although almost identical blessings can be found in the Leofric Missal (A) as well as other service books such as the Sacramentaries of Ratoldus and Fulda, Scribe D’s set exhibit some variations and inconsistencies, as if he were compiling from varied sources, written, oral, or memory. The blessing of new bread (QVIII.5) is similar to one in LM A 2403 and the Durham A.IV.19 original collectar (fol. 47r), but adds part of a line found in LM A 2408 about the two fish Jesus blessed in addition to the five loaves. In the blessing of fruits (QVIII.6), Scribe D wraps the first line around to the line above in space left after the end of the previous prayer, probably to correct an eye-skip error omitting a line from his source.

The labels on the blessings are likewise problematic, suggesting that Scribe D may have added the titles after copying the prayers. The partially legible title of QVIII.4 appears to have both the word \textit{panis} (bread) and \textit{fructus} (fruit) in it, but the prayer itself is closely similar to blessings of grapes found in other service books; however, in the first line after \textit{fructus novos}, Scribe D has written \textit{unæ} instead of \textit{uuæ} (grapes) and may therefore have misunderstood the prayer’s intent. The next two prayers are in fact for new bread (QVIII.5) and fruits (QVIII.6), but their titles are too faint to be legible or are missing, perhaps because they were meant to be \textit{alia} following the bread and fruit label of QVIII.4. The title for wells (QVIII.7) occurs at the bottom of fol. 63v on the end line for QVIII.6 and survives in the same dark ink as the text, while the prayer itself at the top of fol. 64r is squeezed in above Scribe E’s prayer (QVIII.8).

\footnote{132} Some of the errors also seem to indicate haste involving eye skip and letter reversals: \textit{fonte} for \textit{fronte}, with the extra ‘r’ erased (fol. 62v20), while \textit{fonte} does occur below within the cross prayer section (fol. 62v23); \textit{splendoris} misspelled twice and uncorrected, once in the cross prayer section at a line break (\textit{speln/ doris}, fol. 63r15–16) and again after the resumption of the milk and honey blessing (\textit{speldoris}, fol. 63v1). As he concluded at the top of fol. 63v 1–4, Scribe C’s strokes are wide, as if his nib needed sharpening.

\footnote{133} As noted above, Scribe D finished his last text at the top of fol. 64r, crowding his lines a bit, as if Scribe E’s two generic prayers were already there.
Similar compiling confusion ensues at the end of some of Scribe D’s prayers. The blessing of bread (QVIII.5) concludes per te christe iesu qui regnas in secula seculum [sic, seculorum] followed by a redundant “p.” That line is found in LM A 2406, not in the blessing of bread but in the blessing of fruit that Scribe D has next (QVIII.6). There Scribe D has concluded instead with the abbreviation “p” followed by a seemingly disconnected per quem hæc omnia. All of this leaves open the possibility of transposition of texts, intentional or unintentional. Scribe D’s compilation of these prayers may bear some relation, then, to Scribe E’s two short prayers that follow, which include similar generic prayer language that could be adapted as blessings. These variations may be deliberate experiments in prayer composition worked out from written and oral exemplars.

Thus the Chester-le-Street materials added to Quire VIII of the original collectar contributed new or modified blessings related to the consumption of food or drink, along with Aldred’s field prayers. Scribe B’s poison prayer, Scribe C’s blessing of fonts, milk, and honey, along with the cross, Scribe D’s blessings of food products, and potentially Scribe E’s generic model prayers, all add alternatives to those found especially in the heavily marked section of fol. 47 in the original collectar.

In Quire IX, however, Scribe C contributed more blessings, this time duplicates of those found in the original collectar (glossed by Aldred there but not here). These five items appear after Aldred’s field prayers (QIX/X.14), in what must be accounted a separate booklet comprising Quires IX and X through fol. 75. On fols. 67v6–68r16 in his fifth writing stint, mixing majuscule and minuscule (somewhat comparable to Aldred’s attempt at majuscule in the preceding field prayers), Scribe C added a prayer over salt and water and four house blessings. The salt and water prayer (QIX/X.15) is the same as one in the original collectar, fol. 59v1–13 (Corrêa 653), where it was also followed by house prayers. Although some of the differences in fol. 66v could be errors while copying from fol. 59v, similarities to the Leofric Missal suggest that Scribe C had another exemplar instead of or besides the original collectar.134 Scribe C’s four residential prayers (QIX/X.16a–d) are found in the original collectar in two separate sequences (Corrêa 654, 597/655, 656, 598) with several minor differences in each prayer.135 One of the sequences (597–598) is on the singleton fol. 47, heavily marked up on the verso, including Old English instructions for asperging a house with blessed salt and water added by later Scribe M3, whose hand also appears in Quire IX but not on Scribe C’s copy of these house

---

134. See comparison in QIX/X.15.
135. Such house blessings are found in Gregorian as well as Gelasian sacramentaries (Deshusses, 1456–58; see also Franz 1: 608 and Corrêa comparison chart). Three of the four here occur in LM A, items 2317/2690 (two different contexts, one for a sick person’s home, the other an aspersion, right before Leofric’s benedictio ad omnia quae volueris), 2417, and 2418. The fourth one, item 598 in the original collectar, is not in LM.
blessings. The other sequence of house blessings from the original collectar (654–656 in the middle of Quire VIII, fols. 59v–60r) occurs after the salt and water blessing that Scribe C had also just copied, perhaps with comparisons placing the quires side by side. Clearly a salt and water blessing was a prerequisite for conducting a house blessing, so the sequence copied by Scribe C of a salt and water blessing followed by four house blessings forms a neat set otherwise found in separate places in the original collectar.

Together, this evidence suggests that Scribe C did not perceive Quire IX to be a continuation of the original collectar but a separate booklet. The field prayers and house blessings were activities potentially conducted while away from the religious compound, for which a portable booklet like Quire IX–X would prove useful. Indeed, all of the additional blessings and daily office materials need to be seen in terms of the way the texts were used in performance, despite the unusual way that Durham A.IV.19 was written and compiled.

It is curious that the Durham A.IV.19 compilation seems, based on script and basic contents, old-fashioned and out-of-date compared to other service books and manuscripts of its era; and yet on the other hand, it contains some of the earliest witnesses to reform practices in its additional prayers and hymns, as well as unique or less documented texts, primarily from the local Irish and Northumbrian traditions. Ironically, then, what is old is new and what is new is old: the manuscript bears witness to an unusual time of transition at a juncture between local Northumbrian and broader religious changes in the British Isles and on the continent.

First of all, the Chester-le-Street community was balancing between its historic Lindisfarne legacy and new relations with Wessex and reform efforts there. This is both a political balancing act and a liturgical one. Liturgically, Durham A.IV.19’s additions simultaneously update materials from the south and record older local traditions from the north with its Irish heritage. Instead of viewing Northumbria and Chester-le-Street as behind the curve of reform, trying to catch up with southern England, the additions to Durham A.IV.19 may represent an educational and liturgical experiment that is part of the larger reform conversation taking place in the south, as hinted in the 970 visit to Wessex so carefully documented in the colophon. Cuthbert, with his royal patronage and northern base, stands with his community at Chester-le-Street at a critical intersection between north and south, old and new, local and

136. See T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 35 for M3, who made additions both at fol. 47v and also at fol. 68v, as well as corrections throughout fols. 68r–72v; and chapter 3 for the suggestion that Scribe M3 had fol. 47 lying between fols. 67 and 68 when he did his work.

global, Irish and English, Latin and Old English, and monastic and secular religious forces.

Second, the written record found in the Durham A.IV.10 compilation hints at the performative spaces of the religious community: where and how they wrote, what they did together and individually during the day, and how they related to the lands and larger world around them. One of the things easy to forget when examining any artifact, but particularly a written text, is the oral context, the spoken words absent from the page, not to mention the silent thought processes that accompanied deep reflection on the texts. The next chapter explores this performative angle in a pedagogical context. As they worked, the scribes undoubtedly spoke to one another about what they were doing and why. Aldred in particular probably accompanied his corrections to the page with verbal instructions. And while his vernacular gloss may have been an individual enterprise while he wrote it, he may also have verbalized it while discussing the basic liturgy he copied with those whom he instructed. The scribes and other members of the community—the bishop even—may have read each others’ work and discussed it. When parts of the manuscript were taken out possibly for use in services to the community or for devotional use on the road, perhaps the celebrant shared his insights with his audience or companions. Even if studying the volume alone, the reader was interacting not just with the text on the page, but the texts he or she brings from memory or knows from other books. All these speculative environments for interaction with the texts suggest a lively religious community belied by the scrappy appearance of this manuscript.
Both writing and reading are performances invisible to medieval historians but nonetheless implicit in the material artifact of the manuscript. While it proved hard to reconstruct the writing process in a composite manuscript like Durham A.IV.19, as attempted in chapter 3, the presence of different scribes copying different texts also offers an unusual opportunity to see a community reading and studying together. The manuscript artifact allows us to enter the “thought world” of this “textual community.” Textual communities are defined not by literacy per se but by the role that written texts play as cultural resources or authorities in defining the community’s identity and values. Consequently, the writing, emending, and glossing evidenced in a manuscript artifact sheds light on the evolution of religious

---

formation as the community engaged in thinking about texts, as well as performing them in daily life.

The textual community visible in the additions made to Durham A.IV.19 in the late tenth century reveals something about the thought world at Chester-le-Street, both in terms of scholarship and of education, partial as that vision may be because of the fragmentary nature of the additions. On the other hand, this hybridity of the manuscript artifact is in some ways an advantage because it reveals process more than product. The additions show us scribes from a variety of clerical ranks interacting with texts and by implication each other. While the presence of scribes implies a scriptorium—even if that was not a physical room—so too the presence of teaching and study devices, particularly in Aldred’s contributions, implies pedagogical relationships between the master and a *schola*, even if Chester-le-Street did not have a schoolroom. Consistently throughout Durham A.IV.19, we see Aldred as glossator, scholar, and teacher acting in particular ways in relation to the texts, but have to imagine his interlocutors, extrapolating from the scribal personalities we see in the additions correlated with what we know in general about education in early medieval religious communities.

Monastic study and education of the type that might inform our understanding of the Chester-le-Street community, secular though it was, can be gleaned from Benedictine practice, as found in the Rule of St. Benedict and its Anglo-Saxon reform incarnation, the *Regularis concordia*. The Rule specified that books should be checked out to each monk during Lent, with time set aside during the day for reading and reflection depending on the season. Novices were also instructed in the daily office psalms and other rituals through a process of reading and recitation. The *Regularis concordia* elaborated on the Benedictine process of instruction in specifying reading (*lectio*) for junior monks, habits of the mind then implemented individually and privately in the devotional prayer (*oratio*) of senior monks. In its warning about excessive speed in the chant, the *Regularis concordia* exhorts the monks to chant “distinctly so that mind and voice agree and that we may thus fulfill the words

---

2. Although as noted in chapter 1 the *Regularis concordia* presumably postdates Durham A.IV.19, elements of its liturgical reform do appear in the Chester-le-Street additions, as discussed in chapter 4.


of the apostle: *I will sing with the spirit, I will sing also with the mind.*’ This distinction between mind (mens or gehange) and spirit (spiritus or gast) is also reflected in the relationship between *lectio* (rædincg) and *oratio* (gebed), one an intellectual activity, the other a spiritual one, but clearly interdependent. The relationships between exteriority and interiority, memory and devotion, the book and the heart, was a complex, symbiotic one that Aldred addresses in his gloss.6

In the context of meditative reading from a written text, the change from verbalizing aloud or with lips moving to silent reading was variable, with arguments pro and con for the benefits of one over the other.7 Certainly reading aloud slows down the reading process, allowing for greater attention to word units, while silent reading is more rapid, possibly allowing for greater interior reflection on the sense rather than the words. In a pedagogical setting, both strategies of oral *lectio* and silent *meditatio* might be deployed for different effects, as hinted at in the *Regularis concordia* emphasis on *lectio* for novices until they have internalized the texts. Memorization of texts, either for corporate performance or private devotion, involved both eye and ear, with repetitive patterns of “listening, reading, reciting, and repeating” with some readers taking the text deeper through “intensive” reading of familiar texts.8

Likewise, the symbiotic relationship between writing and reading in early medieval pedagogy reveals a complex set of processes for teacher and student.9 Malcolm Parkes correlated the four functions of reading from antiquity with three Anglo-Saxon equivalents: *lectio* (rædan), *emendatio*, *enarratio* (areccan), and *iudicium* (smeagan).10 *Lectio* (rædan) involves *discretio*, or in modern terms,

---

“decoding” the letters to identify words and syntactical units, which would, for
the writer, editor, or reader, shade over into the second stage of *emendatio*, cor-
recting or adjusting the text. But *lectio* also entails *pronuntiatio*, verbalization or
performance of the text that might assist with memory and meditation as well.
The third process, *enarratio* (*arecan*), involves a conversation with the text, and
possibly therefore between writer, reader, and audience. In moving beyond the
literal, this stage might employ the strategies of Biblical exegesis with the four
(or three) senses of Scripture. In the early medieval period, the duality of his-
torical and spiritual/allegorical, using the analogies of body and soul, letter and
spirit, was a common and dominant means of Scriptural exegesis in homilies
and theological treatises; Anglo-Saxon liturgy and preaching emphasized the
allegorical or spiritual sense (*gastlic andgit*). The final stage, *iudicium* (*smea-
gan*) brings the reader to application. For a monastic reader engaged in *medita-
tio*, here is where *lectio* crossed over into *oratio*.

Glossing functioned as a tool for writing and reading at all of these stages,
such that the presence of a written gloss gives us a rare opportunity to uncover
some of these processes, and a vernacular gloss as found in Durham A.IV.19
adds a linguistic twist to it. In particular, Durham A.IV.19’s additions may shed
light on the more misunderstood and controversial aspects of learning to read
and write in the early Middle Ages in regards to the aural and oral components.
While dictation to scribes seemed the norm in antiquity, in the medieval era a
shift to visual copying manifested in changes of format and style of writing. But
the oral component did not disappear entirely: teachers might vocalize or
require their students to vocalize the text while writing; some scribes may have
verbalized the text quietly or interiorly while copying from an exemplar; or the
written text might trigger aural memory that could contribute to orthographic
deviance from the exemplar. Some of these are visible in the additions to Dur-
ham A.IV.19.

Indeed, the interconnectedness of writing, reading, teaching, and perform-
ing goes to the heart of understanding Durham A.IV.19’s composite texts.

---

11. For the traditional view of the four senses of Scripture (historical, allegorical, tropological, anagogi-
cal), see Henri de Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis, Vol 1: The Four Senses of Scripture*, trans. Mark Sebanc (Grand
Parkes, *Their Hands Before Our Eyes*, 57–69 on the relationship between reading and writing.
14. For arguments against dictation in monastic scriptoria, ostensibly silent places according to Alcuin,
scribunt” proverb noted at the outset of chapter 3; Wilhelm Wattenbach, *Das Schriftwesen im Mittelalter*, 3rd
the John Rylands Library* 26 (1941): 49–56. Saenger, *Space between Words*, 266, argues that dictation persisted
with vernacular texts into the later Middle Ages; see also Parkes, *Their Hands before Our Eyes*, 63–66 on the
aural aspects of copying from an exemplar.
Nonetheless, this book’s chapters engage in an artificial separation of these tasks: chapter 3 focused on the scriptorium and writing, chapter 4 engaged with *oratio* in the performance of the liturgy, while the present chapter examines scholarship and teaching. This separation is justified on the grounds that certain aspects of Durham A.IV.19’s additions give more insight on academic study and the processes of learning, while others reveal more about ritual prayer. Consequently, this chapter examines scholarly reflection and pedagogy in Aldred’s glosses to the liturgical materials and in the glossed additions made at the end of Quire XI, often characterized as “educational.” But first, there is one text that more than any other allows us to listen in on a pedagogical conversation between a student and teacher, in Aldred’s instruction of Scribe B as they wrote and read the John poison prayer together.

**Learning to Write and Writing to Learn: Scribe B**

Scribe B’s one text, the prayer against poison attributed to John the Beloved, is heavily corrected as well as glossed by Aldred (QVIII.1; fol. 61r11–22; image 12). The nature of his errors and the ways that Aldred responded implies that the two of them labored over the text at the same time, yet not consistently. A close paleographic analysis of what Scribe B wrote and how he wrote it, along with Aldred’s corrections and gloss, can be read as a narrative of the writing process and as a dialogue between the two that reveals the stages of *lectio, emendatio, enarratio,* and *iudicium.* It produces a rather odd story line. More than likely, Aldred set Scribe B the task of copying this prayer from an exemplar and then walked away, coming back on occasion to check on his progress. If the task had purely pedagogical purposes—teaching writing or Latin—then a wax tablet would have served better than using precious parchment. That he copied the text into an existing quire of collectar material suggests that the prayer had intrinsic value in the additions being made to Quire VIII, regardless of Scribe B’s competency. Given some of the potentially aural errors of orthography and missing words, Scribe B may have been copying letters and words, either from oral dictation or visual copying, without understanding what he was writing. Aldred may himself have read parts aloud and required Scribe B to recite portions, perhaps even as the glossing took place. 15 That the text contains a number of unusual Latin words even Aldred struggled to understand adds to this picture of a student learning to identify sounds and letters via an unfamiliar vocabulary.

15. See Saenger, *Space between Words,* 49 on visual copying errors by scribes not understanding the language. Parkes, “Rædan,” 8, notes how a beginner would read aloud so the teacher could assess a pupil’s progress; see also Parkes, *Their Hands before Our Eyes,* 9.
Scribe B’s first letter, an oversized minuscule “d,” is thin and shaky. The width of his nib was too narrow for an enlarged initial, more appropriate for the size he pursues in the rest of his text. If his exemplar had an enlarged or decorated initial, Scribe B did not have at hand the tools or artistic skill to replicate it. Both versions of this prayer in the ninth-century Book of Cerne and Book of Nunnaminster have a decorated “d” at the beginning, although there is no compelling evidence to suggest that one of these books was his exemplar. Aldred produced several enlarged or lightly decorated initials of the type attempted here by Scribe B, both in his own work as well as supplying those missing in the original collectar. Perhaps Scribe B imagined an illustrator or Aldred going back over it, if not himself, with a more appropriate tool.

Scribe B’s abbreviations, where he used them in the first two lines, are anomalous yet occur on commonly abbreviated words: spiritus, abbreviated to spis, omnia abbreviated to oia and then onis for omnis. If his source, aural or visual, offered no abbreviations on these words, then Scribe B may have invented his own because he was either unaware of or had forgotten the standard versions. But he made no more attempts after this, spelling out every word. Either he stopped himself or Aldred intervened after the second line.

In that second line (fol. 61r12) Scribe B also made two other errors, qui instead of cui and an abbreviation mark over sunt for no apparent reason. The “q” for “c” could be a simple copying error where one might expect “who” after the Trinitarian formula, or an auditory error. The lack of correction by Scribe B as he continued the line could also represent an ignorance of Latin grammar in the phrase, cui omnia subjicta sunt (“to whom all things are subject”), especially given the extraneous and inexplicable abbreviation mark over sunt. Aldred slashed through the “q” with his red ink and wrote a “c” above it, but does nothing about the sunt. Aldred’s gloss to this entire line runs high, right under and within the descenders of the first line above it, perhaps to avoid conflict with his corrections, which presumably he did first. Perhaps he conversed with Scribe B while he corrected and glossed, explaining the grammar of the text to him.

In his third line, Scribe B corrected another error, either on his own or at Aldred’s behest. He wrote potes tes for potestas (fol. 61r13); he then put a dot under the “e” and added an “a” above it. This could be either an eye skip or reduplicating error, combined with poor understanding of the Latin text. Indeed, he lacks three words found in the other five insular versions, two of

---

16. Cerne, Cambridge, University Library MS L.1.1.10, fol. 79r6; Nunnaminster, BL Harley 2965, fol. 37r12.
18. The Book of Cerne and the Book of Nunnaminster use the standard abbreviation sps scs but neither abbreviate omnia and in general include minimal abbreviations, mostly of the deity.
them predating Durham A.IV.19. He may have tried to remember too large of a soundbite from the text and dropped a word. Nothing in Aldred’s gloss acknowledged these lacunae, either because the exemplar also omitted them or because neither Aldred nor Scribe B scrupulously checked the exemplar (unless the omissions were intentional).

Aldred apparently focused initially on Scribe B’s individual letters, as in the “c” for “q” error. In the fourth line of the text, he corrected one of Scribe B’s letter “a”s. Scribe B had been making his “a” in a square fashion, probably with three strokes: an “L” shaped down minim hooked to the right at the bottom; a flat top producing temporarily what would look like a minuscule “t”; and a closing minim on the right. The one Aldred noted in uipera (fol. 61r14) resembles a ligature “ti” even more so than Scribe B’s other “a”s. Aldred’s pointed “a” added above looks to be made quite deliberately, perhaps even slowly: the first curved stroke sloping left to right downward has an angled turn in it. Nonetheless the result is more like Aldred’s two-stroke rounded “a” found in his insular gloss than the boxy efforts of Scribe B to produce a Latin square minuscule “a.”

Curiously, Aldred himself employs four different styles of “a,” most commonly in his gloss the pointed “a” as here and a somewhat similar open-headed form. Although Aldred’s use of a similar (albeit more competent) square form is rare in his gloss, it is common in his Latin texts, visible for example throughout the encyclopedic additions to Quire XI. Perhaps his teacher’s own variability in script between and within his Latin and Old English texts confused Scribe B. Following Aldred’s correction, Scribe B attempted to employ a more pointed, or at least less boxy, “a” in subsequent lines, with mixed success. The two remaining “a”s in line 14 are still squarish although it looks as if at least one began with an effort to create a curved bowl (in rubeta), or perhaps he had already written them before Aldred came along and corrected the one in uipera. But in the next line (fol. 61r15), he got off two curved bowl, pointed “a”s in the first word, rana, and of the five “a”s in the next line, he managed four of them, only having to top off the middle one in uenenata with an extra stroke. Thereafter, the style of “a” varies between the two forms (fol. 61r17–19), finally reverting


20. T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 29, briefly notes Scribe B’s two styles of the letter a, pointed and square.

21. Ker, “Aldred the Scribe,” 8, notes these four: “the common pointed a, an open-headed a usual in the combination æ, a straight-topped a, and an a which resembles Caroline a.” T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 25, notes that the open and the pointed are more common in Durham A.IV.19, but the other two do occur.

22. The square “a” in his vernacular gloss is visible in the original collectar at fol. 44r6 (ondetra glossing confessorum) and line 7 (topifyga glossing adequamur). T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 25, notes the “hairline” quality of the sloping top bar (and thus an indication of a pen angle of 30°). Scribe B’s strokes are quite heavy-handed by comparison, suggesting changes in pen angle that create overall a very uneven aspect to his text.
to his more comfortable square “a” in the last three lines (fol. 61r20–22). Maybe Aldred had walked away or ceased to focus on that particular issue.

Further modification of Scribe B’s letters, whether at Aldred’s instigation or not, occurred with “x” and “s.” Scribe B’s first two letter “x”s in expatues/cit (fol. 61r13) and in extinguitur (fol. 61r15) are larger than his standard height and consequently awkward looking, as if he tried to form it from two “c”s back to back, rather than forming one slanted line followed by crossing line(s). The next two “x” letters are smaller and more clearly balanced (noxium, fol. 61r16 and noxia, fol. 61r17), although the one at the end of line 18 (extingue) is less so. The nearest exemplars would have been the manuscript from which he was copying (if that is what he was doing) and the text of Scribe O immediately above, who has a fine insular “x” in lines 4 and 9. But Scribe B never really mastered the insular “x” with its below-the-ground line flourish.

With the letter “s” Scribe B generally used the insular form (minim descending below the ground line, curved finial added top right). But in the first letter of scs (sanctus, fol. 61r12), the first and last letter of scorpius (fol. 61r15), and the first in salutis (fol. 61r18) he used a curved uncial or insular majuscule “s.” Notably, Scribe B did not attempt a majuscule “s” in his opening word Ds (Deus) or in the rest of the line as occurs in other texts, only attempting it in the “s” beginning line 12 (scs). These majuscule “s”s seem to be somewhat random scribal experiments, perhaps modeling on an exemplar in majuscule. In the case of the majuscule “s” in line 18’s salutis, however, it may be related to an error he corrected in the previous word, aduersae. He apparently wrote first aduer followed by salutis, with some possible erasure under the first letter or two of salutis. Then he went back and added to adver an elevated “se.” This corrected error might have an aural cause: if Scribe B heard aduersae salutis slurred, he might have omitted a syllable, which would again indicate a poor grasp of the Latin.

Scribe B’s remaining three orthographic errors corrected by Aldred are all the same: “d” for “t” in words that in Latin could not possibly have a “d”: habed (fol. 61r20) and ud, twice in line 21. As with qui for cui in line 12, Aldred slashed through the offending letter with his red glossing ink and then added “t” above (although it is not evident above the first ud combined with his gloss abbreviation þ’te). Scribe B probably made these errors in sequence, only to be caught when Aldred returned to correct and gloss this passage. However, the

---

23. The letter “x” is often the measure for the letter height (Parkes, *Their Hands before Our Eyes*, 59, 87). Insular minuscule “x” can be two strokes, the first slanting downward left to right, the second proceeding upward from bottom left (below the ground line) to upper right, which is how most of Aldred’s “x”s appear to have been made (unlike Carolingian minuscule, which uses three strokes). I attempted Scribe B’s “x” both ways, as two curved lines back to back and as two intersecting lines, producing similar results either way.

24. *Nunnaminster* uses majuscule “s” except at the end of words; *Cerne* uses majuscule only in the titles or opening line.

25. The “s” connects to the final stroke of “r,” making it appear to be an “l.”
nature of Scribe B’s error is curious. Either he mistook “d” for “t” in the script of his exemplar, or it is an aural error, hearing “d” for “t” in the voice of someone reciting it aloud or hearing it in his head that way. In either case, it indicates a weak grasp of written Latin and begs the question as to why this type of error does not occur elsewhere in the text, except perhaps in the case of qui for cui in the second line. Perhaps toward the end he became careless in copying, evident in both the letter “a” and the “d” for “t,” and lacked Aldred’s oversight until he had finished.

Aldred’s Northumbrian Old English gloss undoubtedly also formed part of the conversation with Scribe B about the Latin text. Indeed, his glossing continues over to the next page of Scribe C’s work for several lines, as if they had kept on with the lesson exploring Latin vocabulary and orthography (QVIII.2). For example, he deployed Old English compounds otherwise unattested, even if that meant ignoring a common Old English word in favor of a calque, in some cases a redundant compound that breaks down the Latin word into its constituent parts. For example, Redemptor glossed with eflesend (fol. 61v8) combines eft (again) as a literal rendering of re, and lisan (to loose) to produce “release” as implied in redemptor, especially in the sense of manumission of slaves. Since Aldred used lesend for redemptor in the original collectar (fols. 10r11, 15r8), the addition of eft here must be to emphasize to Scribe B the meaning of the Latin syllables. In the next line, Auctor vitae glossed with frumwyhra lifes (fol. 61v9), literally “first-wright” of life, invokes the idea of God as creator, the original craftsman. In other cases Aldred liked to vary his gloss with different Old English words for the same Latin, seen in Scribe B’s text (QVIII.1) with subiecta glossed with underbeged (fol. 61r12) and then underðiodded (fol. 61r13), perhaps to teach the student scribe the range of meanings in the Latin.

But the unusual vocabulary in the St. John prayer that Scribe B copied proved particularly challenging for this exercise, perhaps intentionally: Aldred may have deliberately given Scribe B a text containing words even he was hard-pressed to translate in order to improve Scribe B’s copying skills. The names of various poisonous reptiles unknown in the British Isles forced Aldred to gloss with a more limited variation on words for venom and venomous creatures than the Latin. Draco (fol. 61r14) was easy enough, since dræcca (draca) and its compounds occur regularly in Old English. With uipera, he offered a commonly used word, hatt[er]ne (ettern), adding a Northumbrian “h” in the first

26. Chaytor, “Medieval Reader,” 56, notes this effect of aural memory on final consonants; see also Parkes, Their Hands before Our Eyes, 66.

27. DOE eflesend; cf. alysend, a more commonly used term. Aldred uses a similar compound, onlesende, to gloss one of the alphabet words in QXI.54 (at fol. 88vb3), the panther, allegorized as Christ the Redeemer: Nemar id est christus iesus he glosses onlesend þ’ is crist se hæl’. See note below to Boyd, “Aldrediana XXV,” 51–55.

28. DOE frumwyhra; Aldred also uses the compound frumwyppend to indicate the creator.
instance (fol. 61r14). In subsequent uses, he dropped the “h” and used variations of ættern, with related attor, for uenenosus and/or uires (fol. 61r16, 19, 20). But the Latin terminology for frogs and toads derived from Pliny, Aldred either misunderstood or deliberately used literal translations as calques: Aldred took rubeta (fol. 61r14) as the verb to redden (scomiende), though the text goes on to identify it as rana, glossed as tosca, a poorly attested Old English word, presumably for frog. Frogs appear in the Bible as one of the plagues of Egypt (Exodus 8:1–15) and as unclean spirits emerging from the mouth of the dragon (Revelation 16:13–14); hence they have a primarily demonic reputation in Christian literature.

Similarly, line 17’s ferociör repentia, Aldred glossed ða rifista feerræsenda, using a participle again as a substantive. In this case, repentia (repens) for reptio (crawling, creeping, and by extension, reptile) is a rare attestation but found in all versions of this prayer, including the apocryphal source. But Aldred employed a unique verbal compound of fær (sudden, as in danger) and ræsan (to rush, violently), working from the primary meaning of Latin repens and repentinus as sudden or unexpected action. Whether he was unaware of the rarer reptilian variant, he clearly knew that the word referred to a creature since he prefaced it with ða, and picked up on the demonic element. Aldred also used this compound in glossing the Lindisfarne Gospels’ Luke 8:33, describing the herd of demonic pigs rushing over the edge of the cliff. In Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 819 (fol. 8r7, on Proverbs 3:25), he glossed repentino (“sudden disaster”) with id est diabolum, and overall interprets this Proverb in terms of demonic threats. At the very least, these gloss translations show how Aldred was thinking about the sense of the words in context and perhaps using them to teach Scribe B Latin vocabulary and grammar, as well as a Christian worldview.

With other mysterious reptiles, he either reused a common word or transliterated, perhaps as a name. Scorpius (fol. 61r15), a continental arachnid not found in Northumbria, was presumably known from scientific and astronomical references, but Aldred took it to be a variation on snake and glossed it with nedre (adder). With spilagius (end of line 15), he repeated it in an abbreviated

29. See DOE, draca; ætren/ættern, with note that in Northumbrian glosses (e.g., Aldred), the adjective (poisonous) is used as a substantive for the poisonous creature, as here.
30. Pettit, Anglo–Saxon Remedies, II: 81, cites the Pliny reference on the venomous toad rubeta called rana and its potential to poison liquids.
32. DOE, færæsan; Bosworth and Toller, ræsan.
34. At the end of the preceding line (16), he has glossed adhuc with gee t l with no alternative after the vel, perhaps looking ahead to the problematic phrase.
form as *spilæg* but adds *se ætt’ne*, perhaps assuming *Spilagius* was the name of a snake, similar to *rubeta* called *rana* in the previous line. Line 15 is hampered not only by the omitted *quieta* modifying *torpescit* (the evil frog *rana* put to sleep quietly) but by the absence of *regulus*, another poisonous creature found in the other versions, which might have proved just as mystifying as *spilagius*.\(^{36}\)

Notwithstanding the lack of specific equivalents, the Old English adequately conveys the noxiousness of these threats to human health and well-being (*salutis*). Both the Latin and the Old English vocabulary carried double meanings for both physical and spiritual threats: the dragon as devil, venom (*attor*) as the reek of hell, and poisonous elements (*ættern*) as malevolent and malignant. Aldred might also have had in mind the *Ecclesiastical History*’s opening description of snakeless Ireland in what some take to be a joke on Bede’s part: that not only do reptiles traveling on shipboard to Ireland die on arrival, but Irish manuscripts can be scraped into water as a cure for snakebite, a tidbit of information derived from Isidore of Seville.\(^{37}\) Even so, the absence of these poisonous reptiles does not preclude the possibility of some malefactor importing venom to the isles.

Nonetheless, the low risk of venomous reptiles in Britain and Ireland combined with the insular popularity of this prayer suggests that it was not the animals that attracted attention, but rather the power of God against demonic evil, which might of course include human agency in poisoning or spreading evil, as was the case in the apocryphal story of John challenged to drink a poisoned cup. However, compared to other versions of this prayer extant in Anglo-Saxon England, Scribe B’s text stands alone and lacks context. Copies in prayer books and medical texts include a preface or prologue, some of which emphasize the medicinal value and others the power of prayer or of John’s name. Given the liturgical nature of the additions in these quires, the latter meaning is more likely, although the pedagogical opportunity may be the dominant motive for the text’s inclusion. If Scribe B was starting out at the low clerical rung of exorcist, this would be an appropriate text for him to learn as a liturgical remedy for demonic threats. What discourse Aldred had with Scribe B about the theology and application of this prayer remains uncertain, although the gloss if done with Scribe B present, as seems likely, offered an intriguing opportunity both to teach Latin and Christian apotropaic ritual.

\(^{36}\) *Regulus*, despite its primary meaning as a petty king, is used in the Vulgate to refer to a serpent (Lewis and Short; Isaiah 30:6; Proverbs 23:32; and Jerome, commentary on Isaiah). *Spalagius*, spelled in very different ways, probably because its meaning was unclear, apparently refers to either a venomous fly or spider and appears in the *Old English Herbarium* as well as Pliny (Pettit, *Anglo-Saxon Remedies*, II: 81–82). The omission of *regulus* also leaves Aldred glossing two verbs in a row, *extinguitur uinctur* (*gidrysnad f’cvmmen*).

Speculative as this scenario is, the inconsistencies in copying from either dictation or an exemplar and the way the corrections and glossing intervened nonetheless demonstrate that one way or another, scribe and master interacted during the copying process. As a consequence, this particular text offers the closest we can come to a conversation between Aldred and a student over a text in Durham A.IV.19. But can we also imagine a student or a communal group of readers for his other glosses and additions? The first part of this chapter examines the nature of Aldred’s glossing in Durham A.IV.19 in terms of his own needs as well as the ways in which it might have drawn in others. The second part examines the so-called educational additions at the end of Quire XI as linguistic exercises done perhaps in the presence of and for the benefit of a group of Chester-le-Street scholars gathered around him.

THINKING AND TEACHING: ALDRED’S GLOSSES

Aldred’s contributions to the Chester-le-Street scriptorium seem to have an eye for the confluence of ritual performance, spiritual reflection, and education: glossing Latin prayers with vernacular, correcting Latin errors here and there, copying practical prayers and encyclopedic texts. The materials he included in the first half of Quire XI before the Cuthbert collects and the unusual field prayers at the beginning of Quire IX fall into the same category as what the other scribes were copying, liturgical supplements for the performance of the daily office, blessings, and other religious services. But only he glossed Latin texts in the vernacular Old English, and this seems to be his particular gift to the community as evidenced in the Lindisfarne Gospels and in Durham A.IV.19. While his Latin was not error-free, the monumental nature of the tasks he set himself in glossing all four Gospels and a large liturgical manuscript may account for occasional lapses and misreadings. He was relatively well educated, with access to other manuscripts, commentaries, and vernacular translations and with an interest in reform ideas and texts. His Northumbrian Old English gloss is word-for-word, not a readable syntactic gloss, suggesting a focus on language itself. Bilingual glossing and macaronic text are evidence of a conversation between Latin and non-Latin based vernacular languages, as found in the Irish tradition carried on by the Anglo-Saxons, in addition to Latin interlinear and marginal glossing of texts also engaged in by Aldred in Bodley 819.38 That

Aldred glossed the older and more venerable *Lindisfarne Gospels*, and not the Durham Gospels held also at Chester-le-Street, suggests that vernacular glossing was a high-status enhancement. As such, his gloss of liturgical and other material in Durham A.IV.19 indicates that the manuscript project was a valuable contribution to the life of the community at Chester-le-Street.

The literature on glosses and glossaries in Anglo-Saxon England is large and expanding, in part building on the Dictionary of Old English and Corpus (DOE). Aldred’s vernacular glosses have been of particular interest to language specialists because they offer a rare glimpse of Northumbrian differences from West Saxon standard and because they anticipate developments in Middle English. The “Aldrediana” series of articles initiated by Alan Ross compares not only the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and Durham A.IV.19 glosses to one another but also to other vernacular glosses and lends insight to Aldred’s environment and achievement. This work on Aldred’s glosses is formidable but still incomplete, so the aspects noted here are examples rather than a comprehensive survey.

What has emerged so far from a comparison of Aldred’s glosses to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and to Durham A.IV.19 shows that he did the former first, not only because many features that he altered over the course of the *Lindisfarne* gloss were consistent by the time he did the Durham gloss, but also because the latter gloss shows his expanded knowledge of Latin vocabulary (while the Bodley 819 gloss was probably done between). Moreover, Aldred’s Northumbrian dialect was modified by West Saxon, Celtic, and some Old Norse linguistic features, hinting at multiple cultural currents in his experience.

The MacRegol Gospels were similarly glossed in Old English at Harewood (likely, but not definitively, a dependant house in West Yorkshire) by two scribes, a Northumbrian named Owun and a Mercian priest named Farman, around the same time as, and influenced by, Aldred’s gloss of the Lindisfarne Gospels. The MacRegol Gospels has an original colophon (fol. 169v) recognizing the four evangelists and the scribe in a design of six boxes as well as two colophons by the glossators, one after Matthew and another after John, just as Aldred does in Lindisfarne (discussed in chapter 2). By a complex set of linguistic analyses, Alan Ross and others have shown that Aldred’s gloss influenced both the Northumbrian and the Mercian gloss of the MacRegol, to such a degree that the two manuscripts must have been in physical proximity to one another.\footnote{Unless, as M. Brown suggests (Lindisfarne, 96, 404), they used an intermediary copy of Aldred’s gloss. See also Nee, “Reading Aldred’s Colophon,” 362, 366; Andrew Breeze, “The Provenance of the Rushworth Mercian Gloss,” Notes and Queries 241 (1996): 394–95; Alan S. C. Ross, “The Use of Other Latin Manuscripts by the Glossators of the Lindisfarne and Rushworth Gospels,” N&Q 28 (1981): 6–11; G. C. Britton, “Aldrediana IV: The E- and I-Dipthongs,” English Philological Studies 7 (1961): 17. For an older assessment comparing the MacRegol (Rushworth) and Lindisfarne Gospels glosses, see James A. H. Murray, Athenaeum (1875): 452–53 and Academy (July–December, 1874): 561–62, both responding to Skeat’s edition of the Gospels; in the latter article, he speculates that Farman may have begun his West Saxon gloss (“a readable idiomatic version,” p. 562) in Matthew and then with access to the Lindisfarne Gospels began adapting from its Northumbrian gloss in Mark, before giving over the task to Owun, who essentially copied Aldred’s word-for-word (“verbal”) gloss from the Lindisfarne Gospels.} Since it is unlikely that the treasured Lindisfarne Gospels would have been transported to a small house like Harewood, it appears that some time in the late tenth century the MacRegol Gospels were brought to Chester-le-Street where Farman and Owun could work with access to Aldred’s Lindisfarne gloss and perhaps other exemplars.

Aldred’s vernacular glosses in the Lindisfarne Gospels and Durham A.IV.19, combined with other evidence, tell us something about what Aldred knew, read, and thought. To gloss the Gospels in Lindisfarne, he utilized variant Latin...
versions, not just the Latin on the page in front of him, as well as other vernacular translations. Moreover, Aldred did not just translate the Latin word for word literally but varied between calques on the Latin and etymological and linguistic reflections to interpretive glosses showing a knowledge of commentaries and allegorical meanings, often offering more than one translation linked with a vel.

With place names and personal names, he might offer a literal, a generic, or an allegorical meaning, in place of or in addition to an abbreviated or anglicized version of the name. Thus, for example, Aldred’s glosses on Hebrew names demonstrate knowledge of patristic sources and metaphorical meanings of texts, such as Jerome, either directly or mediated through other sources, like Isidore of Seville. In another case, his gloss of Christ the Redeemer on “leopard” shows Aldred was familiar with the Physiologus typologies.

Aldred’s knowledge of Bede and some of his work is demonstrated both by his Latin gloss on Bede’s Commentary on Proverbs in Bodley 819 (image 20) and by his possible use of Bede’s translation of John in the Lindisfarne gloss of that Gospel. Between the Lindisfarne and Durham A.IV.19 work, Aldred added to Bede’s Commentary on Proverbs Latin expansions of the lemmata (to provide the whole text of the proverbs) and id est exegetical comments often of an allegorical nature, but only through fol. 50v. As with the Lindisfarne Gospels gloss, Aldred’s work in Bodley 819 reinforces the significance of this manuscript as part of the community’s heritage and Aldred’s role in enhancing that heritage while passing it on to the next generation.

---

47. See Alan S. C. Ross, “Rare Words in Old Northumbrian,” Ne&Q 29 (1982): 196–98, on calques as a source of rare words in Aldred’s work; Boyd, Aldred’s Marginata, 56–57, on his knowledge of Scripture and commentaries based on the Lindisfarne gloss; and Hines, “Scandinavian English,” 409–10 on Old Norse variants with vel.
51. The first quire is missing; evidence suggests it was missing in the twelfth century when a copy was made in Harley 4688, which ignores Aldred’s additions. Cod. Lind., Vol. 2, Bk 2, p. 33, notes that the appearance of Aldred’s hand in Bodley 819 from fol. 19v onward is “large and rough,” details the similarities to the Lindisfarne Gospels and Durham A.IV.19 to establish Aldred as scribe, and suggests that the first part was done before Durham A.IV.19 and the later part closer to the time of Durham A.IV.19.
Overall, Aldred’s vernacular glosses to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and Durham A.IV.19 illustrate his skill as a translator, but also his esoteric interests.\(^53\) Indeed the esoteric quality of his linguistic interests begs comparison to Alcuin and Aldhelm whose scholarship flourished in much more rich and sustaining environments than Aldred found himself in at Chester-le-Street. R. L. Thompson went so far as to comment: “One cannot but admire the conscientiousness of a glossator who should not merely insist on glossing something so eminently unglossable as proper names, but take counsel with other manuscripts for the purpose!”\(^54\) Despite certain errors and confusions, some of which are more apparent than actual, Aldred was a conscientious and knowledgeable glossator and commentator.\(^55\) Further, his linguistic variations, like the “Littera me pandat” marginal verses in the *Lindisfarne* colophon, suggest an interest in bilinguality itself as a means of reflection on different interpretations; not only does he often prefer abnormal forms but he was also in the habit of writing variant letters above a word, not to mention using the runes for *dæg* and *monn* instead of the spelled words.\(^56\)

Moreover, the idea of glossing service book prayers was unusual if not unique, suggesting a rather lively mind and set of interests at work in Durham A.IV.19 at Chester-le-Street. Three aspects of Aldred’s glosses and the “errors” that he committed in the additions to Durham A.IV.19 reveal something of his educational and reflective aims.

First of all, besides the original collectar, Aldred only glossed his own additions to Durham A.IV.19, with the one exception discussed at the outset of this chapter, Scribe B’s text on fol. 61r and the first few lines of Scribe C’s text on the verso.\(^57\) And, as discussed in chapter 4, of the benedictions copied, Aldred only glossed his own field prayers and Scribe B’s John poison prayer, both texts with Irish roots. Aldred’s habit, therefore, was to gloss what he wrote for his purposes, while the texts copied by his fellow scribes remained their own work designed for their, perhaps different, purposes. The exception of Scribe B thus stands out as a case for Aldred instructing a pupil with a writing exercise.

\(^53\) Noted by Boyd, “Aldrediana XXV,” 45.

\(^54\) Thompson, “Aldrediana V,” 35, n. 5; see also M. Brown, *Lindisfarne*, 100, for a similarly positive assessment.


\(^57\) Some of Scribe C’s blessings in Quire IX duplicate materials found in the original collectar that Aldred did gloss there. T. J. Brown, *Durham Ritual*, 26, notes that Aldred’s glossing is “rather better” on his own texts than others, e.g. Scribe O in the original collectar.
Second, Aldred’s ability to gloss every single word but then stop glossing mid-text, evident at fol. 61v and in other parts of the manuscript, suggests that the glossing is related less to textual units and more to vocabulary. Aldred assiduously glossed every word, common or uncommon, repeatedly, even very familiar texts and incipits like the Pater noster. He fully glossed extremely abbreviated Latin, perhaps because the Old English mattered more than the Latin, the latter needing only a couple of words and letters to evoke the full text known by heart. Yet at the same time he did not finish glossing every text. At the opening between quires VII and VIII in the original collectar, where Scribe E copied a duplicate hymn over erasure (fol. 53v), Aldred skipped glossing the unerased facing page (fol. 54r) and picked up mid-sentence on the verso. Aldred’s gloss also changed in Quire XI on the sets of psalm incipits just before the Cuthbert collects and colophon on fol. 84r. While the penitential psalm incipits for Prime were fully glossed except for the title, the section for Tierce beginning at fol. 83rb22 is completely unglossed; meanwhile, the section titles for Sext, None, Vespers, and two all-purpose sets are glossed but not the psalm incipits. These latter glossed section titles are rubrics, red instructions specifying the use to which these psalms may be put, glossed in a contrastingly darker ink than previous glosses. As explained in chapter 4, these glossed titles would aid those who might have already memorized the Latin psalm but needed assistance with reading the Latin instructions. Further evidence of the incompleteness of the gloss as part of an ongoing thought process is the frequency of vel without an alternative word following. Many of these absent words, as well as the cases where an alternative is included, involve reflections on interpretation or places where he was searching for a synonym to vary the translation of two different Latin words.

Third, some revealing oddities show how Aldred’s mind worked while glossing Latin that he may have copied some time before he added the gloss.


59. For example, in the Gallican capitella material (QXI.33–36), note the extreme Latin abbreviations while still glossing fully (tenebris shortened to “te” but glossed ðiostro, fol. 78rb18, cf. 78vb4, 79vb23), as well as the glossing of some titles (fol. 78r1) and “amen” (fol. 78r9).

60. See, for example, at fol. 82va13–14 and again at fol. 82va21 (QXI.41), where he glosses tabernaculum with hosincle vel with no alternative both times. In the first instance, it may be because of the redundancy of hus over domus that follows (Ps. 131[132]:3, 5). Or perhaps he was searching for a theological understanding of the tabernacle as something other than literally a small house; at fol. 87ra15–16 in discussing the hostiarius in the ecclesiastical grades, he glosses tabernaculum with hus temple. More examples of vel glosses and vocabulary reflections are discussed below in the section on the encyclopedic additions.
Although not all errors or omissions were rectified, Aldred corrected himself regularly, showing that he read over what he had written. Occasionally he went into the margin to add what he considered important modifications.  

Sometimes vocabulary interested him so much that he varied his Old English, went into the margin to add what he considered important modifications.  

For example, Aldred has several glossing variations involving ece in relation to eternus, a Latin word he clearly knew and understood in most instances. In one of the field prayers (QIX/X.14b), he emended the gloss of Latin eterne from Old English aces to acres with the addition of an “r,” reflecting his concern with fields; the reverse happens on fol. 27v2 when he glossed sempiternum with ece, a line below sempiternum glossed as ece. In another instance, the phrase eternal life is reversed in a way that reflects Old English word order overtaking the Latin: at 78ra9 (QXI.33; image 15), while glossing Latin in uitam aeternam he intially glossed uitam with Old English ecvum and then added Old English life above that. The Old English word ece seemed to hold a broader or multifarious meaning for Aldred, since he also used it to gloss forms of hodiernus (today); conceivably this reflects an exegetical understanding of “day” as sometimes referring to an “eternal now” in Neoplatonic and Augustinian thought.

---

61. At fol. 81rb24 (QXI.38n) he added an abbreviation mark to the Latin while doing the Old English gloss in different ink. At fol. 81rb27–20 he added a missing text to the capitella (QXI.38L) with both the Latin and the Old English gloss in black and using similar letter forms, suggesting that it was done in a third pass after the Latin column was finished and after the gloss in red ink was done. 

62. See, for example, major additions at fols. 78vb18 and 79ra11–12, as well as occasions in the Lindisfarne Gospels when he extended his Old English gloss into virtually a commentary. 

63. For example, Old English duru vel dor for hostia (fol. 80va1), gevexo vel gidu for proficiet (fol. 81vb18–19), stev vel svefen for somnum (fol. 82va17), dinum vel binne for tue (fol. 80ra25), and usum vel userne for nostro (fol. 81ra) seem to indicate a variation in his Old English vocabulary, orthography, or grammar found throughout his glossing of the Lindisfarne Gospels and Durham A.IV.19. At fol. 81rb22, in a severely abbreviated incipit, he glosses the Latin cor’ for cornu (horn) with Old English hearta, apparently misreading the Latin incipit for what should be a familiar psalm ([11][12]:9). Note also a grammar glitch at fol. 80ra25, a decension pronoun issue at fol. 81ra, and the unusual gloss of tun for turribus at fol. 81ra18–19 (QXI.38f). Other examples are discussed below in the hymns and in the encyclopedic additions. 

64. Also in the original collectar (fol. 17v16, Rogation lections from Jeremiah), he glossed de semitis antiquis with Old English of sedum aldon, mistaking Latin semitas, path, for semen, seed (to be fair, this is on an overrun from line 17 written above it that then continues with a word break in antiquis to line 18). A grammar error involving fields also occurs in the Lindisfarne Gospels where he glosses Matt. 7:2 (fol. 38vb22–24) Latin mensi fueritis with bripes ge bilon, mistaking mensi for mesis and glossed fueritis as pres. ind. pl.; see Henry Sweet and Dorothy Whitecock, Sweet’s Anglo-Saxon Reader in Prose and Verse, 15th ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 1967), 216 and note p. 291: he seems to understand Jesus saying that by whatever measuring you use, you will be measured.

65. At fol. 79ra2 he glosses it following the Latin word order. The more common word order (DOE) is ecum life versus Latin vitam aeternam; another instance of this reversal of the Latin is Lindisfarne Gospels John 6:27 (fol. 223vb2), where in ece life is written above in uitam and nothing above aeternam. 

66. As for example, “today, if you hear his voice . . .” in Hebrews 3:7–15 and 4:7, quoting Ps. 94(95):7. See Augustine’s Confessions 7.13 and discussion in Carlos Eire, A Very Brief History of Eternity (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 60–66. At fols. 17v10 and 27v10, Aldred glossed hodiernus with ece or eccele dag, modifying festivitas to indicate a festal day; at 61v2 he corrected Scribe C’s odierna by adding an initial “h” and then glossed it ecelce W [dag]; at 80va15 he glossed actus nostros hodiernus with dedo von ecelcia l with no alternative, as if he were contemplating another interpretation. The Durham Ritual Glossary shows he uses
The glossed hymns provide intriguing examples of Aldred’s habits of mind that we can compare with the glosses found in the other Anglo-Saxon hymnals discussed in chapter 4. Aldred’s gloss of the hymns is independent of the later, primarily West Saxon, glossed hymnals. His “one off” vernacularization emerged as part of his glossing habit in his distinctive Northumbrian dialect, whatever educational function it may have also served in his community. The glosses found in other hymnals are primarily instructional, as for example the vernacular and construe glosses in the Durham Hymnal, which is clearly a school book given its subsequent compilation with Ælfric’s Grammar. But Aldred’s lexical gloss appears to do more and also less than school books: he persisted in doggedly offering a grammatical Old English translation of almost every word, simple or not; yet he did not offer any word order hints, such as construe glosses, useful for highlighting the significant differences in word order between the two languages, particularly with a Latin poetic text.

One example of his thinking visible in an error occurs in a line in Hy 7 for Prime (QXI.26). Instead of sors (glossed hlot, fate, in the New Hymnal), Aldred wrote sol, appropriately glossed sunne, although someone altered both this word and the next (reduxerit). The initial “s” of sol shows some erasure and correction as if it were previously another letter altered to an “s.” A final, unidentifiable letter after “sol” was also erased, while the next word, reduxerit, was added over erasure in red in a hand that is probably Aldred’s. It appears Aldred endeavored to fix the line while glossing in red, although it would have been a different quill with a wider nib than could be used in the gloss. The resulting line reads:

todæg or the dæg-rune for hodie and dag or its rune for dies; but for hodiernus he preferred ece-dæg. Likewise in the Lindisfarne Gospels he reflected on the concept of day: at Matt. 27:8 (fol. 87r012), he glossed in hodiernum diem as ḍone longu dæge ġ wið diise on duord/dæg, extending into the margin to add the alternative (“to this very day”) referring to Judas’ Field of Blood; elsewhere (Matt 28:15, fol. 89r06) the same phrase is glossed only with longe dæge.


68. Keefer, ASM 14, pp. 59–60; Milfull, Hymns, 39.

69. On syntactical glosses and educational texts, see Fred C. Robinson, “Syntactical Glosses in Latin Manuscripts of Anglo-Saxon Provenance,” Speculum 48 (1973): 443–75; he points out (462–63) the pedagogically useful Latin prose paraphrases of hymns in the Expositio hymnorum and the Latin notes in the Durham Hymnal. The absence of construe marks in Aldred’s glosses is particularly notable given the Irish use of such systems (Robinson, 464–68) and Aldred’s frequent use of Irish textual traditions, as well as abbreviations (T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 40).

70. Milfull thinks the “s” was originally an “r” but if so it would not have been the uncial style “r” used by Aldred on this page but an insular “r” that could easily be made into an insular “s” by erasing the right descender (Aldred’s uncial “r” starts to give way to insular on fol. 77v). However, in this case, it appears that the corrector has not only erased a minim stroke on the right, but also extended the left minim down below the groundline, and may have also redone the curved part of the “s” to a final spot. The letter underneath may therefore have been an “n.” Also, the final “l” with an erasure after it might have been a “b.” The word underneath sol, therefore, was clearly not sors but some other error that continued to the word after it. This could be either a visual or an auditory error.

71. That the red gloss and titles were done at the same time, although with different nibs, is suggested by the title on Hy 10 at the top of fol. 77v (image 15), where the title is offset to the right, nicely accommodating
ChAPTEr 5

This alters the sense from “in order that, when day is departed and fate has brought night back again” to something less clear about the sun.72 Aldred may have read it that the sun was departing as well, causing the return of night; or, that the sun’s return will banish night. If Aldred was glossing the hymn with a Latin exemplar no longer at hand, he might very well have experienced some confusion, although one wonders about his familiarity with what is one of the older Latin hymns used regularly in the office.73 But since he evidently knew the word *sors* in the context of the casting of lots, perhaps he was avoiding the pagan and negative connotations.74

Likewise, a theological understanding of the Holy Spirit emerges in the common doxology of Hy 7, Hy 8, and Hy 10 (QXI.26, 27, 29), and in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*. Aldred glossed *paraclito* with *rummode* (−um), although *rummode* is usually used to gloss *clemens* or *clementissime* (as Aldred did in Hy 72, QXI.30, fol. 77v10 [image 14] and at 82rb15, QXI.40).75 The Durham Hymnal and other Old English Gospels gloss *paraclito* with *frofer*, comfort, a literal translation of this Greek loanword.76 Aldred may have been unfamiliar with the etymology of Greek παράκλητος as helper, one called alongside in a legal sense of intercessor or counselor. Nonetheless, his translation to *rummode*, gracious, is in line with early medieval exegesis on the Holy Spirit as grace.77

These “errors” and alterations, combined with his glossing gaps, suggest Aldred was more concerned with word units than textual units. His apparent
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aim was to build up the vocabulary of Christian history and worship in his community. This curious combination of learned knowledge amidst Latin errors suggests that Aldred was not so much incompetent in Latin but that he was a well-read scholar making errors because his primary focus lay elsewhere than creating an accurate script for performance purposes. Because Aldred’s gloss is not syntactic Old English that would provide a free-standing translation of the Latin, it can only be read in conjunction with the Latin. So, one cannot imagine someone singing the hymn, for example, while looking at this text. Rather, a reader would either be learning the hymn, prayer, or psalm and encouraged to consider the meaning of perhaps unfamiliar Latin words; or the reader already knows the text and is using the gloss as an aid to meditation, in effect a commentary. His corrections to Scribe B and the glossed instructions on the psalms also point to an educational function, as do Scribe E’s contributions of a duplicate hymn, two basic generic prayers, and the Advent readings added in Aldred’s Quire XI. On the other hand, the work of Scribes C, D, and probably F, seem to be a different enterprise, more to enhance the service book materials, to which Aldred also contributed with daily office and other rituals.

It may be that Aldred’s first purpose in glossing was as a devotional act of worship, similar to his gloss of the Lindisfarne Gospels. The process of glossing is a form of contemplation for the glossator that could simultaneously serve as an instructional tool and subsequently become a source of inspiration for individual and communal readers. Because we often picture writing and reading as primarily individual rather than corporate enterprises, it is hard for us to reconstruct the performative aspects involved in the contemplative and instructional setting of a religious community. Every “vel,” for example, was an opportunity for an extended conversation, perhaps even more so on the “empty” ones, which might have provided exactly that pause (”or . . .”) needed for reflection and discussion of the exegetical meaning. Further, Aldred’s pedagogical philosophy may have been distinctly different than his counterparts in the south. Although possibly like them relying on standard school book types—Psalters, Bede’s writings—he also developed his own glossing technique with an eye toward inculcating an understanding of the ideas behind the words he glossed.78 To see the full impact of Aldred’s glossing as pedagogical and linguistic study, we can turn to his “educational” additions in Durham A.IV.19.

LANGUAGE STUDY AT CHESTER-LE-STREET: ENCyclopedic ADDitions

In the second half of Quire XI, Aldred copied a number of texts classified as “educational,” but “encyclopedic” is a better designation suggesting scholarly as well as pedagogical functions. F. Wormald in his index for the EEMF volume designated them “educational,” probably for want of a better label since they do not fall into any category of liturgy or synaxis relevant to a service book. The earlier Lindelöf edition introduced by Thompson categorized them as miscellaneous, casual, and unrelated to the rest of the manuscript, copied either from several sources or from some now lost compilation.\(^7\) The difficulties in sourcing them have not yet been overcome, although electronic searching holds out some promise for tracking them in the future as more materials are digitized.

However, although the type of text seems significantly different from the office materials in the first part of Quire XI, the common use of glossing suggests they were part of Aldred’s larger linguistic purposes in the Chester-le-Street community, where they may have been studied corporately or perused privately as reference works. Some of them are reminiscent of glossaries, colloquies, and pedagogical dialogues derived from older encyclopedic works by Isidore of Seville, Raban Maur, Amalarius of Metz, Alcuin, and Bede (or Pseudo-Alcuin and Pseudo-Bede), or in the popular insular versions of the Dialogue of Solomon and Saturn.\(^8\) Most of them exhibit numerical interests reminiscent of the Irish Liber numeris and the Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae, as well as Irish philological interests in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin magnified by the vernacular gloss.\(^8\) The didactic purpose of these texts needs to be placed into a larger, more complex, and changing manuscript contexts for encyclopedic as well as devotional and contemplative texts, as argued for example by Elaine Treharne for the twelfth-century Dicts of Cato.\(^8\)

---


Kees Dekker examined the genealogy of a set of encyclopedic texts in circulation in late Anglo-Saxon England found in four manuscripts, for which he coins the term “micropaedia.”83 Although Aldred’s set appears unrelated, some of the same traits Dekker identifies in these late tenth- and eleventh-century collections are found in Durham A.IV.19’s lists: the Irish associations, the variable educational and scholarly purposes, and their location in empty folios at the end of a manuscript.84 Moreover, one of the four manuscripts in Dekker’s study is Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 183, the manuscript donated to Chester-le-Street by King Athelstan containing Cuthbert hagiography and liturgy, along with these encyclopedic texts that seem to be of the same type as Aldred’s, yet none of them are duplicates.85 Conceivably, Aldred was copying additional encyclopedic materials to complement the set found in CCCC 183.

Aldred’s collection thus fits with a growing interest in the tenth and especially the eleventh centuries in Latin as part of a reform of schools, manifested in the creation of glossaries and encyclopedic compendiums.86 In the surviving glossarial and encyclopedic manuscripts whose genealogies we can trace, Aldred’s is a one-off, which may speak to the conditions in Northumbria and the ambiguous legacy of Chester-le-Street. Yet although Aldred’s unique compilation at the end of Quire XI is not part of an identifiable copying tradition, it may very well be a response to this educational reform impulse and a desire to supply necessary historical and linguistic information for readers in his community. If these materials can be interpreted as evidence for what they might have had to read in their library for which they would need these guides, then they would primarily be useful for reading the Old Testament and patristic commentaries—including, and maybe especially, the works of Bede—as well as apocryphal literature of that sort that turns up in Irish literature.

The materials are identified as follows:87


QXI.49. *De octo pondera de quibus factus est adam* (fol. 86rb10–86va16) (image 16). On the eight pounds of material from which Adam was made [a], followed by two related questions [b].

QXI.50. Ancient titles and offices (fols. 86va16–87ra10). [a] *De dignitatis*
romanorum (fol. 86va16–vb16), an explanation of eleven Roman imperial offices; [b] the names for kings in different ancient or Biblical cultures (86vb17–23); and [c] the magistratus sive tristatus in Egypt (87ra1–10).


QXI.52. Interpretatio nominis sacerdotum (fol. 87va16–b15). Explanation of priestly names and titles, followed by an explanation of eight Greek words (fol. 87vb2–15).


QXI.54. Alphabet of words (fol. 88va1–24, b1–21). Biblical world history emphasizing redemption.


The context for their copying suggests that Aldred grouped these texts here with a common theme, if not a common source. They are included after the break at fol. 84, where Aldred had copied the Cuthbert collects with colophon and memorandum on the recto; on the verso, Scribe E had copied antiphons and versicles for the first four Sundays in Advent. The encyclopedic materials on fols. 85r–88v end the quire and the manuscript, as it is currently bound and has been since at least the early eighteenth century. The last page, 88v, is extremely worn, as is the beginning of the quire (fol. 77v), further evidence that quire XI stood apart as a separate booklet that would have made it easily portable on Aldred’s 970 journey with Bishop Ælfsige commemorated in the colophon. Although these encyclopedic texts in theory could have been acquired on the same journey at some point when he had access to a library, two factors suggest but cannot prove a Northumbrian context. First, Scribe E’s addition on the back of the Cuthbert collects and colophon (fol. 84v) implies a return to Chester-le-Street before Aldred commenced on fol. 85r with the educational additions, unless he left 84v blank and Scribe E filled it in later or was with them on the journey. Second, many if not all of these lists have Irish associations that would more likely have been acquired in Northumbria, although other sites, such as Glastonbury, were transmission sites for Irish materials as well.88 In any case, “Irish” texts came into Anglo-Saxon England over a long period, both from Ireland and from Irish-founded continental missions, so at a certain point they became part of the Anglo-Saxon intellectual community and their Irishness subliminal.

Aldred’s “micopaedia” in Quire XI is double columned and glossed, similar to the liturgical material he copied before the break at fol. 84 (after the

88. See Wright, Irish Tradition, 270.
single-column wide text format of the hymns on fol. 77r–v). The texts themselves (fol. 85r–88v) appear to have been written in at least two stints, first folios 85–87, leaving fol. 88 a separate writing campaign. Blank lines at the end of fol. 87v suggest a writing break, supported by the increasing messiness of fol. 87 compared to the return to neatness on fol. 88r. Thus, while the first five items (QXI.48–52) are written continuously, overlapping folios (85r–87v), QXI.53 stands by itself on fol. 88r, with QXI.54–55 on the verso.

All of the items are lists; in that sense they are reference works but with a linguistic “turn.” Some of them are of a similar type. QXI.50–52 are lists of offices. QXI.48 is referential, to look up abbreviations of terms, either when reading a text with abbreviations or to write one, although it could also serve as a vocabulary list. QXI.53 and QXI.55 offer factual information on the resting places of the apostles and on Old Testament citations in the New Testament. QXI.49 and QXI.54 might have a more reflective function, meditating on the allegorical meaning of Adam’s material composition or pondering issues of the cross and redemption in the alphabetic list. A. Hamilton Thompson, in his introduction to Lindelöf’s 1927 edition, speculated that Aldred was either copying from an encyclopedic compendium of some type or was making notes from such a text or set of texts; he also suggested that the alphabetic reflections on sin and redemption in QXI.54 may be an original composition.89

Yet with no known direct source of identification for most of them, the composite nature of some of them, and the variations throughout in style and abbreviations, Aldred himself may have been the compiler, borrowing from several manuscript exemplars to which he had access. The common feature uniting all of them, whether for educational purposes or not, is an interest in the insights to be gained from multiple languages translated into the Anglo-Saxon vernacular. As with the Lindisfarne Gospel’s gloss and colophon, Aldred may have seen himself adding value to the three sacred languages of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin by a fourth language to complete them, Old English. The vernacular offered not just literal comprehension but added interpretive breadth to bring about greater devotional understanding in the heart. This applied not just to the glossed prayers but to any of the vocabulary of Scripture and Christian tradition into which Aldred wanted his community to be acculturated. These seemingly random and tedious lists provided that challenge.

QXI.48 NOTAE JURIS: HÆ SUNT NOTAS PREDISTINATAS

This first list gives abbreviations of 225 Latin words, one quarter of them legal, and eleven of them ecclesiastical.90 For each, Aldred gave the abbreviation fol-

89. Thompson, Rituale, xx.
ollowed by the Latin word written out, with an Old English gloss above. He did make some errors, many of them corrected. The formatting suggests that Aldred was initially copying a text following a pattern that he abandoned as he sped up (image 16). If this copy was merely for the purpose of transport to another context, then it makes sense to copy with speed and accuracy for the words but not necessarily the format. But then why gloss it, unless the true purpose was to add the Old English and create a vocabulary list?

No exact exemplar for Aldred’s *notae juris* has been found. The closest is apparently in an eighth-century continental list, *Notae lindenbrogianae* [Lindenbrog.] but the two are significantly different in terms of the abbreviations, the words listed, and the sequence. However, such lists were fairly common in earlier ages and Aldred’s may be an artifact of an older system disappearing in the tenth century. Eight of Aldred’s eleven ecclesiastical terms (*affectus, beatus, egressus, lapsis, lapsus, omnipotens, salus, spec*†) appear in Lindenbrog., while *zabulus, zelus,* and *zelotes* occur in Aldred’s list only. Boyd takes particular interest in *zabulus* as a rare variant on *diabolus* and Aldred’s gloss *nið æfest* as a meaningful understanding of Satan as adversary. Nonetheless, he concludes from this example and others that Aldred’s Latin in Durham A.IV.19 shows a predilection for the exotic and rare, a trait also noted in the vocabulary of the John poison prayer copied by Scribe B (QVIII.1).

The kinds of additions and corrections Aldred made to the list tell us something about his working habits and interests. Aldred employed a certain amount of variation, offering alternatives and not glossing words the same way. The use of *vel* (or), for example, shows him thinking about the meaning of words. At fol. 85ra4, an odd abbreviation for *actionem* (*ai~m* or *aii~n*) is glossed.

---

91. For example, at fol. 85ra16, he adds in black “en” to *contra* but at fol. 85ra18, *crimen* is not corrected. At fol. 85va23, he later adds the first “a” below the “m” to *mandatum*; at fol. 86ra5 he adds the “i” to *quia* (the abbreviation was *qu~a*); and at fol. 86rb8, *zł* abbreviation for *zabulus* was added.

92. The title, in red and unglossed as is usual, is made to fit on one line (85ra1), forcing the last two letters of *predistinatas* to be written above. Aldred began copying these entries using a hanging indent format, although the text runs continuously rather than each headword abbreviation starting on a fresh line. Thus on fol. 85ra4, almost every other line he started with a new abbreviation with a large capital offset left, but by 85v he abandoned this hanging indent format to the end of the text (the spacing overall gets tighter as well). He seems to use periods to break between each set, but is inconsistent in their use (sometimes between the abbreviation and the word or between two words that are part of the same abbreviation). The list is alphabetical by first, but not subsequent, letters.


94. See W. M. Lindsay, *Notae Latinae: An Account of Abbreviation in Latin MSS. of the Early Minuscule Period* (c. 700–850), with a Supplement by Doris Bain (Abbreviations in Latin MSS. of 850–1050) (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1963), 413–431; although unfortunately Aldred’s *notae juris* are not included in the manuscripts they examined, his materials seem to resonate with Irish traditions they describe.


96. Boyd, “Aldrediana XXV,” 39–45. Also noteworthy at fol. 86rb8, the abbreviation *zł* for *zabulus* has been added above the period, small. The gloss of the previous word goes above it, thus showing the gloss was done after the Latin.
with *gescir vel* but with no alternative gloss given (he does this more than occasionally). Moreover, *gescir* as a gloss for *actio* has no parallel and is otherwise unattested, although he uses *gesciran* to gloss *vilicare* in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*, Luke 16:2 (to act as a steward or manager).\(^{97}\) In other cases, Aldred glossed *actio* with Old English *ded* (deed) or with *u(o)erc* (work).\(^{98}\) With the abbreviation list, Aldred may have been using the prompt from the word *actio* to have some kind of discussion of various forms of action or service, even to expound a Gospel passage or commentary that the word brought to mind.

In another instance (fol. 86ra6), he used *vel* in the Latin for two different abbreviations of *qui* but did not spell out the word. He did however gloss both with two Old English words, *ða* and *ðas*, both plural demonstratives serving as relative pronouns (those or these who or which) perhaps as a springboard for a grammatical discussion with someone like Scribe B.\(^{99}\) At fol. 86ra14, *res* is glossed not with *ding* but with *aehc*, although above in line 13 *rum* (*res*) has been glossed with *ding*, perhaps because of an impulse to show greater variance of meaning in Old English than Latin. Fol. 86ra22 and 86rb4 both have *tempus* but with two different abbreviations (*T*~ and *tp*~), both glossed *tiid*. This may be evidence that Aldred was merging more than one source.

Aldred corrected himself in ways that show him thinking as he wrote. For example at fol. 85va14, he may have suffered eye skip and wrote for the abbreviation *m~m manu misa* instead of *manu mittit* (the abbreviation for *manu misa* does occur on line 17); so he put deletion lines around *misa* and then wrote the correct word *mittit* at the beginning of the next line.\(^{100}\) At fol. 86ra6 he glossed the abbreviation *qs~ quasi* with *we biddas svæ*. The *we biddas* gloss assumes “qs” is an abbreviation for *quaesumus*; while the *svæ* was then added as the correct gloss of *quaes*.*\(^{101}\) This means that he was glossing as he read the Latin he had already written, and suggests, along with the occasional *vel* lacking an alternative word, that he was thinking while he glossed rather than complet-

---

\(^{97}\) Bosworth and Toller, *gesciran*. An earlier editor, Stevenson, preferred to read it as *gestir*, which does yield the meaning action if based on the verb *gestyan*, to steer, rather than *gestiran*, to correct (Bosworth and Toller’s dictionary has only this instance of *gestir*, based on Stevenson’s reading).

\(^{98}\) T. J. Brown, *Durham Ritual Glossary*, 62 lists for *ded* fols. 20v18, 24r19, 3v14, 7v20, 15v16; p. 90 for *u(o)erc* lists only fol. 4v17.

\(^{99}\) Aldred writes first “q” with a minim above it, followed by a *vel* sign and then the alternative “q” with a colon. Lindenbrog. has *qui* abbreviated as the “q” with a minim over it; Cappelli has “q:” for *qui*, tenth century. My thanks to Sarah Larrett Keefer, personal correspondence, for grammatical insights on this mystery.

\(^{100}\) Thin lines above and below the word *misa* (*manu misa*), indicate recognition of an error for the abbreviation for *mittit*, written on next line; the two words are glossed *honde sendeð* but the mistaken word is not glossed. Fol. 85va17 has *manu misa* (*manu corrected with an “a” added) and glossed *honde gesendeð*. The Lindenbrog. list has both together “mn~m” for *manumitti* and “mm~s” for *manu missus*. Note also the periods between the two words, where normally the periods are between sets.

\(^{101}\) The *svæ* is hard to read, a bit faint or smudged, written into the center margin. *Quaesumus*, a common word in a liturgical context, is one he has abbreviated elsewhere as “qs” (see fol. 79vb4) and which he glossed in the original collectar as *we biddas*, fol. 1v2. DOE notes *we biddas* in the gloss is of *quaesumus*. See Parkes, *Their Hands before Our Eyes*, 68 on this type of error by a religious scribe copying a secular text.
ing the work or copying it. In this case, he copied out the Latin abbreviations and texts, and then went back through at some later point adding the gloss. Cruising along, he saw *qs~*, thought in his liturgical mind, *quaesumus*, wrote the gloss, then realized, that is *quasi*, hence *svae*.

102 If his intentions were educational and he was glossing word by word, then leaving both here served his purposes for explaining both *quaesumus* and *quasi* to his pupils.

Some errors Aldred apparently did not catch or did not recognize. At fol. 85ra18 for the abbreviation *cri~m* he wrote *crinem* instead of *crimen*, but correctly glossed it as *hehsynn* (*crime*).103 So he knew the word, but must have been working hastily and did not catch the inversion of “m” and “n.” At fol. 85rb16–17 for the (second) abbreviation “G.” he wrote *gauisetus* and glossed it *gilgladade*. The participle *gavisus* from *gaudere* can hardly be declined with an extra –*et* in it.104 But since he clearly understood the meaning in Old English here and elsewhere, that may be the ultimate point, to use the vernacular as a way into the Latin. If he was instructing pupils orally, then he probably pronounced the Latin appropriately while giving the definition in Old English.

The *notae juris* text may therefore have served multiple purposes as a linguistic exercise. It could conceivably have been used for its original purpose, to understand Latin abbreviations while reading legal texts. However, it appears to have no direct effect on or relation to the abbreviations used in other parts of Durham A.IV.19, which tend to vary depending on the source. For example, the next text, *De octo pondera* (QXI.49) uses different abbreviations for *est* and *enim*. So Aldred may have copied the *notae juris* from some older manuscript(s) less for the abbreviations and more for the opportunity to flex his own vocabulary muscles as well as those of his community, almost like flash cards.

102. According to the *Durham Ritual Glossary* he used *bid(d)eth* for *deprecari*, *exorare*, *implorare*, *obisecare*, *orare*, *pocere*, *precari*, *quaere*, *rogare*, *supplicare*, *competere*, and *deponere*. The “-as” ending on *biddas* occurs several times, including right on fol. 1v2 “we biddas” glossing *qs~*; “ve biddas” (“v” not “win”) also occurs, as well as “ve biddath” for *exoramus*. In other cases, he abbreviates to *se bidd* or *bid*. The “-as” ending on *biddan* for a first person plural is unusual; all of the instances in DOE are from Aldred, either the *Lindisfarne Gospels* gloss or here in Durham A.IV.19. The Aldrediana group discusses Aldred’s gloss as the major early evidence for the switch from -ð to–s endings in the plural as well as 3rd singular, although these articles predate the identification of Aldred as the sole glossator of Lindisfarne and of Durham: see A. S. C. Ross, “The Origin of the s-Endings of the Present Indicative in English,” *JEGP* 33 (1934): 68–70; L. Blakeley, “The Lindisfarne s/ð Problem,” *Studia neophilologica* 22 (1950): 15–47; and Ross, “Supposed Use of the 2nd Singular for the 3rd Singular in ‘Tocharian A,’ Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Hittite,” *Archivum Linguisticum* 6 (1954): 112–21, who summarizes Blakeley. Blakeley argues that the–s form spread (first in verbs with stem ending in δ, d, t and less so those ending in–s or–m, or the verb *doa*) from 2nd person singular to plural and thence to other plurals and then from 3rd plural to 3rd singular. These authors, working primarily before Ker’s article, assume that the switching between the–ð and–s forms is further evidence confirming two scribes in *Lindisfarne*, now discredited, but the mixing of forms remains unexplained: see Ross, “Aldrediana XVII: Ritual Supplement,” *English Philological Studies* 11 (1968): 13 on the “Variation Problem.”

103. He glossed *crimen* also in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*, Matthew (Bosworth and Toller, *hebd-synn*).

104. Lindenbrog, has after Gaius (which Aldred transliterated as a proper name) another proper name Gaius Seius abbreviated GS and does not have *gavisus*, *gauisetus* or *gaudere*; the *Notae Papianae*, p. 320 does have *gaudium* abbreviated G. similar to Gaius right above it (the Notae Papianae is another of the *notarum laterculi* ed. by Mommsen in Keil, *Grammatici latini*, iv, pp. 315–30).
Continuing after the notae juris and seemingly in the same writing campaign, Aldred wrote out a text titled “on the eight pounds from which Adam was made” [a], followed by two related questions about the nature of breath and wind [b]. These allegorical texts have Irish roots as well as unique spiritual insights from a linguistic point of view.

The text is clearly written and glossed (image 16), although the verso of folio 86, especially the “a” column, shows some wear, rendering the gloss hard to read. Aldred made some corrections both to the Latin (fol. 86rb16) and to the Old English gloss (fol. 86rb21). At the page turn, he repeated the last two words at the top of the next, both the Latin inde est and its gloss, of ðon is, although he had not habitually done this on page turns. Perhaps it reflects an interest in keeping a syntactically whole phrase started on the next page, which he doggedly glossed over again—or possibly he took a short break in writing at the bottom of 86r.

De octo pondera (QXI.49a), and similar companion texts on Adam’s name, is derived from Enochian apocrypha and was popular in insular literature. A comparison of variants on this text by Charles Wright reveals that Aldred’s version belongs to a strand containing an apparent scribal error that developed a life of its own: instead of “solis” for the eyes, this version has “floris,” flower or blossom, which some modify to indicate “variety” to explain eye color while others change it to plural “flowers.”

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 326 (s. x/xi Canterbury) has the more common “solis” version that includes allegorical and spiritual interpretations and applications: earth = flesh; sea = blood; sun = eyes; clouds of the sky = thoughts; wind = pant/desire (anhela) or breath/soul (flatus); stones of the earth = bones; holy spirit = placed in man; light of the world = interpreted as Christ. An earlier text in CCCC 326, labeled On Perias Lector Litteras tam Gręcas, shows similar linguistic interests to Aldred’s educational additions.
The “floris” variant is found in Hiberno-Latin texts such as the *Liber de numeris* and in two Anglo-Saxon versions, Aldred’s Latin text glossed in Old English here and a twelfth-century Old English Dialogue of Solomon and Saturn. These two vernacular versions, however, differ in their vocabulary and sequence as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALDRED</th>
<th>SOLOMON AND SATURN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. earth (limi / lames) &gt; flesh (caro / flæsc)</td>
<td>1. earth (foldan) &gt; flesh (flesc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. fire (ignis / fyres) &gt; blood (rubus sanguis calidus / read blod hat)</td>
<td>2. fire (fyres) &gt; blood (blod read et hat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. salt (salis / saltes) &gt; tears (salsa lacrimae / salto tehero)</td>
<td>3. wind (windes) &gt; breath (æðung)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. dew (roris / deawes) &gt; sweat (sudor / svat)</td>
<td>4. cloud (volcnes) &gt; unstable mind (modes unstaðelfæstnes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. blossom (floris / blostmes) &gt; eyes (uartetas ocularum / jægeng egena)</td>
<td>5. grace (gyfe) &gt; understanding and thought (sefa ond gedang)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. clouds (nubis / volcnes) &gt; unstable thought (instabilitas mentium / unstædfæstnes ðohta)</td>
<td>6. blossoms (blosmena) &gt; eyes (eagena mysentlicnys)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. wind (uenti / windes) &gt; cold breath (anhela frigida / oroð cald)</td>
<td>7. dew (deaues) &gt; sweat (svat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. grace (gratia / gefe) &gt; thought (sensus homini / doht vel . . . monnes)</td>
<td>8. salt (sealtes) &gt; tears (tearas sealte)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of these associations are familiar enough from Biblical creation accounts and the classical humors—earth associated with flesh, fire with blood, and breath with wind—while others are common associations, salt with tears, dew with sweat.

But in Aldred’s last three, clouds, wind, and grace, more of human nature is contemplated as derived from the more ethereal ingredients, in a way similar to the exegesis in the CCCC 326 variant: the inherent instability of clouds as a mental condition; the cold breath of wind (which the questions that follow will explore); and the seemingly non-material component of grace associated with the senses or thought. Similar to the gloss of *rummode* on *paraclete* for the Holy Spirit, Aldred seemed interested in exploring the theological and spiritual in his gloss, an aspect of monastic *devotio*.

For example, in two places Aldred’s gloss offered a *vel*, the second one unfulfilled. At fol. 86vai he went into the margin to offer an alternative for

---

Bella Parisiacae urbis selections; On Perias Lector Litteras tam Graecas, pp. 133–34. See QXI.49x for a transcription of the *De acto* in CCCC 326, pp. 135–36.

110. QXI.49x, from London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius A.xvi, fol. 87v (Ker 215, Gneuss 399); in The Prose Solomon and Saturn ed. Cross and Hill, 26, 67–70.
instabilitas: vnstydfullnisse l vnstæðolfæstnis'. The first word, unstedefull, appears to be a Northumbrianism, while the second option is a more commonly used Old English root, unstæðol. At fol. 86va4, he glossed sensus with ðoht l with no word following. Perhaps because he had just glossed mentium two lines above (unsteady mind) with ðohta', he was considering whether another Old English word might make a distinction here between mentium and sensus, indicating his interest in words for human thought and speech in a devotional context.111 Aldred’s two vels suggest that he may have pondered the relationship between the cloudy unstable mind (instabilitas mentium; vnstydfullnisse l vnstæðolfæstnis' ðohta') and the grace-given human sense or thought (pondus gratiae inde est sensus hominis; pond gefæ of ðon is ðoht l . . . monnes). If the mentium (mood, mindset) is unstable, does grace counterbalance with sense and thoughtfulness, or at least self-awareness? This question, implicit in Aldred’s gloss alternatives, invokes the Benedictine notion in the Regularis concordia of reading or singing with both the mind and with the spirit, noted at the outset of this chapter.112

Similarly, the question of wind (QXI.49b) led into further discussion of human nature. Aldred’s text has “cold breath,” while the later Solomon and Saturn version does not give the temperature of breath. The two questions pick up on this aspect and ask: “Tell me why the two breaths are not equal, whereby one is hot and the other is cold” and “Tell me whence the wind blows.” The first question addresses the temperature of the breath (inhaling and exhaling, presumably). The answer draws in another element: “It is that the one is of fire and the other is of wind. And this signifies that from these are made the spirit.” A complex physiognomy and psychology is implied here with Aldred’s use of getacnað (significat). The human spirit is made up of both fire and wind, hot and cold paralleled in the previous list. The fire of the blood heats the exhaled breath, which the inhaled cold wind counterbalances; between the two, the human lives by the breath, external and internal interacting in this vital act. The CCCC 326 variant defined wind (uento) with anhela vel flatus, each of which has both a literal and spiritual meaning in Biblical terms: anhela as panting or desire and flatus as breath or spirit. Likewise, Aldred seemed to read this text allegorically for its spiritual significance.

111. The twelfth-century Solomon and Saturn uses the more common unstæðelfæstnes, which Aldred also uses elsewhere in the positive: gistaðolað glossing stabilire at fol. 39v13; gistaðolfæstnað glossing solidare at. fol. 10v18; and stabolfæstnað glossing status at fol. 52r11 (see Durham Ritual Glossary, 83). Aldred’s apparently unique attestation of “unsteadfast” (Bosworth and Toller, unstæðelfæstnes) occurs elsewhere in his gloss: stydfæst glossing constantia at fol. 24v11; unstedefull glossing apostacius at fol. 59r3 and infestatio at fol. 59v9 (Durham Ritual Glossary, 84).

112. Durham Ritual Glossary, 87 shows Aldred used ðoht to gloss cogitatio (once), mens (9), sensus (3), and anima (2); but the glossary does not list the ðoht glossing sensus at fol. 88v4, just the ðohta glossing mens at 88v2. See also gidenceð (gedohte) glossing cogitare and excogitare. At fol. 78vb18–19 (QXI.33), he glosses in cogitatione et in locutione et in operatione with in smeavnge 7 in giriorde 7 l in spréc 7 in wyrcinge l [no alternative given].

113. It also echoes the insular tradition of the trea muta (three mute things) for wisdom: mens, oculus, littera. See Wright, “Why Sight Holds Flowers,” 184.
The answer to the second question, “tell me whence the wind blows,” goes further into the spiritual realm: “It is from the seraphim, hence it is said seraphim of the winds.” Aldred’s interest in angelology is noted in other places, but here the angelic order of seraphim is explained in terms of the winds that blow (or vice versa), although without the detailed angelic roles given in other creation of Adam texts.\textsuperscript{114} The seraphim are known as the angels of love, light, and fire who perform the trisagion (holy, holy, holy) before the presence of God, a performance echoed in the liturgy. Their number is four, according to 3 Enoch (26:9), because they correspond to the four winds.\textsuperscript{115} Their dual association with fire and wind as spirits mirrors the spiritual nature of humans as described in the first question and in Adam’s composition of both fire and cold wind. Both questions demonstrate Aldred’s interest in this text as a source of spiritual inspiration more in keeping with the CCCC 326 variant than the twelfth-century Solomon and Saturn version.

Where did Aldred find this text and why did he choose to copy the eight pounds of Adam here? Given Aldred’s interest in copying other Irish-rooted texts with apocryphal and numerical significance, such as the five field prayers, it is unsurprising to find insular precedents for this text as well. All the extant versions show considerable variation, making it difficult to ascertain what dependence, if any, they had on each other. As part of Aldred’s educational campaign and vocabulary exercises in the later part of Quire XI, this text is comparable to dialogue pedagogy in the Joca monachorum tradition found prominently in Irish texts and Carolingian educational tracts.\textsuperscript{116} The premise, evident in Alcuin’s dialogue with the young prince Pepin, is that vocabulary understood allegorically is the basis of thought. Arguably, this was one of Aldred’s larger purposes in assembling this collection of texts and overall in his glossing enterprise.


\textsuperscript{115} See James Charlesworth, ed., The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol. 1 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1983), 281. See also A Dictionary of Angels, Including the Fallen Angels, ed. Gustav Davidson (New York: Free Press, 1967), 267 and David Keck, Angels and Angelology in the Middle Ages (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 54. The only canonical references are in Isaiah 6, where they have four faces and six wings and Revelation 4:8 where the name is not used, but they are described in similar terms. Anglo-Saxon iconography does not show a strong correlation between seraphs and wind. Seraphs are indicated in other ways, while personified winds are not necessarily seraphs; see index in Thomas H. Ohlgren, Insular and Anglo-Saxon Illuminated Manuscripts: An Iconographic Catalogue, c. A.D. 625 to 1100 (New York: Garland, 1986). Nor does the Irish Saltair na Rann have Seraphim associated with winds; see John Carey, “Cosmology in Saltair na Rann,” Celtica (1983):33–52 and “Angelology in Saltair na Rann,” Celtica (1987): 1–8.

QXI.50–52 Official Lists

The next three items form a group of explanations of titles and names that function as reference works for a religious community, aids to understanding Biblical and church history, particularly in relation to ecclesiastical organization. These reference works imply the existence of reading material for which they would be useful, not only the Bible, but also writings of the church fathers, various commentaries, and ecclesiastical histories. But like the *notae juris* (QXI.48), Aldred’s gloss added another layer of interest in vocabulary and linguistic reflection. The first of the three lists (QXI.50) is concerned with secular titles, with an eye toward the royalty of Christ, while the other two are religious lists (QXI.51–52), with some overlapping terminology. What joins these three together is a concern for language—Hebrew, Latin, and Greek, accompanied by the vernacular Old English gloss. That is, these Latin lists were designed to explain terminology in its cultural context, whether ancient Hebrew society, Egyptian, Greek, or Roman. The three sacred languages of Scripture in particular—the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin found in Pilate’s inscription above Jesus’ cross—became the source of a peculiarly Irish tradition of philological exegesis evident in Aldred’s lists. However, Aldred extended that cultural translation project to include the vernacular Old English. Like his macaronic colophon to the *Lindisfarne Gospels*, Aldred’s primary interest was in words, their variable meanings, and the effort it takes to understand them in context. Just as he was the fourth maker of the *Lindisfarne Gospels* by adding his gloss, so here his gloss to language lists in the Durham A.IV.19 additions shows him acting as the next generation of translator taking the texts into another culture.

The list of ruler titles in QXI.50 can be subdivided into three sections: [a] *De dignitatibus romanorum* (fol. 86va16–86vb16) explains eleven Roman imperial offices, followed second by [b] names of Hebrew and other kings (fol. 86vb17–23), and then third [c] the *magistratus sive tristatus* in Egypt (fol. 87ra1–10), known from Jerome’s commentary on Ezekiel.

With the Roman titles (QXI.50a), Aldred endeavored to give an Old English translation or equivalent. Thus *imperator*, emperor, is *hæser*, a commander who has command (*imperium, hæs*), over many people. Second to the emperor, the consul is *hergæ larwv* (*lærow*), master teacher of a host, a curious label for this officer, for which Aldred sought an alternative using *vel* but did not fill in, although in the next line he gives a seemingly superfluous alternative to *secundus* as either “after” or “next.” For proconsul in the next line, he used *forelatwa under herges larwu*, apparently preferring the more straightforward Old English word for commander, *lad-teów*, for this underling or sub-

---

117. For example, *princep* glossed *aldormon* occurs in all three (fols. 86vb16, 87rb22, 87vb4).

commander, but retaining *larwu*, master teacher, for consul. A patrician is a
*bheahaldormenn*, high elder over the army (*here*), and second to him but less
worthy, a *dux* is *heretoga*, army leader, while *comes* is *heghgeroefæ* (high steward,
officer) or, repeating the *dux* title with a *vel*, *heretoga* over thirty thousand men.
Procurator is *hehsciremenn* (more or less a high business official) and tribune
is a landowner (*londhebbende*) or, Aldred offered this alternative, *latwu* of his
people. Centurion, *quinquagenarius*, and *decanus* are *latwu* defined primarily
by the number of troops they command, although *decanus* also is taken to
mean an official over a kin-group (*megscire, from megscir*; as a gloss on *decurio*
as two words, *de curio*), while *princeps* is an *aldemon’* of his ten. Through-
out, Aldred seemed to be using Old English equivalents that varied between
an emphasis on military command and rule over people groups, not unlike
their Latin Roman counterparts. However, the Anglo-Saxon social organization
seems more oriented toward kin groups and warbands, using terms for local
leaders (*aldormann, larwu, lad-teów, sciremann, geroefa*) *prefaced with “high”
(or “under”) in order to indicate hierarchies of rank or distinctions beyond that
which would be familiar to the Anglo-Saxons. Presumably an understanding
of the Roman hierarchy was necessary in order to understand New Testament
texts, saints’ lives, and church histories.

On the names of Hebrew and other kings (QXI.50b, fol. 86vb17–23) that
follows, the primary interest was in the various words for king in other cultures.
Many of these Latin titles or royal names, Aldred glossed as *cyning*: Egyptian
Pharaoh, Syrian “Antiochus,” Persian “Arridi,” Philistine “Mei.” However,
the Hebrew and Roman entries are different. The Latin for the Hebrew entry,
which comes first in this list, notes that their name for king (*rex/cyning*) is
called Christ, which Aldred glossed as *gecoreno* (chosen). The Old English gloss
above *Apud romanos cessares / et cuiu?* reads *mið romaniscv’ casaras et rics[ara]s.*
Aldred transliterated caesar, presumably as a recognized loanword, and offered
over the unclear Latin *cuiu* or *ciui* in the gutter an Old English word with
a common root for rule, *ric*. Aldred elsewhere used *ricsere* and other derivations
to gloss *dominatio* primarily but also *gubernatio* and *regnare*.

Like the list of Roman titles, this list also allowed Aldred to explore vernacular cultural
equivalents for titles, with some relevance to Biblical exegesis, as does the third
section.

---

119. Bosworth and Toller note the gloss seems to read *decurio* as two words.
120. See Boyd, “Aldrediana XXV,” 45–49 for a discussion of this section and each name. In the case of
the Syrians and Philistines, “each” king has this name, implying that Aldred recognized these as personal
names used in a dynasty (“Antiochus” but “Mei” is an unknown derivation). Isidore, *Etymologies* XVI.14
(trans. Barney, et. al., p. 302) discusses how Antioch was named after Selucus’ father Anthiochus. The origin
of “Arridi” as the title of “all” Persian kings is likewise a possible use of a personal name.
121. *Durham Ritual* Glossary, 78. The Roman entry is more difficult because both the Latin and the gloss
run into the gutter. The Latin reads *Apud romanos cessares / et cuiu?*, with the “et” sign and the last word
below and almost illegible. Possibly *cuiu?* is an attempt at some form of *ciuis*.
The last section (QXI.50c, fol. 87rai–10) in these lists of titles is derived from Jerome’s *Commentaria in Ezechielem*. Jerome explained the rulers Ezekiel prophesied would come up against the people, and noted the meaning given to *magistratus sive tristatus*, referring back to Exodus 15 and the list of pharaoh’s leaders who were thrown into the sea. The section copied by Aldred fits here with his lists in the sense that it explains a Greek-derived word, *tristatus*, for three high-ranking officials or attendants for a magistrate (*ternos statores*). But the gloss shows some confusion, at least initially, about the word *tristatus* in relation to the role of magistrate. Aldred glossed *magistratus* at fol. 87rai with *aldordom vel lardom* but on the next line glossed *tristatus* with *vel rotnisse*, “or gladness,” a seeming antonym to a misreading of *tristatus* as *tristitia*, sadness; perhaps “un-” is missing in front of *rotnisse*. Curiously, Aldred had glossed with *rotnisse* before in this way: although he used *unrotnise* once to gloss *maeor*, grief (fol. 50r19), he used *rotnise* without the negative prefix to gloss *maeror* at fol. 20r7 and again to gloss *tristitia* at fol. 33v9. So his use of *rotnisse* to gloss is consistent enough with these other instances to show he initially at least read *tristatus* as indicating an emotion of sadness, not, as the entry later explains “three magistrate’s attendants,” *ternos statores*, which Aldred glossed accurately enough as *ðriffaldo stondendo*. The *tristatus/tristitia* confusion is a logical one, similar to the *quaesumus* error noted above, if the gloss was done some time after he copied the Latin and if he was translating a word or short phrase at a time, perhaps stopping to expound to an audience.

Aldred may have copied all three parts of QXI.50 from a single source, which seems likely given the similarity of content and the continuous copying format. But his gloss shows us an interesting aspect of his mind at work as he contemplated ways to translate cultures and make Christian history intelligible to an Anglo-Saxon audience. It also presumes that he not only had access to these reference lists but also to books for which they would be useful beyond just the Bible, such as commentaries from the Church Fathers and other histories.

QXI.51–52 explain ecclesiastical ranks and priestly titles, more immediately useful for an understanding of the church hierarchy historical and contemporary, but similarly used as a vocabulary exercise linking the three sacred languages. QXI.51 gives the Latin ecclesiastical hierarchy from bottom to top with their Greek or Hebrew origins, while QXI.52 explains the Greek origins of certain ecclesiastical titles and then several other Greek words.

---

122. Jerome, *Commentaria in Ezechielem* VII, xxiii (PL 25: 219) commenting on Ezekiel 23:23–27 (QXI.50x); see Thompson, *Rituale*, xx. Raban Maur (PL 110: 745C) repeats Jerome’s description and Frigegodus (PL 133: 1007) also discusses *tristatus*. This type of list must have been fairly common and could have been transmitted into Anglo-Saxon England through a variety of sources.

123. See *Durham Ritual* Glossary, 79, and Bosworth and Toller, who surmise a missing “un-.”

124. Folio 87 where these two lists occur exhibits some material differences. Besides the bottom edge cut at an angle (leaving an indentation on fol. 86), Aldred’s writing has slightly more errors (not all corrected).
The *De gradibus ecclesiae* (QXI.51, fol. 87ra11–87va15) appears from its title to be one of a garden variety of such lists numbering off the ecclesiastical grades, albeit a much confused tradition varying in number and order. However, Aldred’s list overall differs in several significant ways from the competing traditions outlined by Roger Reynolds and may indicate an effort by Aldred and/or his sources to resolve some of their inherent difficulties, as well as provide a linguistic exercise for himself and his readers.125

First, Aldred avoided the numerical problem created in the common label *De vii gradibus ecclesiasticis* found in many sources by simply omitting the number altogether in the title.126 Unlike many of these lists of “seven grades” that have eight or nine orders, Aldred numbered his to ten, a rarer variant not similar to his list in any case: *hostiarius*, *lector*, *exorcista*, *subdiaconus*, *diaconus*, *presbyter*, *episcopus*, *archepiscopus*, *pontifex*, *choriepiscopus*, and then, unnumbered, *papa*.127 The first seven are fairly close to the Irish Ordinals of Christ (doorkeeper, lector, exorcist, subdeacon, deacon, presbyter, bishop), although lector and exorcist are reversed in the Irish and in many of the other lists.128 Unlike most early medieval lists, for example in the Carolingian traditions represented by Alcuin and Raban Maur, Aldred did not include psalmist, even under lector, but neither did he add acolyte, although he discussed the term acolyte along with some other words in the next treatise, QXI.52. Perhaps Aldred was dealing with some older texts and anticipating the future trend of eliminating the psalmist and adding the acolyte as part of an effort to reconcile the numbers, evident for example in the later pastoral letters of Ælfric with a definitive seven (*hostiarius*, *lector*, *exorcista*, *acolitus*, *subdiaconus*, *diaconus*, and *presbiter/episcopus*).129 In any case, Aldred’s list predates Ælfric’s letters to Wulfstan and the need the reformers perceived to define clearly the secular clerical hierarchy.

---

127. The numbers are in a lighter ink with circles or boxes around them; variation in their style may indicate that they were added later.
Second, his list is made up of *excerptiones* from various sources, with a stronger interest in the Old Testament and linguistic origins of the clerical offices than in the New or in their function. Further evidence that Aldred is compiling disparate sources is evident in the fact that the entry for priest in the QXI.51 list of ecclesiastical grades (fol. 87rb11–13) offers only the Greek and not the Hebrew derivation as was the pattern with the lower grades, but in QXI.52 the entry for priest (fol. 87va17–87vb1) makes up for that by giving the Old Testament background.

The Ordinals of Christ, a dominant tradition focused on Christ’s establishment of each rank, is not represented here. Rather, the majority of Aldred’s phrases can be found in Isidore of Seville’s *De ecclesiasticis officiis* or his *Etymologies* (*Origine*), Raban Maur’s *De clericorum institutione*, Pseudo-Alcuin’s *Liber de divinis officiis* and the *disputatio puerorum*, and the *Collectanea Pseudo-Bede*. The latter two are similar in format to Aldred’s text, in that they are *excerptiones*, but the excerpts do not line up with Aldred’s selections, which draw more on Isidore, Raban, and Pseudo-Alcuin, although none are an exact match. The *disputatio puerorum* attributed to Alcuin is in the pedagogical *quaestiones* format found in the *Joca monachorum* tradition, *Dic mihi*, used by Aldred with the two questions about wind above. Although Aldred was not using the question and answer format here, the pedagogical function may be implicit: these are answer sheets to questions or references for linguistic study.

Third, the episcopal offices, where he has gone off the numbered lists and drawn on different treatises to describe these positions within the sacerdotal ranks, reflects historical and geographic shifts in terminology that may be relevant to Chester-le-Street. The rather long explanation of *chorepiscopus* (fol. 87va5–13), using some information from Isidore of Seville’s *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, endeavors to explain the origins of this Greek term for an assistant bishop who oversaw rural areas outside of a city-centered bishopric, a position legislated against in the Carolingian empire despite a defense from Raban Maur and gradually supplanted by the archdeacon in the tenth and eleventh centuries. QXI.52 elaborates on the sacerdotal order as including both *presbyter* and *episcopus* within it, the latter with higher authority, as Aldred’s text explains.

---


These explanations may extend beyond an interest in the vocabulary to practical aspects of rank within the Northumbrian bishopric. Aldred as provost may have seen himself as a type of assistant bishop overseeing the rural areas around Chester-le-Street under Bishop Ælfsige.

Fourth, a few items from his gloss demonstrate Aldred’s pattern of thought and perhaps some of his other information sources. The Hebrew roots for the roles of deacons as Levites and subdeacons as “nathinnaei” from the book of Ezra (fol. 87rb3–10) demonstrate a knowledge of Jerome, Isidore, Bede, or other patristic commentaries. Although the Latin Aldred included for subdeacon does not have the full explanation found in Isidore of “nathinnaei” as servants, Aldred clearly knew the meaning because he glossed it (although above the word Ezra) as degnung menn (serving men). For the role of bishop (fol. 87rb16–19), Greek episcopus is explained as “inspector” (speculator in Isidore) because he has oversight. Aldred gave the etymology of the syllables in Roman characters (lines 16–17) but with an error: “epis super/ scopus inspector.” Over the “s” of “epis” he placed a dot to indicate the error, and put correctly on the next line “scopus.” The Old English gloss on superinspectores is ofer insceawre (plural ofer insceawras), emphasizing the role of sight in the bishop’s duties, which Wright discusses in his exploration of sight metaphors relevant to the Alfred Jewel and the Pastoral Care.

QXI.52, under the rubricated title Interpretatio nominis sacerdotum (fol. 87vb16-b15), draws on similar sources to supplement the previous list. The first section explains the relationship of sacerdos and episcopus, as noted above, then defines patriarch, metropolitan, acolyte, pisteuus (fidelis), martyr (testis), epiphania (manifestatio) and ypapante (ob[v]iatio). The Old English gloss uses ecclesiastical loanwords as well. Sacerdos remains sacerd (or abbreviated to sac’), while sacerdotalem [sic] becomes sacerdlichad (priesthood). Presbyter is abbreviated to meas’ for Old English mæssepreóst, while episcopus is bisco’ (these terms were in the previous list with different explanations). From fol. 87vb2, the text offers a

---

133. See Boyd, “Aldrediana VII,” 14–16, on Aldred’s Lindisfarne gloss of leuita with se diacon, referencing Jerome’s De septem ordinibus ecclesiae that makes this identification of Levites as deacons, rooted in the Hebrew root sense of function, as attendant; followed and developed by Isidore, Bede, Alcuin, and Raban Maur. Boyd also cites ordination rites for deacons, such as the Egbert Pontifical, hence common liturgical usage presumably familiar to Aldred. On subdeacons as “nathinnaei” see Ezra 2:43 and Nehemiah 11:21 (see also 1 Chronicles 9:2); Boyd, “Aldrediana XXV,” 49–50 discusses this passage in relation to Isidore and cites Bede, Comm. in Ezram et Neemiam I, on Ezra 2:43–58 (CCSL 119.235.552–4) as evidence that this is a “common liturgical description of the role of sub-deacons” (p. 50).

134. Isidore, Raban Maur, and Pseudo-Alcuin use superintendere as the Latin explanation of episcopus, while Aldred has supervispectores, which does occur as a definition of episcopus in Bede’s commentary on Acts (Bede, PL 92: 986A) and a treatise of Pope Nicholas I (PL 119: 973A).

135. Wright, “Why Sight,” 185 and see discussion above of the de octo pondera text; on sight and rulership, see also David Pratt, The Political Thought of King Alfred the Great (Cambridge University Press, 2007), 187–92, 317–27 and passim.

136. T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 51 sets apart the last section (fol. 87vb2–15) as an additional explanation of “eight Greek words” but Aldred treats it as part of the same text.
Latin explanation of a Greek title, which Aldred then glossed in Old English. Curiously in this section, he has copied the abbreviated Greek and Latin g. and l., but glossed them fully every time with Old English crecisc and lædin (hebraice is spelled out in the Latin and glossed in Old English with ebresc). Similar to the earlier list of titles (QXI.50), sometimes he transliterated the Greek with a recognized ecclesiastical loanword and other times he offered an Old English equivalent, but in both cases giving a different Old English translation above the Latin explanation of the term. Greek patriarch is glossed with behfæder and its Latin counterpart pater with fæder, while the Hebrew abba is glossed with an abbreviation for Latin pater, an ecclesiastical loanword in any case. Greek archus is glossed with an abbreviation of the word (ar’) with the Old English gloss aldormann appearing over its Latin equivalent princeps. Similarly with metropolitan (glossed with the abbreviation metro’) Aldred offered Old English glosses of its explanation: Greek polis is Old English hehfæstnunng, Latin urbs is Old English burg and its alternative civitas is Old English ceaster. This pattern continues with accoluthus (acolyte) and pisteus, but Greek martyr, he glossed drów’ (Old English dróuere) and Latin testis as giwitnisse. However, the last two items, epiphania and ypapante, do not seem to be from the same type of list of names or titles and may be from a different source given the different abbreviation for Latin he used here (“lat” in lines 12 and 14).

Aldred ended this section and writing stint with a line possibly summarizing the whole enterprise: “id est antiqui plebis” glossed þ’ is ða aldo folcum, as if to say, this is an explanation of the people of antiquity, but by extension also their languages, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. But these lists of secular as well as ecclesiastical offices may have also served a practical purpose for the mixed community of St. Cuthbert, if taken in light of the categories of persons found in the Durham Liber vitae, for whom ostensibly the community continued to pray. The ninth-century core of the Liber vitae divides into Nomina regum uel ducum, Nomina reginarum et abbattissarum, Nomina anchoritarum, Nomina abbatum gradus praesbyteratus, Nomina abbatum gradus diaconatus, Nomina abbatum, Nomina praesbyterorum, Nomina diaconorum, and Nomina clericorum. Aldred’s list is more specific in delineating the lexical origins of different offices, yet it would serve to shed light on these persons for whom they prayed and their ranks.

137. Accolythus, glossed accol,’ is given the explanation of candle bearer at the recitation of the Gospel. His gloss of the Latin as wæx biornende, “wax burner,” is an overly literal translation of Latin cerarius or Greek akolouthos (note this use of biornende is not in DOE).

138. “Epiphany in Greek, in Latin manifestation (yppe, bring to light). Ypapante in Greek, in Latin obvi- ate (go up against).”

139. A letter resembling either a “u” or an “i” is inserted in the same dark ink and hand above and between the “i” and the “s” of plebis. The grammar differs between the two languages: antiqui plebis is presumably genitive, while aldo folcum may be dative plural.

Reynolds also suggests that the ordinals texts served various purposes filling space in manuscripts, for practice or instruction, or even as “wit sharpeners or puzzles.”141 Aldred’s combined lists of ecclesiastical offices may have been experiments in merging texts and reconciling different traditions (Northumbrian/Irish with continental/southern English), sharpening his own wits and those of his community in the process. What in effect Aldred was doing was offering a translation of a translation, an intriguing cultural project. Taken together, these three lists in QXI.50–52 reveal much about Aldred as glossator. His quest for understanding was not simply that of a struggling Latinist seeking to shore up a Latin-deficient priesthood in his community but that of a scholar reflecting on the nature of language and culture. Despite the errors—most of them attributable to haste or tiredness rather than ignorance—Aldred demonstrates an impressive knowledge of textual traditions that lie behind these lists, suggesting they served as far more than reference works.

QXI.53–55 Places in Christian History

The last three items in this “encyclopedic” section, and the last of the manuscript as it now stands, are part of a single writing stint done on folio 88 recto and verso. As with the material that preceded, though, these are Christian vocabulary lists: locations, an alphabet poem, and a Biblical citation index. The first item on the recto is more accessible, if not easier to source, than the two barely legible on the verso. All three, however, share a concern for understanding the Biblical heritage in the context of Christian ritual practice.

QXI.53, the list of places where the apostles are buried (Nomina locorum in quo apostoli requiescunt) starts fresh on fol. 88r, foregoing the one-third blank column on fol. 87vb. The text finishes on the same page (fol. 88ra1-b24) and thus stands alone. In fact, Aldred made an effort to get the text all on this single page, using abbreviations and some line overruns so that he could start each apostle on a new line, but barely squeezing in Stephen on an extra line in the b column. This format suggests an exclusive focus on this text, either copied from a single source or compiled from several sources. Nonetheless, it is of an encyclopedic type similar to the preceding lists offering names and places glossed in Old English. The absence of an identical source for this narrowly conceived list, amidst a wide array of similar types of traditional and apocryphal material on the apostles, combined with some anomalies in the place names and the gloss, point again to both Aldred’s peculiar interests in vocabulary as well as his access to Irish or Northumbrian sources no longer extant.

141. Reynolds, Ordinals, 69.
The information the list provides derives from a larger group of popular materials on the lives and deaths of Biblical and early Christian saints, and a particular subset on the apostles from canonical and apocryphal Acts, as well as patristic sources such as Jerome’s martyrology. Distilled versions of these lives converged in the early Middle Ages in encyclopedic collections like Isidore of Seville’s *de ortu et obitu patrum*, continental histories such as Freculf of Liseux’s *Chronicon*, and extracts like the *Breviarium apostolorum* and *Notitia de locis apostolorum*, attached to Jerome’s martyrology. Irish tradition adapted these texts in a variety of ways: the Pseudo-Isidore *de ortu et obitu patrum*, Pseudo-Abdias’ *Virtutes apostolorum*, the *Leabhar Breac*, the *Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae*, the *Irish Liber Hymnorum*, and the Irish “Reference Bible” include lists of the apostles with various details on their lives. Most notably, the *Leabhar Breac* includes their genealogies, appearance (with an interest in hair and beard), and places of death. Insular texts overall reveal a particular devotion to the apostles and their geographic place in a Rome-centered landscape. The locations vary slightly from one another in these insular texts, but none is a match for Aldred’s compilation, which is unique in only offering the burial places with both the city and the province or land.

Aldred’s list has a more problematic relationship to Bede, who had a considerable interest in the geography of holy places and drew on Irish sources, but was more selective about the apostolic traditions. Bede’s *De locis sanctis* is based

---


on that of Adomnán, which passed into Anglo-Saxon in the seventh century.\textsuperscript{145} His \textit{Expositio actuum apostolorum} with \textit{Retractatio} works its way in sequence through the canonical book of Acts, but the extra-Biblical and patristic traditions included are carefully chosen.\textsuperscript{146} In particular, Bede objected to certain elements for Philip, Matthew, Simon, and Thaddeus found in Pseudo-Abdias, and possibly for John and Thomas in pseudo-Melitus.\textsuperscript{147} Bede also produced an alphabetically arranged list of regions, the \textit{Nomina regionum atque locorum de actibus apostolorum}, but Aldred’s geographical designations do not seem to rely on its information.\textsuperscript{148}

However, the development of the historical martyrology, initiated by Bede, provides a broader liturgical context for Aldred’s list of the apostles’ burial places.\textsuperscript{149} Following Bede’s leading and in response to Carolingian reform rules, historical martyrologies in the ninth century compiled data on saints and apostles for use in the chapter meeting.\textsuperscript{150} A strong Irish tradition is evident in the collated edition of manuscripts from Metz, Cologne, Dublin, and Lund.\textsuperscript{151}

---


\textsuperscript{147} Bedae Venerabilis \textit{Expositio, Retractio I,13} (pp. 95–96) and \textit{VIII,1} (p. 120). See arguments by James E. Cross, "Cynewulf’s Traditions about the Apostles in \textit{Fates of the Apostles}," \textit{ASE} 8 (1979): 163–75, at 165, and "The Apostles in the Old English Martyrology," \textit{Mediaevalia} 5 (1979): 15–59, at 18–19; see also Biggs, \textit{SASLC: The Apocrypha}, 48, who disagrees with Cross’s reading of Bede’s comments in \textit{VIII,1}.


\textsuperscript{149} Bede, \textit{EH V,24} describes “Martyrologium de nataliis sanctorum martyrum diebus, in quo omnes, quos invenit potui, non solum qua die ut etiam quo genere certaminis sub quo iduice mundum uicerint, diligentem adnotare studui.” “A martyrology of the festivals of the holy martyrs, in which I have diligently tried to note down all that I could find about them, not only on what day, but also by what sort of combat and under what judge they overcame the world” (Bertram and Colgrave, 570–71).


\textsuperscript{151} \textit{A Martyrology of Four Cities: Metz, Cologne, Dublin, Lund}, ed. Pádraig Ó Riain, HBS 118 (London: Boydell, 2009), 1–2, 20–21 for a general overview.
graphies and homilies, information on the apostles that would have been well-known in religious communities where they were regularly commemorated.152

How Aldred’s list drew on these continental and insular traditions—or not, given the variations—is puzzling, but another Old English text provides an analogous source puzzle: Cynewulf’s Fates of the Apostles in the Vercelli Book.153 James Cross makes the argument that rather than borrowing from intermediary lists derived from texts like the Breviarium apostolorum, Notitia de locis apostolorum, or a version of Isidore’s De ortu et obitu patrum, Cynewulf as a religious would have known the apostles’ features well from liturgical celebrations that included readings from full accounts of their lives.154 A similar argument could explain Aldred’s list and its anomalies, that he was excerpting from martyrologies and hagiographies read on their feast days. Thus he—or his source if this is a verbatim copy—may have worked from memory, rather than consulting an encyclopedic source like Bede or Isidore. This would account for some of the geographic variations that are otherwise untraceable to a single, or even multiple, sources.

The starting point for his list may have been liturgical, but his focus on these particular apostles and only their burial locations points also to study and reference. The variations in Aldred’s list stand out in contrast with, rather than traceable to, the encyclopedic and martyrological sources. His fifteen names include ten original apostles (Matthias substituted for Judas), as well as the evangelists Mark and Luke, John the Baptist, Paul, and Stephen the first martyr. The sequence of the names is neither chronological, as in Isidore’s De ortu et obitu patrum surveying Old and New Testament figures, calendrical, as would occur in a martyrology, nor alphabetical, as with apostolic histories or Bede’s Nomina regionum. Rather, it is more like—but not exactly like—a litany.155 Aldred places the four evangelists first (matching a section in the Collectanea

---


154. Cross, “Cynewulf’s Traditions,” 164d.

155. Allen and Calder, Sources and Analogues, 36, note the same argument for Cynewulf’s Fates of the Apostles, while Cross, “Cynewulf’s Traditions,” 164, 175, suggests that he worked from a full account in a collection of lives. Thacker, “In Search of Saints,” in Early Medieval Rome, ed. Smith, 266, compares insular lists to the order of the apostles in the canon of the mass, and also (p. 268) notes the lack of a clear ordering for what was a relatively late development of liturgical commemoration listing the apostles as a group. Frecculf’s Chronicon (PL 106: 1149), Isidore’s de ortu (Fraga 57.2), and the Collectanea Pseudo-Beda, ed. Bayless and Ladig, 170–171 (pp. 140–41) have summary passages listing the places in which the apostles preached, but the sequence starts with Peter and the cities or regions, similar to the Breviarium apostolorum (Allen and Calder, p. 38). For litanies, see Anglo-Saxon Litanies, Michael Lapidge, HBS 106 (London: Boydell, 1991).
Pseudo-Bedae) and then omits the apostles Matthew and John from the subsequent list. After the evangelists, Aldred starts a common litany sequence of John the Baptist, Peter, Paul, Andrew; skips John the evangelist already named; proceeds with James; then reorders the usual sequence with Bartholomew, Thomas, Philip, and Simon the Zealot; and finally ends with Matthias, Judas’ substitute, and Stephen the first martyr from the Acts of the Apostles. However, he omits the apostle Thaddeus (Jude) and the other James. The wooden coffin of St. Cuthbert has incised on its lid the four evangelists and on one side the apostles, with both runic and Roman inscriptions, not all of them legible, in a sequence reminiscent of a litany. ‘The coffin may have served as a source of inspiration and a way of linking the apostles’ burial locations to Cuthbert’s resting place at Chester-le-Street, relating the local saint to the universal church. Nonetheless, Aldred’s list does not exactly match any of these apostolic litanies, leading to the suspicion that he ordered the list according to his own peculiar interests rather than in accordance with a particular type of source.

Two examples demonstrate the variability of insular source traditions on which Aldred may have drawn. First, the one Jacob (James) Aldred lists is buried in Jerusalem, the location associated usually with James the Lesser, son of Alpheus and “brother” of Jesus. According to most sources that follow Isidore of Seville’s de ortu, James the Greater, son of Zebedee and brother of John the Beloved, preached in Spain and was buried in Achaia Marmarica; but most of the martyrologies focus on his beheading by Herod, presumably in Judea, and do not give a burial place. Moreover, the insular Notitia de locis apostolorum and the Irish Leabhar Breac locate James the Greater in Jerusalem. If Aldred

156. Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae, ed. Bayless and Lapidge, 301 (pp. 164–65): Matthew in Judaea (confusion with Matthias?), Mark in Rome, Luke in India, John in Asia; these locations do not align with the earlier list in the Collectanea (170–71) or Aldred’s list of cities and provinces, except John in Asia. Bede, Nomina Regionum, XVIII, 24 entry on Alexandria, Egypt confirms Aldred’s identification of the location as Mark’s resting place.

157. The Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae, ed. Bayless and Lapidge, 170 (pp. 140–41) also omits Jude at the end of its list, compared to the summary passages in Isidore and Freculf.


159. Bede (Beda Venerabilis Expositio actuum apostolorum, I,13, p. 10) weighed in on the confusion of three possible apostles named James, arguing that James son of Alphaeus was one and the same with James the so-called brother of Jesus, actually a cousin through Mary of Clopas, and celebrated as the first bishop of Jerusalem.

160. Those listing Achaia Marmarica include Isidore, de ortu, Fraga 47; Freculf, Chronicon, PL 106:1147; and the Breviarium apostolorum (Allen and Calder, 38). James the Greater’s feast day is 25 July (viii Kal. Augustas), but the Old English Martyrology (pp. 128–29) only notes that he was killed by Herod.

161. The Notitia de locis apostolorum (Allen and Calder, 37) has insular roots according to Thacker, “In Search of Saints,” in Early Medieval Rome, ed. Smith, 276–77; Thacker also notes that Willibrord’s calendar from eighth-century Echternach betrays his Hiberno-Northumbrian roots in its treatment of the apostles, and assigns separate dates for James the brother of Jesus on 27 December and James Alphaeus on 22 June. The Irish Leabhar Breac (p. 180, col. 2), in Stokes, “The Irish verses, notes, and glosses in Harl. 1802,” 362–65. However, the Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae, ed Bayless and Lapidge, 170 (pp. 140–41) locates James the Greater in Spain.
followed this insular tradition, the James he lists as buried in Jerusalem could be either one, the son of Zebedee or the brother of Jesus, although given his place in the litany-like sequence it is more likely to be the James the Greater, son of Zebedee. Second, Aldred identifies Thomas’ location as India of the Saracens (\textit{india saracenorum}, glossed \textit{india saracina}), a peculiar association found also in the \textit{Leabhar Breac}; this is a pre-Islamic meaning of the term Saracen, but conjoining it with Thomas and India is unusual.\footnote{\textsuperscript{162}} These two oddities suggest access to, and modification of, no longer extant insular materials for which Aldred is a unique witness.

What sets Aldred’s list even further apart from the more common source texts is his linguistic preoccupation with these place names, evident in the vernacular gloss, where he assiduously translated every word even though the formula settles into a pattern after the first couple of entries: \textit{Beatus N. requiescit [in civitate] in provincia.} . . . \footnote{\textsuperscript{163}} All but three entries use the present tense \textit{requiescit} (or abbreviation \textit{requies’}) glossed with variations on \textit{geresteð}, but at the outset Matthew, Luke, and John have the past tense \textit{requievit}, glossed with OE \textit{gi-} or \textit{gereste}, although Matthew has an anomalous abbreviation mark over the final \textit{e}. Similarly, with Thomas buried in “Emina,” he not only omitted the first syllable of the city’s name as found in other sources (\textit{Calamina}) but also added a \textit{vel} glossing the present tense \textit{requies[cit]} with \textit{gerestað \ l gireste æt frvm} (rested at first), a possible indication that Aldred was aware of the third-century translation of Thomas’ relics elsewhere, to Edessa in Mesopotamia. A similar story might lie behind the three past tense verbs in the evangelists.

In addition to this tense variation in the initial evangelists, the first entry on Matthew is a bit more elaborate:

\begin{quote}
\textit{se eadga mathe’ ap’ 7 godspellere gireste’ on earðe armenia on londe āmanito’ ðara lioda}
\end{quote}

\textit{Beatus matheus apostolus et euangelista requieuit in terra armenia in terra amanitorum}

Two lands are given, with Aldred glossing the first \textit{terra} as OE \textit{eard(e)} and the second with \textit{lond(e)}, as if he sought to distinguish two different territorial meanings, or perhaps just two different ways of translating Latin \textit{terra} into Old English. Armenia is repeated in the gloss, but when he comes to \textit{terra amanitorum}, he shortens it in the gloss to \textit{āmanito’} with abbreviation marks above both the first and last letters, perhaps thinking that it referenced the Armenian

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{162} Stokes, “The Irish verses, notes, and glosses in Harl. 1802,” 365, 365; see also McNamara, \textit{Apocrypha}, 85. Aldred’s Saracen reference, although not the Irish source comparison, is discussed by Katharine Scarfe Beckett, \textit{Anglo-Saxon Perceptions of the Islamic World} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 172.
\item \textsuperscript{163} Although inconsistent, Aldred’s gloss favors \textit{in} for cities and \textit{on} for province or land/earth. See analysis by Thomas Miller, \textit{The Old English Version of Bede’s Ecclesiastical History of the English People}, EETS 95, pp. xli–xlii.
\end{itemize}
people. He then added for clarification in Old English the genitive phrase “of the people” (ðara lioda). Neither term lines up with the Isidorean traditions or the martyrologies, which locate Matthew variably in Macedonia, the Parthian mountains, or in Ethiopia.

The inclusion of both the city and province renders the list closer to encyclopedic traditions than the historical martyrologies, where a city name first is given as the place of commemoration, then descriptions of places they traveled, died and were buried, or moved later. Further, Aldred’s place names are sometimes anomalous, not only the Thomas example above, but also Peter and Paul are both listed as resting in Rome, but Peter’s Rome is in the province, rightly, of Tuscia and Paul’s Rome is in the province of Campania. He generally transliterated the province name into the Old English gloss (megðe mesopotamia), and at first the city name, but eventually he glossed city names with ðær byrig, his translation of urbs in the previous list (fol. 87vb6), referring the reader down to the Latin name below the gloss. In the cases of Matthew, John the Baptist, Thomas, and Simon of Chana, the use of the genitive indicates a territory defined by a people rather than a geographic boundary. This suggests that the province name was of some interest as demonstrating the spread of the gospel to all peoples through apostolic authority in each province. That concept could extend to include the territory and community under the authority of St. Cuthbert, whose body rested at Chester-le-Street in a coffin decorated with the apostles.

What this text, in the context of the other lists, tells us is more about Aldred: that he was interested in sacred geography in terms of Biblical literacy; that he thought his textual community needed to be able to identify these traditional sites while honoring the apostles in their liturgy at the site of their own saint; and that the multiple languages assist one another in comprehension and

---

164. It probably refers to people living in the mountain range Amanus between Cilicia and Syria (Lewis and Short).

165. Isidore, *de ortu*, Fraga 53.3; Martyrology, 21 Sept (*A Martyrology of Four Cities*, 160).

166. These province names do not occur with Peter and Paul in Isidore or the historical martyrologies, although Tuscia and Campania are referenced in other contexts. According to Isidore (*de ortu*, Fraga, 44.5), Peter is “sepultus in Vaticano ab urbe Roma ad Orientem miliaris” and according to the martyrology for 29 June (*A Martyrology of Four Cities*, p. 113), “sepultus est in eadem urbe in Vaticano, iuxta uiam Triumphalem, qui totius orbis ueneratione celebratur,” while Paul in Isidore “in via Ostensi truncatur ibique est cum honore sepultus,” the papal basilica of Saint Paul Outside the Walls. Conceivably, Aldred or his source attempted to identify the Roman roads with the provinces, placing Peter in the city of Rome itself, properly in Tuscia, and locating Paul outside the city westward on the via Ostia; although that coastal town is not in the province of Campania (further to the south), one of the Roman roads between Ostia and Rome is called the via Campana (map at http://www.ostia-antica.org/intro.htm).

167. Mark in the second entry receives both the transliteration of the city, Alexandria, as well as the explanation, in ðær byrig. In the case of John the Baptist, the Latin identifies the place as in ciuitate nomine sabusta.

168. Thacker, “In Search of Saints,” in *Early Medieval Rome*, ed. Smith, 274–75, suggests an insular interest in the Isidorean notion that each province has an apostle, and that the expanding definition of an apostle represents not only a need to establish Rome’s apostolic authority in England, but also local apostolic authority in provincial saints like St. Cuthbert.
remembrance. This latter point is an important one for understanding the vernacular gloss throughout Durham A.IV.19. Rather than simply dismissing it as a crib for Latin-deficient readers, we ought to recognize the power Aldred perceived to reside in multiple languages interacting, whether in liturgy or pedagogy. Indeed, for Aldred the bilingual text was crucial to the performance of rituals, so that it may be best to treat these encyclopedic additions not as separate from other service book materials, but as vital to the community’s apprehension of their prayer labor.

In that context, it is unfortunate that the verso of fol. 88 is hard to read, since it also contains texts relevant to the devotional life of the community, particularly the alphabet poem that fills most of the page (QXI.54, fol. 88va1–24, b1–21). Almost illegible due to wear as the end page of this quire and of the manuscript, the poem is laid out with the alphabet letters in the left margin of each column and with an effort to keep each entry to two lines, even if some had to wrap around above or below.\(^{169}\) The gloss is even harder to read.

As with the other lists in this section, the poem is difficult to trace to a single source and is unique to Aldred, conceivably even an original composition. However, its overall tenor makes it likely another Irish-derived text. For example, the letter “a” for Adam alludes to the allegorical interpretation of the four letters of Adam’s name, while the letter “e” for Eve at fol. 88va12–13 is similar to a discussion of the age of Adam in the *Dialogue of Solomon and Saturn* that follows the eight pounds of Adam and is found in other insular literature.\(^{170}\) The poem’s theme is redemptive, contrasting the work of the devil and the work of Christ, and interpreting Biblical characters and animals allegorically. For example, N for *nemar*, the panther, is identified as Christ, which Boyd links to a knowledge of the allegorical interpretations in the *Physiologus* (88vb3).\(^{171}\) In the entry for the letter R (fol. 88vb9), Raguel is identified with strength and with “Satahel,” both apocryphal angelic names; curiously, Aldred glossed Raguel with *noma* (name) rather than retaining the name as he did with Satahel.\(^{172}\)

At fol. 88vb5, for the Latin *christus crucem* (cross) Aldred glossed *hroda*, an unusual spelling even for Aldred, who on this same page spelled it more normally (*rod-*).\(^{173}\) It may be that Aldred’s exemplars included Old English or other glosses affecting his orthography, or conceivably the spelling anomalies reflect an oral dialogue taking place with students while he glossed. That bilingual
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169. Generally Aldred tried to start each new alphabet letter on a new line; most take two lines. For a couple, he added a word from the first line to an empty half line above; in two cases, he overran to the next line and then started the next letter midline (“n” and “u/v” in column b).
172. See discussion of angels in Jolly, “Prayers from the Field,” and Boyd, “Aldrediana XXV,” 55–56, who works out the etymological twists that lie behind the idea of strength in Raguel and Satahel. As for the curious gloss of *Raguel as noma*, Boyd, 55, notes that “noma merely recognizes that Raguel is a personal name.”
173. *Hrode* was also used in the gloss to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* only at Mark 15:30 (see *Cod. Lind.* index verborum). At lines 11 and 14 on fol. 88vb, he glossed *ðerh rod*, which has a preceding “h.”
dialogue would introduce students to the allegorical interpretation of Scripture, bringing redemptive meaning to nature.

The poem is in effect a world history, from Adam the first man’s name lettered by God at the Creation to world’s end and the last judgment, told as a battle between good and evil.\(^\text{174}\) In between, Christ is revealed in Old Testament figures and then Incarnate, conquering the devil through the cross. The crux of the poem, occurring not coincidentally at the top of the \(b\) column, is light: *Lumen id est uerum lumen* (leht þ’ is sod leht I), the *vel* alternative left incomplete. Although Aldred fails to gloss further what he thought this light meant, the poem’s emphasis on the person and work of Christ is clear. \(P\) stands for *Portauit id est christus crucem suam portauit* (gebær þ’ is crist hroda his gebær). That Christ carried his own cross is explained further in the letters “\(s\)” for *Saluator* who saves the world through the cross and and “\(t\)” for *tenuit*, that he holds and carries the world through the cross.\(^\text{175}\) In some ways, the poem transmits the same spiritual vision and ritual celebration as the Dream of the Rood and the Ruthwell Cross.\(^\text{176}\)

The canon table below similarly unites Old and New Testament exegesis in Christian interpretation. Below the alphabet poem in both columns is the last text, at least in the surviving folios of the manuscript (QXI.55; fol. 88vb22–26, a25–26), only partially legible. Its presence in both columns at the bottom suggests that it was not planned as an addition until after the alphabet poem had filled both columns and seemingly the page. The text consists of a summary of Old Testament citations (*testimonia*) in the Gospels and Ammonian sections (*canones*) of the Gospels. Matthew and Mark are in the \(b\) column and Luke and John in the \(a\) column. This type of material is fairly common, but what is legible here does not clearly match referenced sources.\(^\text{177}\) The content, however, seems to fit with the other material Aldred copied in these last few pages, as a reference work for understanding Biblical texts and history, a cross-reference that connects Old and New Testaments. The listing of the four Gospels on the last page of Durham A.IV.19’s Quire XI brings us back to his gloss and colophon in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* marking his entry into the community of St.

174. “Adam primus homo factus est a domino de prima litera id est de iiiii litteris. de quibus nominatum est nomen eius” glossed *se f’na mon aworht fro’ drihtne of ðæm f’na stafe of f. ver stafe of ðæm* . . . . . . . ad ves noma his.

175. “Saluator id est christus iessus. qui saluauit mundum per crvcem. Tenuit fortitudinem magnam chris-tus qui portauit mundum per crucem,” glossed *hælend þ’ is crist hæl’ se þe gehælde middang’ ðerh rode giberal strengo micel crist se ðe geber middang’ ðerh rode.*

176. For the ritual connection between the Dream of the Rood and Ruthwell Cross, see Êamonn Ó Carragáin, *Ritual and the Rood* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005).

177. Thompson, *Rituale, xi*, calls it “a summary of the numbers of the canons of the four Gospels.” T. J. Brown, *Durham Ritual*, 51 cites the *testimonia* in D. de Bruyne, *Préfaces de la bible latine* (Namur, 1920), 186–88 from Paris BN, Lt. 6 and Paris BN Lat. 268. De Bruyne, however, is not very helpful: the four lists, one for each Gospel, have an opening line different from these and then gives each Old Testament book and its citations, lacking here.
Cuthbert. It serves as a pertinent reminder that the Biblical texts were never far from his mind while glossing, and the Gospels in particular were probably deeply embedded in his psyche through the extraordinary vernacular gloss he performed as an act of worship in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*.

Thus Aldred’s interests, while seemingly eclectic, do illustrate a scholarly mindset belied by the label “educational” or even “encyclopedic.” In particular, his penchant for glossing suggests an active engagement with the material for the purpose of considering the relationship between the local and the global, between Anglo-Saxon language and culture and that of the Roman Christian tradition. More prosaic than the legendary work of Caedmon or the great Old English Biblical poems of Junius 11, and less highly placed and centralized than King Alfred’s educational enterprise, nonetheless, Aldred was also a cultural translator as all good philologists are.178

Aldred’s glossing is more than incidental in understanding the textual additions made in Durham A.IV.19’s constituent parts. Arguably Aldred’s primary purpose as sole compiler and glossator of the encyclopedic materials was to explore the multilingual heritage of the Christian tradition and to add Old English to that heritage in the same way as the Old English enhanced the Gospels in *Lindisfarne* and the liturgy in the original collectar. While Aldred’s gloss to the liturgical texts in the main collectar and in his own additions may appear to be a secondary, or even tertiary, use of service book materials whose primary purpose is performance, the gloss may have been for Aldred the main thing, comparable in some ways to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* gloss which he valued so highly as to place himself with the original creators of the manuscript. As a wordsmith—a philological craftsman—Aldred committed a significant amount of time and resources to this linguistic enterprise.

The question remains, why this intense effort in the additions to Durham A.IV.19, particularly the glossing of liturgical materials and the encyclopedic texts. The texts probably served multiple purposes for Aldred and his community, both as they were written and later when they were read by others. The examples discussed in this chapter suggest at least three: vocabulary study, teaching Latin, and theological reflection. The analyses of the scriptorium in chapter 3 and of the liturgical additions in chapter 4 support this interconnection of writing, reading, and teaching as central to understanding this manuscript. For although the primary function of a service book is the performance of the liturgy, in the case of Durham A.IV.19, the eclectic texts found in the manuscript may have been “performed” while writing, reading, and teaching in locations other than the church.

---

Life at Chester-le-Street in the second half of the tenth century cannot be reconstructed from a single manuscript witness, even in conjunction with other artifacts and records or by analogy with better known communities. Nonetheless, Durham A.IV.19 gives us some sense of what living in a religious community meant for a group of primarily secular clergy with a strong monastic heritage and reform influence. It takes a certain degree of historical empathy to enter into the thought world of those who engaged in an extensive cycle of ritual prayer and to comprehend both the spiritual and the practical sides of that life. One supports the other, in Durham A.IV.19. The devotional aspects are linked to the craftsmanship needed to produce the texts that encourage and support the pattern of life established in the community. Much, of course, remains opaque to us because we lack the oral context and textual reference points known to the producers and users of the manuscript, not to mention a sacramental worldview alien to the modern temperament. This returns us to the questions at the outset of Chapter 1:

What does Durham A.IV.19 tell us about the reform of religious life in the late tenth century?

What does the Chester-le-Street scriptorium reveal about liturgical practice and education in a small, secular community?

How were service books used in religious communities for private devotion, corporate worship, and pastoral care?

What role did the vernacular play in the devotional and educational life of the community?
This concluding chapter endeavors to speculate about some of these issues by exploring the locations where the manuscript quires or the texts in them would have been used: in the scriptorium, schoolroom, and library, in the cloister and church, in the field and on the road. These geographic and temporal spaces, which merge from one to the next, can help us see how they saw their world and interacted within it, shaping it through ritual performance with the power of words. Aldred as the resident philologist and religious specialist focused on words as the key to texts because he believed that a multilingual vocabulary had the ability to enhance worship and the spiritual life of the community. In particular, the ancient sacred languages of the universal Christian church could be understood through the local Northumbrian dialect of Old English. For his educational and devotional agenda, language was thus a key to religious formation.

Linguistic study, private meditation, and ritual performance were tied together with pastoral care centered at Chester-le-Street and extending outward into the surrounding communities and beyond. Jean LeClerq’s *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God* paints an insightful picture of monastic spirituality and *lectio divina* in the Benedictine tradition.¹ The powerful combination of grammar, liturgy, and meditation is evident in Durham A.IV.19’s additions and glosses. But LeClerq tends to separate monastic theology from scholastic education among secular clergy along the fault line between inward-focused meditation and outward service in pastoral care. However, his book does not take into account the mixed lifestyle of secular religious communities found in early medieval England before monastic reform heightened this distinction.² Chester-le-Street in the late tenth century was at that particular crossroad, with Aldred arguably working to synthesize a devotional and liturgical life within a secular religious community committed to pastoral care.

As a corollary to that effort to meld old and new, monastic and secular, Aldred’s additions and glosses demonstrate a sensitivity to both the local Northumbrian traditions and the reform movement in the larger Christian world of which he was an active part. His community’s sense of place extended backward to Lindisfarne to the north and forward to Wessex in the south, with their patron Cuthbert presiding over both land and church. The church at Chester-le-Street was a sanctuary—a political and religious center of safety protected by their relics and their ritual prayers, at once both very localized and yet connected to a larger network of the *commune sanctorum*, living and dead. In terms of temporality, ritual prayers ushered worshippers into a timeless space in the

---

divine presence: the daily hours marked time but also marked breaches in time. As those daily prayers grew longer and more complex in the reform of the office, more of the day was dedicated to connecting the community and its patrons to the divine: special prayers for the king, for the dead, and for those in need, combined with memorials to the cross, the Trinity, the Virgin, and saints brought temporal and eternal together on behalf of the community and the people they represented before God, both in Northumbria and Wessex.

Service books held in or near the sanctuary, or copied and modified in the scriptorium, served multiple purposes in relation to ritual performance. They could educate, guide the celebrants, or be a resource for study and personal devotion. Their physical location would depend therefore upon the activity and people involved: scriptorium for copying, library or storage for reference, cloister for reading or study, church for performance, on the road or in the field for community service blessings. Durham A.IV.19 encompassed all of these functions, both educational and ritual services, and thus existed at some time or another in several locations, in whole or in parts, while the texts themselves had a life of their own apart from the manuscript in oral performance.

IN THE SCRIPTORIUM, SCHOOLROOM, AND LIBRARY: READING, WRITING, AND STUDY

The relationship between reading, writing, and speaking in the context of liturgical texts is a complex one. For members of a “textual community”—a community whose ritual life revolved around the words of Scripture, the liturgy, and Christian tradition—a text existed as both spoken and written, with the written in service of the spoken. Words were activated by speech acts. In Christian thought, the Word became flesh and is re-embodied through the sacramental speech in the celebration of the Eucharist. In Anglo-Saxon poetry, humans are distinctively “speech-bearers,” those who communicate through language. Written texts, as they evolved, served as repositories and reminders for speech, clues or notes to verbal performance and hence were perceived as less complete than speech itself, ironically mute. Thus the wisdom riddle of three mute things (treæ mutæ) links the mind, the eye, and the letter on the page, similar to Aldred’s verses in the Lindisfarne Gospel’s colophon, littera me pandat: the eye of the mind must interpret the spiritual significance of the material letter.

---

4. Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae, ed. Debby Banham, Martha Bayless, and Michael Lapidge (Dublin: School of Celtic Studies, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1998), 142 (item 175); Adrian and Ritheus 38 in The Prose Solomon and Saturn and Adrian and Ritheus, ed. and trans. J. E. Cross and T. D. Hill, McMaster Old English Studies and Texts 1 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982), 39, which has four things.
Literacy in the diverse and evolving context of early medieval religious communities encompassed the craft of writing, the ability to read, and by extension the dependence of the community—including its members who did not write or read—on written words to conduct their oral activities. Aldred, with his erudite colophon to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and multilingual glossing enterprise, was a master of literacy in the community at Chester-le-Street, playing across the artificial boundary of oral and written, Latin and vernacular.

In communal religious establishments, monastic or secular, service books became multipurpose compilations in heavy use on a daily basis as a guide to the ritual cycle of the year, week, and hour. Most service books existed primarily as resource volumes for the celebrants in the rituals and were self-referential: they presumed knowledge of the rituals through performative experience and through access to other volumes at the same time that they offered a guide to the performance. Consequently, the community needed a collection of books, a library of some kind, to function, although the books themselves could be stored in cupboards in a variety of locations or in some cases belonged to individual clerks as personal possessions, as might be the case with Psalters.

The lists of books a priest needed for public performance of rituals, the records of books owned by the church, and the proliferation of service books were the result of increasingly complex liturgical needs in the ninth and tenth centuries. The community could have acquired service books from elsewhere and modified them for local use, or produced their own by copying and adapting. In either case, they needed scribal skills, at a minimum, as appears to be the case for the Chester-le-Street scriptorium in the late tenth century. A scriptorium at its simplest was defined by a group of scribes working together on a common task and only secondarily came to refer to a writing surface or place where that work took place. In that basic sense, Durham A.IV.19 is evidence of a scriptorium as a community of scribes engaged in liturgical experimentation and scholarly reflection. Aldred’s recruitment as described in his colophon to the *Lindisfarne Gospels*, as well as the likely presence of the *MacRegol Gospel*’s glossators visiting Chester-le-Street to use Aldred’s gloss, suggest that the community of St. Cuthbert had some kind of scriptorium and library with valuable resources.

How they functioned together as scribes in relation to the texts, verbal and written, is harder to reconstruct. They could have worked together in a room with desks, written on portable surfaces in their laps, sat in the cloister by
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themselves reading and writing, or all of the above. In some cases, the Chester-
le-Street’s scribes worked at the same time or in pairs, perhaps with one recit-
ing from memory or dictating from an exemplar, as may have happened with
the twice copied Auctor salutis hymn of Scribes C and E or the St. John poison
prayer of Scribe B corrected by Aldred. Other additions in Durham A.IV.19
appear to have been done by scribes working alone to record, either from an
exemplar or from memory, their own text into the quires, even in the middle
of the work of someone else who was not present to redirect them, as happened
with Scribe C’s work interrupted by Scribe F. They apparently took turns with
the quires, between their rounds of other clerical duties, particularly amid the
increased emphasis on an extended liturgy found in the additional texts. In
these settings, perhaps in the cloister area if Chester-le-Street had one, individ-
ual scribes may have vocalized the text while copying, simultaneously reading
and praying while writing. One can imagine Scribe E, for example, rehearsing
his generic prayer phrases and perhaps elaborating on them for specific uses or
moving the words around in different order:

   We beseech you, Lord, hear the prayers of your servants [for . . .]
   and lead us into the kingdom of heaven [in these ways . . .]
   you who live and reign, God through all ages, Amen. (fol. 64r13–17, QVIII.8)

Unlike Scribe E’s basic prayer form, Aldred took on a more complex series of
written tasks in glossing prayers in Old English. He may have verbalized the
Latin text while copying it, but the later addition of the vernacular suggests
a word by word reading—either silently to himself or aloud, possibly with an
audience to whom he expounded the text.

This communal environment for reading and writing implies a pedagogical
component as one of the uses to which the manuscript or parts of it were put,
“a classbook.”8 The scribes visible in Durham A.IV.19’s additions include both
teachers and pupils: religious experts and authorities such as Aldred and Scribe
C, but also less experienced or subordinate scribes whose additions may have
formed part of their education. We can see that Aldred and Scribe C not only
employed them in these writing tasks but also can imagine they discussed both
the old and the new texts with them, aided by Aldred’s gloss. Some of the office
materials in Durham A.IV.19 are elaborations using incipits of texts presumably
known to the reader or instructor who could have filled in the rest of the text.
But other items are very basic, including a complete doxology, which presumes

8. See Michael Lapidge, “The Study of Latin Texts in late Anglo-Saxon England [1]: The Evidence of
Latin Glosses,” in Latin and the Vernacular Languages in early Medieval Britain, ed. Nicholas Brooks (Leices-
ter: Leicester University Press, 1982), 99–140, who argues against Latin glosses as evidence of classbook status,
who offers other criteria for determining classbook use as one among several purposes to which a glossed
manuscript might be put.
someone able to read but who nonetheless needed the full text of the hymn or prayer completely written out for them—perhaps adult entrants or clergy able to read but unfamiliar with the newer liturgy.

The education of novices and younger clerks in a religious community involved teaching them the ritual texts using a combination of oral and written instruction, with the primary aim the performance of the ritual. Theoretically, a novice who remained unable to read or write memorized the psalms and prayers as oral text, practiced daily in the performance of the daily office. Nonetheless, religious education came increasingly to depend on the existence of written texts, annotated and bilingual collections including Psalters and monastic prayer books. An instructor taught from these by reading aloud, expounding on the meaning along the way, but also by teaching the students to read the text themselves. The ability to read would allow them to further their study and devotional life on their own, but undoubtedly vocalizing the text as they read to themselves or aloud to someone else so that they could practice pronouncing the prayers. The aim of instruction in a religious community remained being able to perform the text “by heart” or from memory through recitation, chant, prayer, or exposition to an audience, whether fellow religious, laity, or God.

The ability to write might become part of this learning process, as evidenced by Scribe B’s errors of “c” and “q,” “d” and “t,” indicating someone who knew some Latin aurally and orally first before learning to read and to write the language. But at some point, being able to read, and possibly write, became not only tools for learning the Latin language and performing the rituals but ends in themselves, for reflection and study. In that context, written letters, rather than their aurality, came to define words, something the highly literate today no longer notice, namely, that we “see words.”9 Aldred’s contributions to Durham A.IV.19, particularly his vernacular gloss and encyclopedic texts, might very well be evidence of that kind of literacy focused on letters and words as visual objects, not just cues to auditory performance.10 Learning to see words, and not just hear them, may have been central to Aldred’s own scholarship as well as his pedagogy, evident in his fascination with multiple languages and encyclopedic lists of words and abbreviations.

The didactic conversations implied in Durham A.IV.19’s additions would necessarily take place in a space with other service books and manuscripts from...
which the scribes copied or to which they could refer—books inherited and
gifted to the community both for practical use and as treasures. The latter were
undoubtedly kept in the church, while other books could have been stored in
cupboards in areas set aside for readers and scribes to access. The relationship
between activities evident in the manuscript and the architectural spaces where
they took place is complicated for Chester-le-Street with its no longer extant
wooden church, compared to major religious communities where architectural
remains, contemporary descriptions, or even drawings show cloister, scripto-
rium, library, or schoolroom. The existence of a library as a separate room
where books were stored is unrealistic for the early medieval period. Rather
books were stored in the rooms or spaces where reading took place, which
could include the church, refectory, chapter meeting, infirmary, cloister, scrip-
torium, or schoolroom.

Thus the “scriptorium”—the location(s) where scribes worked—was prob-
ably one of several places storing books, along with the cloister cupboards,
books in use in the church, and those checked out to community members
for private reading. A scriptorium suggests a quiet space set aside for scribes,
equipped with supplies for producing manuscripts, whether that was a room
exclusively for that purpose or not. Likewise, references to the early medieval
schoolroom imply a space where a teacher could verbalize instruction, using
books, in a way that would probably be distracting for scribes. Such instruc-
tion could take place wherever the books were, in the church, in the cloister, or
another space set aside for that purpose.

It may be that at Chester-le-Street, scriptorium, library, and schoolroom
were not separate spaces or even a single space. Nonetheless, Durham A.IV.19
shows us that the activities associated with these locations were taking place:
members of the community had tools for writing, owned or borrowed books
to peruse and copy, and taught ritual life and words using writing as a means of
instruction. To an unusual degree, the additions to Durham A.IV.19 reveal these
activities in one manuscript, rather than, as in other cases, separate manuscript
resources—a service book for instruction or reference in church, a textbook
glossed Psalter or Hymnal for novices, a workbook or wax tablet for learning
to write. These combined features in Durham A.IV.19 may indicate a shortage
of manuscript supplies. Given the way the booklets were shared with scribes

11. Most famous are the Plan of St. Gall and the architectural diagrams in the Eadwine Psalter: St. Gall
Monastery Plan: Codex Sangallensis 1092 at http://www.stgallplan.org/ or Lorna Price and Walter William
Horn, The Plan of St. Gall in Brief: An Overview Based on the 3-Volume Work by Walter Horn and Ernest Born
(Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982); The Eadwine Psalter: Text, Image, and Monastic Culture in
Twelfth-Century Canterbury, ed. Margaret Gibson, T. A. Heslop, and Richard W. Pfaff (University Park, PA:


13. M. B. Parkes, Their Hands before Our Eye, 8–9, expresses doubts about the stability of a specific
physical space and focuses more on the activities taking place.
of varying tasks and abilities, the evidence also implies a small multi-purpose space where these overlapping activities of scriptorium and schoolroom took place.

This select group of scribes interacting with one another in the additions to Durham A.IV.19 also participated as worshippers outside the scriptorium, along with other members of the community who were not scribes. The spaces where reading and writing took place could also therefore be places of contemplation and worship. One can pray while reading and studying, meditating on the Scriptures and lessons. Aldred’s gloss, whatever its subsequent pedagogical uses, began with his own devotional life. Aldred saw glossing in Old English as an act of worship and gift to the community in the Lindisfarne Gospels and presumably also in his additions to Durham A.IV.19 where the gloss may have been a devotional aid for himself and his colleagues as they studied and elaborated on the liturgy. Consequently, private devotions may have flowed between scriptorium, schoolroom, and cloister, as well as from the corporate performance of the liturgy in the church sanctuary.

IN THE CHURCH AND CLOISTER: INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE PRAYER

When it comes to prayer, whether private devotion or communal celebrations, the text remains central, whether a manuscript copy is present or not. In a religious community, both corporate and private prayer was highly structured: specific psalms, collects, and types of prayers were designated for specific times and places. Regular and secular clergy prayed in church, in preparation for church, or while going about their tasks, as encouraged by the Rule. In corporate prayer in the daily office, psalms, hymns, and standard prayers would be familiar enough to recite from memory, while special prayers would be cued from a service book and led by a celebrant. The services could be open to lay people as well, whether residents of the Chester-le-Street compound (servants, family members, the poor in the almshouse) or from the surrounding community.14

Durham A.IV.19’s materials may have been used corporately and individually in the church and cloister, if such existed, at Chester-le-Street. The original collectar had an organized selection of prayers appropriate to the season in the Temporal and Sanctoral sections as drawn from the relevant mass. Since Aldred glossed and corrected Scribe O’s work, we have to presume they used the texts either in the performance of the liturgy or to instruct others in the performance of it. To it, Scribe C and Aldred added memorials and special mass prayers that

would extend the daily office considerably, running some services together in line with the elaborations described in the *Regularis concordia*. The majority of the prayers are communal in orientation, using plural verb forms. Much of the material was made accessible for those performing the texts in a corporate setting, whether cantor, lector, or priest, by marking sung portions, writing out the complete text of lections, or listing repetitively prayers used in multiple services. But some of the additional prayers, not to mention the glossed sections, may have been designed also for private devotions for individuals to pray; hence at some point they must have been instructed in the use of these prayers from the manuscript quires or booklets, either brought into the church or studied elsewhere.

Whether Chester-le-Street had a cloister and chapter house associated with the church is problematic. A monastic cloister was kept relatively inaccessible to the laity and offered a space for reading and reflection as part of the vowed life of devotion to God.\(^\text{15}\) Chapter meetings, which included readings and prayers, usually took place in a chapter house, a room set aside for the monks (or nuns) to meet and address communal issues. Since the Chester-le-Street community in the tenth century was primarily, if not wholly, secular clergy, it is hard to know the daily working spaces they inhabited besides the church and possibly scriptorium.

Conceivably, if Symeon of Durham’s oral traditions are correct, a small group of monks may have conducted services exclusive to the body of St. Cuthbert, which would account for the collects for the saint that Aldred copied into Quire XI with Bishop Ælfsige in Wessex.\(^\text{16}\) The other office materials Aldred and the other scribes included are all presumed to be for the secular office based on the number of lections for Nocturns, but since these lections are only incidentally and randomly included in the additions, the vast majority of the rest of the office materials could have been used by both secular and monastic clergy, separately or together. In particular, the *capitella* and memorials added by Aldred and Scribe C represent extensions of the daily office congruent with the monastic reforms found in the *Regularis concordia*. Thus, how the community of St. Cuthbert at Chester-le-Street worshipped, and whether a small monastic core survived with a cloister, remains a mystery.

The church, on the other hand, we do know something about: its wooden exterior contained within rich relics, including the body of Cuthbert in a rune-inscribed coffin decorated with seven archangels and the twelve disciples (fig. 2), the gold and silver gifts of King Athelstan, and the gloriously illumined

---


Lindisfarne Gospels that Aldred glossed (image 9). However visibly these and other treasures were displayed or not, their presence enhanced the sanctity of the space in which prayer was offered and drew attention to eternal glory in the divine presence. In this space, the clergy would perform the mass as well as the divine office on behalf of the people of St. Cuthbert, the *haliwerfolc*, the folk of the land belonging to the holy man.17 And although the sanctuary undoubtedly had manuscript treasures and service books, the primary mode was auditory: the space was filled with the sound of voices reciting, chanting, and singing prayers, psalms, and hymns:

Christ, most merciful king, take possession of our hearts so that we may always sound your praises as we owe them to you. Glory to you, Lord, you who were raised from the dead, one with the Holy Spirit in eternity, amen. (fol. 77v9–13, QXI.30; image 14)18

The audience, certainly, was God but also the angelic ranks and saints invoked in these texts. Also joining in and being led by the clergy in these praises, was a congregation, both those physically present and those virtually present, patrons and benefactors for whom the community prayed: royalty, nobility, ecclesiastical leaders, and the souls of its dead.

In that sense, no one ever prayed alone but in the midst of a larger community of the living and dead, an orientation that calls into question the anachronistic boundary between the corporate public and “private” individuality.19 Meditation on Scripture, particularly the Psalms, cultivated this sense of personalizing the text by placing oneself or the community into the text, and vice versa, implicating the text in the present. In public ritual individuals corporately recited psalms with a first person singular pronoun; so too an individual praying alone might use a plural pronoun, speaking as one member of a larger class to which he or she belonged. What is interesting in this context is the alteration of prayers from plural to singular, as well as gendering of pronouns, to indicate personalizing the text to a particular need. However, the absence of such written changes does not preclude the possibilities for performative applications that move fluidly between corporate and individual uses. Private devotion by individual community members was tied both to corporate worship and to the daily life of the community. The Benedictine Rule, elaborated

17. Symeon, *Libellus* ii.11, n. 66, and ii.16.
19. For example, Anna Harrison has recently argued for a greater understanding of the communal aspects of the liturgical spirituality of Mechtild of Hackeborn and Gertrude of Helfta, whose writings are often taken as symptoms of highly individualized piety: “‘I Am Wholly Your Own’: Liturgical Piety and Community among the Nuns of Helfta,” *Church History* 78 (2009): 549–83.
further in the *Regularis concordia*, stipulated certain psalms and prayers for monks to recite outside of the daily office both in preparation for worship and as spiritual protection. In Quire XI, Aldred linked to specific hours of the day suffrages and psalm incipits often found in private prayer books to address spiritual concerns: the seven penitential psalms, psalms for temptation and trouble, and at the end of the day, those celebrating spiritual victory. The expectation within the community was that prayer permeated all activities and governed the thought life of its members. That mentality would be maintained even outside the cloister and church.

**IN THE FIELD AND ON THE ROAD:**
**BLESSINGS AND PROTECTION**

Outside the explicitly religious zone of the church, cloister, and scriptorium are concentric circles of outbuildings and property, extending to the immediate estate, the other lands in the bishopric, and beyond to areas where members of the community traveled. All of these zones fell under the protection of St. Cuthbert and the liturgy performed by his community, specifically the secular clergy responsible for the spiritual well-being of the laity. If the small group of scribes represented in Durham A.IV.19 are any indication of the clerical staff and ranks in the bishop’s household, then we know they had a provost assisting the bishop, Aldred, at least one other priest or celebrant given Scribe C’s extensive liturgical copying, deacons or priests evident in Scribe D’s blessings of objects, lectors from Scribes E and F’s contributions, and potentially a lowly exorcist in training in the person of Scribe B. These clerical ranks, itemized by Aldred in his encyclopedic additions (QXI.51), served not just their own liturgical needs but those of the lay community on their estate and in the surrounding areas, both those of Northumbrian stock and the newer and less Christianized viking settlers.

The Chester-le-Street estate would have had kitchens, storehouses, and residences for the clergy, as well as household staff and possibly an almshouse. Whether the residences for the clergy were dormitories, as one would expect for monastics, or separate living quarters accommodating family for married secular canons is unclear. But Durham A.IV.19 does have, both in the original

---

20. Frank Barlow, *The English Church 1000–1066*, 2nd ed. (London: Longman, 1979), 229–30, draws this conclusion from later evidence in Symeon of Durham, that the secular clergy had separate residences built for them at Durham, implying that was the lifestyle brought from Chester-le-Street in contradistinction to the cell or dormitories of a reformed monastic community. Also, T. J. Brown speculates that the Boge hand in the Durham Gospels may be that of an oblate or a child of one of the community’s members; *Durham Gospels, together with fragments of a Gospel Book in Uncial*, Durham Cathedral Library Ms. A.II.17, ed. C. D. Verey, T. J. Brown, E. Coatsworth, and R. Powell, EEMF 20 (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1980), 51–52.
collectar and in the additions, a considerable number of house blessings. Those in the original collectar may include prayers for domiciles within the religious compound and a separate set for blessing homes elsewhere in the estate or on other lands lay-owned or leased from the community. The fact that Scribe C added the same prayers, although not identical enough to be a copy, in Quire IX allows for the possibility that the Quire IX–X booklet could be taken out to remote locations to perform these services. Slim as it is, this evidence suggests the nature of pastoral care taken on by the Chester-le-Street community.

Similarly, in addition to houses, the estate and surrounding areas included fields, produce, and animals in need of blessing and protection. The benedictions added by Scribes C and D in Quire VIII complement those found in the original collectar in offering prayers to protect and enhance the productivity of the land and its assets, and to bless the material products, whether for direct consumption or for sacralizing their use in the rituals of the church. Blessings of grapes, fruit, and nuts copied by Scribe D indicate some of the produce in the surrounding landscape, in addition to the more generic (and somewhat confused) blessings in the original collectar for game, domestic animals, and rodent-fouled vats of beer.

But Aldred’s five field prayers added at the beginning of Quire IX represent an outstanding example of local Northumbrian culture incorporated into pastoral care (QIX.14).21 A unique witness to an Irish tradition of apocryphal lore otherwise lost to us, these prayers were designed to call on divine and angelic power to prevent birds and other vermin from harming the crops in the field, either at the time of planting when seeds are vulnerable or more likely just prior to harvest when the grain is full. The comparable Æcerbot Ritual is also bilingual but in a different way: it uses Old English for the instructions and appeals to Mother Earth and Latin for the basic liturgical prayers and Scriptures adapted for blessing the fields.22 Probably it was developed as a way of Christianizing Anglo-Saxon customs on the occasion of what later becomes Plough Monday. Aldred’s field prayers were not necessarily tied to a particular celebration but were more specifically focused on vermin as a physical manifestation of invisible and destructive malign forces in the field—potentially including Viking depredations. Yet Aldred’s field prayers reflect a much older literate tradition than the Æcerbot Ritual, drawing on Mediterranean apocryphal lore retained and developed by the Irish and inherited by Northumbrians, also visible in the St. John poison prayer copied by Scribe B (QVIII.1). For


example, Adomnán describes how St. Columba’s tunic and books warded off a feared drought. The elders walked around the sown field, waving the tunic three times and reading his books on the hill where the saint had had converse with angels.\(^\text{23}\) Cuthbert had a similarly close relationship with angels who, in apocryphal traditions, had power in the natural landscape.

Aldred’s majuscule for the Latin texts of the field prayers indicates the revered antiquity of the tradition while his red Old English gloss localized the prayers in the vernacular of Northumbria. Translated yet again into modern English, these five prayers reveal a sacramental worldview that requires considerable historical empathy to understand:

[a] Christ be Blessed. creature over the crop for birds on fourteen. To God omnipotent, to you Lord God we pray, who have named your son Jesus Christ with twelve names. Therefore I adjure you creature of water through the archangel Panchiel that these may be burned up and put to flight: demons and flying things, worms and rodents, and all venomous animals from our fields, in the name of God the Father and Son and Holy Spirit, [you] who reign forever and ever.

[b] Likewise for birds: Creator and protector of human kind, giver of spiritual grace, bestower of eternal salvation, send forth your Holy Spirit over this creature of water so that armed with the virtue of heavenly defense it may benefit the health of soul and body. through [our] Lord.

[c] Holy Lord, Father omnipotent, eternal God, send forth your Holy Spirit with the Archangel Panchiel that he may defend our crops from worms, from winged things, from demons, from lightning bolts, from all temptations of the devil, by the invocation of your holy name, Jesus Christ, [you] who reign with the Father and who live with the Holy Spirit, forever and ever.

[d] Likewise another. We pray you Lord holy Father omnipotent, eternal God: Reproduce fertile seed, as in your name Panchiel wishes, who is over all fruits of the earth and over seeds, along with forty-four thousand angels, so that this creature may take root or, cast upon the earth, may remain unharmed. May your name be magnified in all the earth, or in all places so that the people will know that there is no other God beside you. Through God omnipotent and through the Lord of lords and through his son Jesus Christ who called the twelve apostles by [their] names. Therefore I adjure you creature of water that the Lord command neither evil nor disease; nor

temptation be allowed to operate in this field. Rather, just as the demon Asmodeus who was driven out by the fish gall through the archangel Raphael, so may the birds be driven out from our crops. And may this creature be beneficial for putting to flight and expelling the demon, in the name of God the Father and Son and Holy Spirit.

[c] A creature against birds who attack our fields and eat them: through the Lord Father omnipotent, you who have named your son with twelve names, I adjure you creature of bread that you be a fire burning against snares of the devil and winged things, just as the demon Asmodeus fled, who was driven out by the fish gall through the archangel Raphael, so may winged things be driven out from our crops. In the name of God, Father and Son and Holy Spirit. Lord, deign to bless our crop through this creature of water and through the blessing which we bless so that the flying things of the sky and birds of the earth be overthrown from them through the invocation of your name, Father and Son and Holy Spirit.

These powerful prayers opening the Quire IX–X booklet could easily have been performed on any of the lands under the oversight of St. Cuthbert, whose own angelic connections and power over nature and birds in particular were well known in his hagiography. These prayers make no appeal to St. Cuthbert, but Paniel/Panchiel featured in these prayers was undoubtedly one of the archangels incised on his coffin, although the spelling of that name is no longer visible.

Thus Chester-le-Street was also a center for the surrounding area between the Tyne and the Wear presided over by St. Cuthbert, whose body resided at Chester-le-Street, the episcopal seat from which the bishop and his representatives oversaw the religious life of the Lindisfarne see. From the copying of the *MacRegol Gospels* gloss in tandem with the *Lindisfarne Gospels* gloss, we know that Harewood and other small religious communities looked to Chester-le-Street as a venerable place and textual repository. The people of St. Cuthbert viewed him as their protector, such that wherever his body was, they would flock there. Presumably travel went both ways, and Chester-le-Street clergy went out into these areas, offering some of the liturgical services found in Durham A.IV.19. While traveling, clergy probably took service booklets with them to use in ministering to laity and other clergy, as well as for private devotional purposes. That Aldred carried a writing kit to Wessex also suggests that manuscripts could be copied bidirectionally at these various sites.

The journey to Wessex goes further afield, but was nonetheless under the protection of Cuthbert, as Aldred made clear in his colophon noting the occasion on August 10, 970. The four Cuthbert collects recorded on that date can be read as textual acquisitions to take back to the Chester-le-Street community,
but they were and are prayers. It is easy to forget, when studying manuscript “copying,” that the text was performed as a prayer while it was being written, copied, taught, and read. These four collects to Cuthbert asking for protection and blessing on his people were living, breathing prayers for Provost Aldred and Bishop Ælfsige, and for their community at Chester-le-Street and later Durham, where these quires were preserved down to the present, not entirely by accident but under the watchful eye of St. Cuthbert:

God, who graciously receives the intentions of your saints, by blessed priest Cuthbert interceding, we beseech, Lord, your right hand of mercy, protect always and everywhere your family. (fol. 84rb1–8, QXI.44c)

A SACRAMENTAL WORLD

While deconstructing the material artifact of Durham A.IV.19, this book has simultaneously sought to bring the community that produced it back to life, which means taking seriously their spiritual aspirations with as much empathy as we can muster. A renewed historicism, one that is willing to take a theological turn away from secular modernity, calls us to a medieval way of thinking, of imagining history as a living dialogue with the dead.24 In this conversation, we both place ourselves in the past, but also bring that past into the present.

What, then, does the tenth-century community of Cuthbert have to say to us, in our present moment? More specifically, do their sacraments reveal something meaningful to our secularizing society about coping with the material-temporal world? And what does Durham A.IV.19 suggest to our hyperspeed textual environment about reading, writing, studying, and yes, praying and meditating, as ways of thinking? These two latter questions about ritual performance and textuality are interrelated: how does our thought world shape our experience in “lived religion”?25 For the community of St. Cuthbert at Chester-le-Street, word and ritual combined in a powerful sacramental experience of the world rooted in Christian theology.

First, Durham A.IV.19 represents a liturgical response to the world in which the community of St. Cuthbert lived. The heart of medieval ritual rested on a sacramental worldview in which the relationship between nature and supernature was not one of isolation but a pathway to be acted on, sometimes in very


pragmatic ways for surviving natural and human disasters. The community maintained its coherence through prayers and rituals that not only bound those in the present to each other, but to their forebears as well as those to come after. By contrast, a secular, materialist worldview often fails to offer a meaningful human past because it is impersonal, lacking the sense of intimacy between generations found in the early medieval sacraments.

Second, the ritual performances of the liturgy and daily office are logo-centered meditations. Texts were read, performed, and heard in a way we only reserve today for poems, a process of slowly digesting each word in relation to the next, savoring their syntactic and philological interplay. In some ways, the medieval is very different from our modern world, where words flow fast and consequently often superficially, and poetry is often overlooked as too slow or laborious to unpack. In other ways, however, the medieval and modern share a common human need for repetition: the desire to hear a song or experience a story over again, is a similar impulse to the psalms in the daily office or the annual cycle of festivals.

Third, Durham A.IV.19 reveals how word and ritual combine in ways specific to the Christian tradition. Christian ecclesiology has at its heart the sacrament of the Word, a double play on the Incarnation visible in the Eucharist where the Word made flesh is consumed and the community, the body of Christ, is renewed. Thus the “spirituality” of the community of St. Cuthbert cannot be found in the kinds of interiorized or confessional reflections found in later ages, but in ritualized and yet personalized intimacy with the Word, understood simultaneously as Christ, Creation, Scripture, and Eucharist. The alphabet poem (QXI.54) found on the last surviving page of Durham A.IV.19 sheds light (Lumen id est uerum lumen) on that sacramental world: from Creation through the Incarnation to the Last Judgment, each letter speaks its message that the redemptive power of the cross is stronger than the devil. The rituals found on the pages of Durham A.IV.19 acted on that power in daily life and prayers.

In short, Durham A.IV.19 has more to say to us if we listen to its voice on its own terms and not just ours. Our impulse as historians is to place this manuscript in the context of the history we have already written about tenth-century Anglo-Saxon England, and from that view we see what is lacking in it. In our eagerness to untangle the secular versus monastic in religious communities of the tenth century, presumed to be under the aegis of a seemingly dominant


reform movement, we may have overlooked the sacramental ecclesiology operating in a place like Chester-le-Street, where the question of the day may not have been whether or not to be “monastic” as opposed to “secular” clergy but to determine how best to live a life mindful of the spiritual realm impinging on a fragile temporal world. In Durham A.IV.19 the scribes at Chester-le-Street built for themselves a safe space to read, write, meditate, and pray. We can but imagine what it would mean if we allowed their sacramental thought world to intersect with our own.
This edition contains the texts added to Durham A.IV.19 at Chester-le-Street by Aldred and Scribes B-F, as well as Scribes M1–3 at Durham. Materials from the original collectar, already edited by Alicia Corrêa, are not included except for a few items given for comparison. The collation diagrams are based on my own observations in conjunction with the slips in the manuscript and T. J. Brown’s description in the EEMF Durham Ritual. The chart lists the quires in order, summarizing the contents of the original collectar as well as the additions.

**Quire Chart**

The chart’s columns include the larger codicological context (columns 1–4) as well as information on specific texts in the additions (columns 5–11):

1. The quire number, using the T. J. Brown facsimile numbering with Quires IX and X in order; the older numbers, also used by ASM, with Quires IX and X reversed are in brackets.
2. The gathering of sheets and added leaves.
3. Folio number or range of folios for sections listed in columns 2 and 4.
4. Lost or canceled leaves, indicated by italics.
5. Type of material: Temporale, Sanctorale, Commune Sanctorum, Benedictions, Hymns, Orations, Memorials, Suffrages, Offices by hour, Collects, Psalms, Educational Memoranda, and Notes.

---

6. **Folio** and line **numbers** for texts listed in columns 7–8.

7. **Text number** used in the edition here (or in Corrêa for the original collectar).

8. **Description of contents**.

9. **Scribe** responsible: O=original collectar scribe; A=Aldred; Scribes B, C, D, E, F, M1, M2, M3.

10. **Glossed**: Y(es), N(o), or P(artial).

11. **Notes**, generally of additional marks and scribal stints.

## TEXTS

The materials are divided into the three main quire sections or booklets where the additional texts were added by the Chester-le-Street scribes. Comparable or duplicate texts found within the original collectar, as well as Scribe E’s copy of a hymn over erasure and the later contributions of Durham Scribes M1–3, are included in the relevant sections of the additions.

The texts are numbered sequentially, 1–56, with some divided into parts with alphabetic letters following the number (e.g. four parts divided into a-d, or an interpolation labeled “a”). For clarity in this book’s chapters, all texts are referred to by the quire followed by the text number, thus: QVIII.1, QIX/X.14a (first field prayer), QXI.26, etc.

**QVIII** contains the additions made to the original collectar’s Quire VIII on folios 61–65, items numbered 1–13.

**QIX/X** contains the additions in the Quire IX and Quire X booklet, folios 66[70]–75[68], as well as folio 76[69], items numbered 14–25.

**QXI** contains the additions made in the Quire XI booklet, folios 77–88, items numbered 26–55, plus the binding leaf fol. 89, item 56.

## NOTES ON FORMATTING

This transcription was initially done from the print facsimile with reference to the Surtees edition done by Lindelöf,\(^2\) then corrected and checked against the original manuscript at Durham Cathedral Library.

Latin abbreviations are expanded with italics, except where noted in special cases. Old English abbreviation marks are indicated by an apostrophe.

The number 7 has been used for the Old English *ond* symbol; Latin *et* has not been italicized as an abbreviation.

---

Word breaks follow modern Latin rather than combinations or spaces used in the manuscript; when a word is split at a line end or page break, no hyphen is added.

Both “;” and reverse version (comma on top with tail extending right, period under), used as punctuation marks in the manuscript, are rendered with a semi-colon. Where the manuscript uses an “;” as an abbreviation for -us it is expanded to us.
DURHAM CATHEDRAL LIBRARY
A.IV.19 COLLATION DIAGRAMS

Quire II

Quire IV
## Durham Cathedral Library A.IV.19 Codicological Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quire</th>
<th>Gathering</th>
<th>folios</th>
<th>Lost leaves</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Fol/Line</th>
<th>text #</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Scr</th>
<th>Gl</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proto-I</td>
<td>5 sheets?</td>
<td>1-10?</td>
<td>5 sheets</td>
<td>missing Temporale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>5 sheets</td>
<td>1 at beg.</td>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>Temporale</td>
<td>1-135</td>
<td>in mid, Epiphan...</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>5 sheets</td>
<td>1 cancelled (3)</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>Temporale</td>
<td>135-214</td>
<td></td>
<td>missing Easter prayers</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4 1/2 sheets)</td>
<td></td>
<td>between 11-12</td>
<td>cancelled leaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>between 15r-16v</td>
<td>other half missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>Temporale</td>
<td>17v11-23</td>
<td>215-39</td>
<td>Rogationtide (236-38)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>5 sheets?</td>
<td>8 at beginning</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Temporale</td>
<td>239-35</td>
<td>Gelas. collects 18r1-19r23</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 at end</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>5 sheets</td>
<td>4 at beginning</td>
<td>19-21r12</td>
<td>Temporale</td>
<td>255-89</td>
<td>Greg. collects 19r24-21r12</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21r14-24</td>
<td>Sanctorale</td>
<td>290-332</td>
<td>26 Dec - 5 Feb</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>5 1/2 sheets</td>
<td>2 lost</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>Sanctorale</td>
<td>332-99</td>
<td>5 Feb - 2 Aug</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>added leaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31-33</td>
<td>Sanctorale</td>
<td>400-36</td>
<td>10 Aug - 8 Sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 at end</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>5 1/2 sheets</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sanctorale</td>
<td>437-94</td>
<td>29 Sep - 21 Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>added leaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38v16-21</td>
<td></td>
<td>rubric for CommSanc faded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39-44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CommSanc</td>
<td>495-574</td>
<td>incomplete due to missing</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: italics=missing  Gloss: Y=yes; N=No; P=Partial  O text #s Corrêa; Additions Q text #s this volume (Continued)
### Durham Cathedral Library A.IV.19 Codicological Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quire</th>
<th>Page Count</th>
<th>Lost leaves</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Fol/Line</th>
<th>text #</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Scr</th>
<th>Gl</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>5 1/2 sheets</td>
<td>2-4 at beg.</td>
<td>CommSanc</td>
<td>45r1-21</td>
<td>575-80</td>
<td>6 Collects to Holy Cross</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>45r21 - 46</td>
<td>581-91</td>
<td>various blessings</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>added leaf</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>48r1-49v4</td>
<td>591-98</td>
<td>var. blessings; food and house</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>47v xb; M3 add.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>49v4-53r23</td>
<td>599-604</td>
<td>hot water ordeal, exorcisms</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mass</td>
<td>53v1-16</td>
<td>605-30</td>
<td>nun and nuptial; erasure</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hymn</td>
<td>53v1-16</td>
<td>QVIII.90</td>
<td>Passiontide</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>over erasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quire</td>
<td>Gathering</td>
<td>folios</td>
<td>Lost leaves</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Fol/Line</td>
<td>text #</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Scr</td>
<td>Gl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>6 sheets</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>54-61</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>54r1-55r20</td>
<td>632-34</td>
<td>hot iron ordeal, exorcism</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55r20-61r10</td>
<td>635-67</td>
<td>misc. blessings; collects</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additions:</td>
<td>55-61</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>61r11-22</td>
<td>1 John poison cup</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>61v1-62v18</td>
<td>2 Lections</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P sect. 1 minuscule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>62v18/-/63v4</td>
<td>3 benedictio lac et mel</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N sect. 2 minuscule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>62v12-63r20</td>
<td>3a cross</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N interpolation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>63v5-11</td>
<td>4 grapes</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>63v12-19</td>
<td>5 new bread</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>63v20-3</td>
<td>6 fruits, apples and nuts</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>63v23-64r8</td>
<td>7 wells</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orat</td>
<td>64v9-17</td>
<td>8 generic (2)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N sect. 3 majuscule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hymn 68</td>
<td>64v1-16</td>
<td>9 Passiontide</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hymn 55</td>
<td>65r18-32</td>
<td>11 Lent</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N sect. 4 near-maj.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hymn 67</td>
<td>65v1-16</td>
<td>12a-b Passiontide</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N sect. 4 min. 65v1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hymn 70</td>
<td>65v17-29</td>
<td>13 Easter</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N sect. 4 cont. min.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quire</th>
<th>Gathering</th>
<th>folios</th>
<th>Lost leaves</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Fol/Line</th>
<th>text #</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Scr</th>
<th>Gl</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IX[X]</td>
<td>3 1/2 sheets</td>
<td>66[70]-72[76]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flesh-hair</td>
<td>66-68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>med. stiff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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## Quire Gathering folios Lost leaves Type Fol/Line text # Content Scr Gl Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X[IX]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 leaves</td>
<td>73[66]-76[69]</td>
<td>none?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flesh-hair; stiff</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Mass/Suffrage</td>
<td>73r1-22</td>
<td>23d</td>
<td>cont. for several martyrs</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>sect. 7 cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mass/Suffrage</td>
<td>73r22-74r10</td>
<td>23e</td>
<td>common of virgin martyr</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flesh-hair; stiff</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Mass/Suffrage</td>
<td>74r11-74v21</td>
<td>23f</td>
<td>vigil of an apostle</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can't tell; soft</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Mass/Suffrage</td>
<td>75v1-23</td>
<td>23b</td>
<td>Matth.reading, confessor</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Note</td>
<td>75v24-25</td>
<td>23M1</td>
<td>honoring Aldhun</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hair-flesh; stiff</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Collects</td>
<td>76r1-26</td>
<td>24a-h</td>
<td>canonical hours (8)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>sect. 8 maj.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ant, Vers, Res</td>
<td>76v1-29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Kings, Wisdom, Job</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>illegible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hymn</td>
<td>82rb12-v3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Hy 11 Compline</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(Continued)
## Durham Cathedral Library A.IV.19 Codicological Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quire</th>
<th>Gathering</th>
<th>folios</th>
<th>Lost leaves</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Fol/Line</th>
<th>text #</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Scr</th>
<th>Gl</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>6 sheets</td>
<td>77-88</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>flesh-hair</td>
<td>77-82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stiff</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Fol/Line</th>
<th>text #</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Scr</th>
<th>Gl</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hymn</td>
<td>77r1-11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Hy 7 Prime</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymn</td>
<td>77r12-18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Hy 8 Terce</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymn</td>
<td>77r19-24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Hy 9 Sext</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymn</td>
<td>77v1-8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Hy 10 None</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymn</td>
<td>77v9-13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Hy 72 stanza II</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymn</td>
<td>77v14-18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Hy 1 Vespers</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontifical?</td>
<td>77v19-25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Episcopal Benedictions</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>double column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collects</td>
<td>79va6-b2</td>
<td>34a-b</td>
<td>Prime (Gallican)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect</td>
<td>79vb3-14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Sunday Prime</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitella</td>
<td>79vb5-80va9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Terce, Sext, None (Gallican)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td>80va10-11</td>
<td>36x</td>
<td>to 3 collects</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect</td>
<td>80va12-22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Vespers</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitella</td>
<td>80va23-82ra5</td>
<td>38a-s</td>
<td>Vespers (Celtic)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collects</td>
<td>82ra6-b11</td>
<td>39a-b</td>
<td>Vespers Collects (2)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quire</td>
<td>Gathering</td>
<td>folios</td>
<td>Lost leaves</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Fol/Line</td>
<td>text #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI cont.</td>
<td>hair-flesh</td>
<td>83-88</td>
<td></td>
<td>Capitella</td>
<td>82v-4-83r10</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>83r11-21</td>
<td>42a-g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>83r22-84r2</td>
<td>43a-d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collects</td>
<td>84r24-23, b1-18</td>
<td>44a-d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Note</td>
<td>84r24-26</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Note</td>
<td>84r29-26</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ant, Vrs, Res</td>
<td>84v1-35</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educ. Mem.</td>
<td>85r1-86r9</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educ. Mem.</td>
<td>86r10-86v16</td>
<td>49a-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educ. Mem.</td>
<td>86v16-87r10</td>
<td>50a-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educ. Mem.</td>
<td>87r11-87v15</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educ. Mem.</td>
<td>87v16-b15</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educ. Mem.</td>
<td>87v16-35</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educ. Mem.</td>
<td>88r1-24</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educ. Mem.</td>
<td>88v1-24, b1-21</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educ. Mem.</td>
<td>88v22-6, a25-6</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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QUIRE VIII

Additions at the end of the original collectar

1. fol. 61r11–22

Prayer against poison, no rubric.¹
Scribe B minuscule, corrected and glossed in OE by Aldred.
Other versions found in Book of Cerne, Book of Nunnaminster, Leechbook of Bald, Lacnunga, and Irish Liber Hymnorum.

61r

god min 7 fæder 7 svnv 7 gast
11 Deus meus et pater et filius et spiritus³
halig ðæm alle vnderdiodded aron 7 ðæm alc giscaeft giheres
12 sanctus qui³ omnia subiecta súnt⁴ et cui omnis creatura deser
7 ælc onwæld vnderbeged is 7 onscynað 7 ondredad
13 uit et omnis potesté’s⁵ subiecta est et metuit et expaues
7 se dreeca fleed 7 svigað sio hatt’ne 7 sceomende da ðio is acvoeden
14 cit et draco fugit et silet uipera⁶ et rubeta illa que dicitur

1. Lind. says, p. 216, that “only faint traces of a rubric are visible” but I see nothing in the ms and don’t know where he thought he saw it.
2. T. J. Brown, 29, notes “erroneous” abbreviation spis, as well as oia and onis in 1. 12.
3. Note “q” crossed out and corrected with a “c” above it, by Aldred using the red ink of his gloss. Note also insular majuscule for the first “s” in sanctus, but insular minuscule for the final “s” in the abbreviation (sc).
4. Note abbreviation mark above “un” of sunt.
5. Note “e” corrected with “a” above it; the “e” appears to have a dot below it to indicate correction. The added “a” is more in Scribe B’s style of “a,” square three stroke, than Aldred’s, and is in same dark thick strokes as B.
6. Aldred has added a corrected red “a” above the final “a” of uipera, perhaps because Scribe B’s “a” looks almost like a “ti.” Subsequently, Scribe B appears to have made an effort to make a more rounded two-stroke “a” like Aldred’s (evident a few times earlier, and with some reversion to his square style after). T. J. Brown, 29, notes Scribe B’s special square or rounded “a” letters, as well as his “r,” “x,” “&” and round “s” (1. 15 on initial “s” of scorpius and 1. 20 on conspectu).
tosca gilattia ðio nedre se gidrynsad f`cvmmen sie æc spileg` se ætt`ne
rana` torpescit scorpius9 extinguitur10 uincitur et spi
noht sceðend`e givyrca 7 alle ða ætt`na 7 geet l
lagius nihil noxium operatur et omnia uenenata et aduc
ða rifista feerræsenda æc` netna sceðend`e sie adiostrado 7
ferocious repentina12 et animalia noxia tenebrantur et
alle widirweardo heles mennis` wyrttr`vm` giscrinca hia ðv gidrynsne
omnes adueræ13 salutis humani radices arrescunt tu ex
dis ætt`ne attor voercdedo his deaðberendo
tingue hoc uenenatum uirus44 operationes eius morti
7 ætt`no ða in him hæfed gidldæ15 ðu 7 sel in onsione ðinv`
feras et uires quas in se habed16 euacua et da in conspectu tuo
allvm ða ðv gisceope ego þ`te hia gisii eara þ`te hia gi
omnibus quos tu creasti oculos ud17 uideant aures ud18 audi
hera hearta 7 micilnise ðin hia ongette
ant cor et magnitudinem tuam intellegant ::

2. fols. 61vi–62vi8

Lection benedictions (Incipiunt benedixiones ad lectionem) for Christmas,
Epiphany, Easter, Ascension, Whitsun, Advent, Virgin, Peace, Trinity,
Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors, and All Saints.19
Scribe C, minuscule, dark brown ink, first writing stint;20 Aldred gloss
only on 61vi–10.

7. The end of spileg is hard to read: the “e” of the “æ” seems to merge with “g.”
8. Other versions have quieta between rana and torpescit.
9. Note use of insular majuscule “s” in scorpius, both at beginning and end, rather than insular minuscule.
10. Other versions have Regulus between extinguitur and uincitur.
11. Note absence of insular etiend symbol (7).
12. The initial “r” of repentia is badly formed, almost appearing like a “p.”
13. The “æ” added above “r” is in Scribe B’s hand and ink. Lind. corrects to adverse. T. J. Brown, p. 29
lists a 1. 19 correction by Scribe B, but he must mean this one on 1. 18. The next word, salutis, begins with
an insular majuscule rather than insular minuscule “s.”
14. Other versions have extingue between uirus and operationes.
15. Lind. has giidla, but it could also be gild although what follows is almost illegible (very small
scribble, including the ða).
16. Aldred corrects “d” to “t” by putting a dot below the “d” and adding a “t” in red.
17. Aldred crosses through the erroneous “d” in red but does not appear to add the corrected “t” above,
which is glossed with his usual abbreviation “þ`te.”
18. Scribe B made the same error again, “d” for “t” in ut, with Aldred again lining out the “d.” Apparent-
ly, if Aldred was checking B as he wrote, he did so only after this reduplicating error.
19. Compare to LM A, fols. 9v-1r, items 52–96.
onginnad bloedsungas to rede

1 Incipiunt benedictiones ad lectionem: 

god godes sunv se ðe ecelice  [dæg]22 of heghstalde gicenned

2 Deus dei filius qui [h]odiernā of heugine nascī24

gimeodvmad is gimilsa vσṇa

3 dignatus est miseriātus nostri. Amen:-

god sō ðæc monn sō acenned of hehstalde usig giboed/sia25 amen26

4 Deus uerus et homo uerus natus ex uirgine nos benedictat; 27
cynīg cyningā to dæg acenned usig ṭ' gihalda sie gimeodvmad

5 Rex regum hodie natus nos custodire dignēt; amen;28

ricsande mið feder acenned of moeder crist usig gibloedsia

6 Regnans cum patre natus ex matre christus nos benedictat: amen

hẽlend middang' acenn' of hehstalde ṭ' vσg gibhele gimilsā' amen

7 Saluator mundi natus ex uirgine nos saluare dignēt;

eftlesand menniscēs cynnēs to  [dæg] acenned gihalda vσg driht' amen

8 Redemptor hĕ mani;29 generis hodie natus conseruet nos dominus;

frumwrhtā lifes acenned of hehstalde' gimilsia us driht'

9 Auctor uitae natus ex uirgine miseriātur nobis dominus; amen
god sibbes 7 lufes to  [dæg] acen’ sie mið allo’ vs

10 Deus pacis et dilectionis10 hodie natus sit cum omnibus nobis; amen

11 Ipse nos benedict in teris11 qui hodie nasci dignatus

12 est ex uirginis;12 amen:// + de eppiphaniāe:-

13 Deus dei filius qui hodierna die mundo apparere

14 dignatus est miseriātur nostri. amen:-

+de resurexione // // dignētur. amen:

15 Christus dei filius ab æterna morte nos resuscitare

16 Saluator mundi pro nobis passus et a morte re

17 surgens nos saluare dignētur. amen:-

18 Deus dei filius qui hodie a mortuis resurgere dig

19 natus est miseriātur nostri. amen. † de ascentio:-
20 Deus dei filius qui hodierna die cælos ascendit
21 miseriatur nostri nunc et in secula; † de pentecosten

62r
1 Deus dei filius qui hodierna die discipulis suis sanctum
2 misit spiritum nostra inlustrare dignetur corda. amen.
3 † de adventu domini:-
4 deus dei filius quem uenturum colimus det nobis ueniam
5 nostrorum de lectorum;34 cotidianis diebus:-
6 Ab omni malo defendat uos dominus. amen.
7 A cunctis malis inminentibus liberet nos dominus. amen.
8 A morte secunda eripiat nos dominus amen.
9 Diuina maiesta s35 nos tueatur amen.
10 Deus dei filius nos benedicere dignetur amen.
11 Diuina gratia nos benedicat amen.
12 De sede sancta sua aspiciat nos dominus amen.
13 Creator omnium nos benedicat amen.
14 Benedixionibus suis repleat nos dominus amen.
15 Custos omnium custodiat nos christus amen.
16 Ipse nos benedicat qui nos creauit amen.
17 Protegat seruos suos omnipotens dominus amen.
18 Spiritus sanctus nostra inlustrare dignetur corde. amen.
19 Trinitas sancta nos benedicat37 amen.
20 Spiritus sanctus aperiat nobis sensum cordis. amen.
21 Saluet et benedicat nos omnipotens dominus. amen.
22 In suo sancto seruitio conseruet nos dominus amen.
23 In sancta religione conseruet nos dominus amen.
24 Deus miseriatur nostri et benedicat nobis. amen.

62v
1 Intercedente38 pro nobis sancte dei genetrixce39 maria
2 auxiliat orbis omnipotens dominus. amen.
3 Per intercessionem sancta40 dei genetricis maria in suo sancto
4 seruitio confortet nos dominus. amen. //omnipotens dominus amen.
5 Rex regum et dominus dominantium da pacem in diebus nostris

33. The abbreviated “-costen” written above and into the gutter.
34. LM A item 67 has delictorum.
35. Erasure of one or two characters between maiesta and final “s.”
36. This line’s prayer and the next are reversed in LM A, items 76 and 75.
37. This line’s prayer and next are reversed in LM A, items 82 and 81.
38. Unlabeled here but labeled in LM (before item 87) as commendationes post nocturnos.
39. Lind. has genetrix, but the ms has an “x” with dots above and below to indicate error.
40. LM A has “sanctae.”
Deus omnipotens sancta trinitas miseratur nostri qui uiiuit in
secula seculorum. amen. de apostolorum:-
Intercedentibus pro nobis christi apostolorum meritis
succurrat nobis omnipotens dominus: de martyrum:-
Intercedentibus pro nobis christi martyrum meritis
miseratur nostri omnipotens dominus. amen:
Intercedentibus pro nobis christi confessorum meritis exau
diat omnipotens dominus. amen:- de omnibus sanctis:-
Omnium sanctorum suorum meritis eruat nos dominus.
A malis pro nobis christi martyrum meritis
misereatur nostri omnipotens dominus. amen.
Intercedentibus pro nobis christi confessorum meritis exau
Omnium sanctorum suorum meritis eruat nos dominus.
Sanctis intercedentibus christe tuorum electis succurr
re nobis omnipotens dominus;.

3. fols. 62v18–63v4

Blessing of (Font), Milk and Honey, with interpolated cross prayer (3a, 62v22–63r20).

Scribe C, minuscule, light brown ink, second stint; relatively few abbreviations.

No gloss, but heavily corrected by Aldred in the area of the cross prayer (3a).

62v
18 benedictio lac 7 mel:-
19 Benedic domine et has creaturas fontis et lactis et mel
20 lis et pota famulos tuos de hoc fonte perenne qui est
21 spiritus veritatis et enutri eos de hoc melle et lacre.
22† tu enim domine. [3a] pro crucis tuæ qui nos redemisti por

41. Unlabeled here but labeled in LM A (before item 93) de confessioribus but that is clear from the text of the prayer.
42. In LM A (item 94) a malis is the end of the previous prayer and the second prayer (item 95) begins with Cunctis.
43. The same hand, apparently, added “i” above second “u” of cunctus with a dot under it to indicate correction.
44. Absent from LM.
46. Only partially identified (63r1–15, see below).
47. Erasure after “f” of fonte, looks like an “r” (e.g., fronte).
48. LM A has perenni qui es.
49. LM A 2401 p. 416 continues from here with the milk and honey blessing, unlike this switch to a cross prayer.
tauimus tam in fronte quam in corde contra
astutias inimici uexillum fidei et ueritatis ad nostram
salutem quia proinde domine supliciter te rogamus
Signum sanctæ crucis tuae. et signum sanctitatis tuae.

Signum dei uiui. Signum æternæ salutis. Signum beatæ
trinitatis. Signum gloriae cælestiam[ ]
saluatoris domini nostri

iesu chrištī. Crux saluatoris chrišti

patriarcharum. Crux. apostolorum. Crux mæryrum. Crux
confessorum. Crux cæsariarum. dei. Crux uniuersorum
credentium. in sanctam trinitatem ac perfectam tu domine es
qui das animas dá salutem. per signum crucis tuae ut in

lo cis ac domibus fidelium. ubi crux ista permaneat
fugantur demones et inmundos spiritus ac pestifer expellet
inimic[o]s morbosque careant et inmundi spiritus aduersa
potestate cognatione tuae depulsæ et uirtute benedicti

onis tuae sit. Benedictę sanctificata mundata.
quomque loco fixa maneat et in nomine tuo
omnes uanos terrores. seu meredianos adque noctur

50. The “as” added as correction in front of “tutias” in margin, seems to be different hand and ink/nib, probably Aldred (T. J. Brown, 29).
51. For a similar text to 63r1–15, see RGP, vol. 1, items 100–101, pp. 158–59 and PL 138: 1030c.
52. The “am” erased, “s” inserted above “i” by Aldred (T. J. Brown, 29).
53. Abbreviated “sig +” added above “am” erasure by Aldred (T. J. Brown, 29).
54. Cross inserted in corrector’s hand.
55. The “-os” added by Aldred.
56. The “o” added above “u” to make inimicos, by Aldred.
57. Added by Aldred above erasure of three or four characters, perhaps part of inmundi (the final “i” looks altered). Last erased letter has descender (?).
58. The “-iti” is a correction above erasure of “ixi,” by Aldred.
59. The “in” added by Aldred.
60. The “re” added above “s” by Aldred, two dots above and below “o” somewhat angled.
61. The space before and after seu gives the appearance of erasure; the “s” of seu may be the hand of Aldred.
na[o]s. animarum suarum et corporum. et pignus speln

doris ac æternæ dulcedinis permissionum tuarum mitte in ea

petitus spiritum sanctum tuum paracletum qui et illos. qui hoc gus
tauerint dulcidine caritatis tuae feruoris accendat. et
albor sanctitatis in munditia super niuem efficat quibus

gaudia æternæ uitæ et dulcia super omnia mella sortietur.

[Tu] ex animo domine promisisti patribus nostris abrahæ 7 issaac
et iacob introductam uos in terram reparationis
terram fluentem lac 7 mel. implo pro misericordia tua
magna haec promissa in nobis eorum filiis aliquantenus
et fide et operibus iunge nos famulos tuos in christo et

spiritui sancto lac et mel iunctum e cuius ducatum accipiemus

in eum speldoris albidinem in quam uitæ passionem
suam coram discipulis in monte transfiguratus est
et dulcidinem æternæ in resurexionem suam fatum
mellis commedit per quam hæc omnia domine:-

Blessing of grapes
Scribe D, majuscule with some minuscule; no gloss.

. . . panis fru . . . 

62. The “o” added above “a” with a possible dot below the “a,” correction by Aldred?
63. Misspelling for splendoris; see also 63v1 below.
64. The “u” with macron abbreviation mark above it appears to be a correction over an “a;” there appears
to be an erased “s” after that.
65. The “f” of feruoris is written over some other letter by Aldred; in front of it appears to be an erased
letter, possibly a “u.”
66. Large T descending below the line. Repetition of Tu enim domine from 62v22 signals return to milk
and honey blessing as found in the comparable texts.
67. LM A does not include Jacob, while Ratoldus does.
68. Departure from LM A.
69. Cannot see in facsimile, relying on Lind.
70. The phrase iunge . . . sancto appears similar to LM A Coniuge domine famulos tuos spiritui sancto . . . ;
see also Ratoldus 1063 and RGP 2:410.
71. On “ducatum” Lind. has ducatum but I see an abbreviation mark above the “u.”
72. Lind. corrects to splendoris; see also 63r15–16 above.
73. The phrase in 63r26–63v4, lac et mel . . . commedit, is not present in LM A, but the ending per quam
haec omnia domine is in LM A.
74. Compare LM A 2404 and Fulda 1168, which both have usae where Scribe D’s has une (line 6).
Ratoldus 1606 is nearly identical, but does not have usae in the first sentence. See also Franz 1:372.
75. Title illegible, very light brown, possibly erased or a different ink. Lind, 217, refers to Wanley’s read-
Blessing of new bread
Scribe D, majuscule with more minuscule; no gloss.

63v
12 ebic\textsuperscript{77} domine creaturam istam panis nouam\textsuperscript{28}
13 sicut benedixisti quinquè panes in deserto\textsuperscript{79}
14 et duos pisces et .u. milia hominum satiasti
15 ita benedicere dingeris ut sit dominis eiusdem ha
16 bundans in annum alimentum gustantes qui ex
17 eo accipient tam corporis quam animæ sani
18 tatem per te christe iesu qui regnas in sæcula sæcu
19 lum.\textsuperscript{80} p. .

Blessing of fruits, apples and nuts
Scribe D, majuscule and minuscule; no gloss.

63v
19 //nucleosque et omnem fructum

\textsuperscript{76} See LM A 2403 for lines 12–13 and 2408 for \textit{et duos pisces . . . dingeris}; see also the original Durham Collectar \textit{benedictio panis} on fol. 47r (Corrêa 594, p. 214) which is the same as lines 12–13 and lines 15 from \textit{ut sit} through line 18 \textit{per}, comparable to LM A 2403; Franz I:268; see also CCCC 422 (Red Book of Darley), p. 295.

\textsuperscript{77} Seems to be something missing, at least one letter, in front of this, but no sign of erasure, apparently an error for \textit{benedic}. There may be a title on the half line above (11).

\textsuperscript{78} Scribe D’s “u” and “n” often appear as two minims without a bottom or top connector, line 12 \textit{nouam}, line 13 \textit{in}, line 14 “.u.” for a number.

\textsuperscript{79} After \textit{deserto} is some space at the end of the line, possibly an erasure.

\textsuperscript{80} \textit{This per te . . . sæcula sæculum [sic, sæculorum]} is found in LM A 2406, the blessing of fruit that Scribe D copies next but does not include the line there (see below, 63v23).

\textsuperscript{81} LM A 2406; Franz I: 379 (87).
20 Domine sancte pater omnipotens sanctifica pomas et\textsuperscript{82} nuces\textsuperscript{83} arborum quam herbarum qui tuo imperio us
21 sum omnibus præbent animantibus. p.;
22 per quem hæc omnia;\textsuperscript{84}

7. fols. 63v23–64r8

Blessing of a well\textsuperscript{85}
Scribe D, majuscule and minuscule;\textsuperscript{86} no gloss.

63v
23 benedictio putei;

64r
1 Deprecamur domine clementiam pietatis tuæ ut aquam
2 putei huius sanctifices et ad cum\textsuperscript{87} cumunem urâ\textsuperscript{88} concedas
3 salubre et ita ex eo fugare digneris omnem diabolice
4 temptationis incursum ut quicumque ex eo ab hic hauserit
5 bibere tuæ. tēl in quibus libet necessaries usibus
6 hausta aqua usus fuerit totius virtutis ac sanctificatori
7 nitas dulcedine perfrauat utti\textsuperscript{89} semper sanctificatori
8 et saluatori omnium domino gratias agereatur.\textsuperscript{90} per-

8. fol. 64r9–17

Generic prayers
Scribe E, large hand, widely spaced, probably here first before the work of
C and D; no gloss.

\textsuperscript{82} The “t” of et is unclear, only a minim close to “n” of nuces.
\textsuperscript{83} The end of the line wraps above to line 19 in the space left after the previous prayer.
\textsuperscript{84} This is a different ending than found in LM A (cf. 63v18–19 above) and appears to be disconnected
from this prayer, which he has already ended with the abbreviation per on the previous line.
\textsuperscript{85} LM A 2414; Ratoldus 192; Fulda 2790.
\textsuperscript{86} Letter forms on 64r seem sharper, are smaller, less space between lines, possibly because Scribe E’s
text below was already there.
\textsuperscript{87} Lind. has ad cumunem, omitting the extra cu, which appears to have some faint marks or partially
erased letters over it. Leofric 2414 reads communem.
\textsuperscript{88} Lind. expands to usitam, but LM has usiam here. Scribe D error, uti fort uti?
\textsuperscript{89} Lind. has ut tibi but there is no evidence of a “-bi” or abbreviation mark.
\textsuperscript{90} Corrector has added above the middle of agereatur an insertion mark and “mere” to correct to agere
mereatur. LM 2414 has agere mereatur. I wonder if the scribe blended the two words together. Ratoldus and
Fulda are the same as LM.
9. fol. 64vi–16

Passiontide hymn, *Auctor salutis unicus* (Hy 68)\(^91\)

Scribe C, third stint, majuscule;\(^92\) no gloss.
Scribe E adds the same hymn over erasure on fol. 53v (see below).

64v

*Auctor*\(^93\)

1 Auctor salutis unicus. mundi redem
2 tor inclitus. tu *chrīste* nobis annuam. cru
3 cis secunda gloriam; Tu sputa. calap
4 hos. uincula. et dira passus uerbera.
5 crucem uolens ascenderas. *nostrae* sa
6 luitis gratia; Hinc mortem morte\(^94\) diruens.
7 uitam quae uita largiens. mortis mi
8 nistrum subdolum. deuiceras diabolum;
9 Nunc in parentis dextera. sacrata ful
10 gens uicima. audi pręcamur uiuido. tuo
11 redemptos sanguine; Quo te sequentes
12 omnius. morum processu sæculi. aduer
13 sus omne scandalum. crucis feramus.
14 labarum; Pręsta:*pater*\(^95\) per filium.*prika*\(^96\) pręsta per

---

92. T. J. Brown, p. 30, calls it a "most imposing" majuscule.
93. Added by modern hand in upper margin, same as hand on fol. 53v, noted below.
94. The reverse, *morte mortem*, is standard in other manuscripts of Hy 68; both Scribes C and E have this order (see below, fol. 53v).
95. Inserted correction, possibly different nib, perhaps in his minuscule hand.
96. Milfull collation, p. 279, ends with *Presta, beata trinitas*, while H has *Presta pater per filium*. Only Durham scribes E and C have this longer doxology.
almum spiritum. cum his per euum triplici.
unus deus cognomine. Amen:-

Passiontide hymn (Hy 68) from Quire VII, original collectar, over erasure Scribe E, no gloss.

Auctor\textsuperscript{98} salutis unicus. mundi redemptor
inlitus tu christe nobis annuam crucis secunda gloriām
Tu sputa. colaphos. uincula. & dira passus uerbera.
crucem uolens ascenderas. nostrae salutis grattā.
Hinc mortem mortem\textsuperscript{99} diruens. uitam\textsuperscript{100}uita largi
ess. mortis ministrum subdolum deuiceras
diabulum. Nunc in parentis dextera.
sacra fulgens uictima. audi precamur
uiuido. tuo redemptos sanguine.
Quo te sequentes omnibus. morum pro
cessu seculi.\textsuperscript{101} aduersus omne
scandalum crus\textsuperscript{102} cis feramus.
labarum. Presta pater per
filium. presta per’ almum spiritum.
cum his per euum triplici. unus
deus cognomine.\textsuperscript{103} Amen.

Lection Responsories, Versicles, and Antiphons for Tobit, Judith, Maccabees, Minor Prophets

\textsuperscript{98} Modern hand, same as the one who added Auctor above the hymn fol. 64v, recopied Auctor here as well as the first word of the next line, inlitus (for inclitus). Prior damage in the corner may have washed out the letters.

\textsuperscript{99} Erasure here of one or two characters.

\textsuperscript{100} The “q:” for que inserted possibly by Scribe E, although the letter and the insertion caret mark below and between uitam and uita appears to be a browner ink; Milfull suggests another hand for both.

\textsuperscript{101} Erasure cracked the middle of the page; scribe E worked around it.

\textsuperscript{102} Messy erasure here; “cr” visible on left and “cis” on right.

\textsuperscript{103} The word “cognomine” perhaps is split to work around a rough spot above a white patch in the ms right below “mine.” The white patch is only visible on the verso and appears to be over the palimpsest, not under it. Looks papery, perhaps glued on after the erasure caused some damage. As it turns out, Scribe E did not write over it since the text ends above it.
Scribe F; 3 columns 64v17–28, 2 columns fol. 65r;[104] no gloss; rubricated titles and margin letters (R, V, A) oxidized.

64v
17a REP’A DE TOBI.
18a R’. Peto domine ut de uinccula [Tobit 3:15]
19a V’. Qui regis israël intende [Ps. 79:2]
20a R’. Omni tempore benedic deus [Tobit 4:20]
21a V’. Memor esto filii quoniam pav. [Tobit 3:3; Ps. 73:2, 18, 22]
22a R’. Memor esto filii quoniam [Tobit 3:3; Ps. 73]
23a V’. Fiducia magna est [Tobit 4:12]
24a R’. Sufficiebat nobis. [Tobit 5:25]
25a V’. Heu me fili mi ut qui [Tobit 10:4]
26a R’. Benedicite deum caeli [Tobit 12:6]
27a V’. Temps est ut reuertar [Tobit 12:20]
17b R’. Benedicite deum caeli [Tobit 12:6]
18b V’. Benedicite deum caeli [Tobit 12:6]
19b AN’ VNDE SVSVPRA
20b A’. Ne reminiscaris domine [Tobit 3:3]
21b A’. Omni tempore benedic [Tobit 4:20]
22b A’. Memor esto filii quoniam [Tobit 3:3]
23b A’. Tempus est ut reuertar [Tobit 12:20]
24b RP’A DE IVDITH
25b R’. Adonai domine deus magnæ [Judith 16:16]
26b V’. Qui regis israël intende [Ps. 79:2]
27b R’. Tribulationes ciui [Judith 8:22–23?]
28b V’. Peccauimus cum patribus [Judith 7:19]
17c R’. Benedixit te dominus [Judith 13:22]
18c V’. Qui regis israël [Ps. 79:2]
19c R’. Nos alium deum nes [Judith 8:19]
20c V’. Qui regis israël [Ps. 79:2]
21c R’. Recordare mei domine
22c V’. Exurge domine adiu [Ps. 43:26?]
23c R’. Dominator domine
24c V’. Qui regis israël[106] [Ps. 79:2]

104. Columns do not line up so numbering is specific to each column (a, b, c or a, b); 65rb ends half way at line 17. Fol. 64 bottom left edge torn away and patched with light colored, thin material similar to several other patches. The patch is glued to the recto side. Although it looks like Scribe F started his first column to the right of the patch (his text does line up with the text above), the rubrics are very close to the edge and damaged.

105. No abbreviation mark to indicate “m” for tempus.

106. This line squeezed in between 23c and 25c, later but by same hand.
26c AN’ VNDE SVPRA
27c A’. Adonai domine deus [Judith 16:16]
28c A’. Tu domine cui humilium [Judith 9:16?]

65r
1a RP’A DE MACHABEORUM
2a R’. Adaperiat dominus cor usestrum et in [2 Mach. 1:4]
3a V’. Exaudiat dominus orationes nostras [2 Mach. 1:5]
4a R’. Tua est potentia tuum regnum.
5a V’. Qui regis israel intende [Ps. 79:2]
6a R’. Refulsit sol in clippeis aureos [1 Mach. 6:39]
7a V’. Disrumpam uicula populi
8a R’. Impetum inimicorum ne timue
9a V’. Mementote mirabilium eius. [Ps. 104:5]
10a R’. Ornauerunt faciem templi coronis [1 Mach. 4:57]
11a V’. In ymnis et confessionibus [2 Mach. 10:38]
12a R’. In ymnis et confessionibus bē [2 Mach. 10:38]
13a V’. Ornauerunt faciem templi [1 Mach. 4:57]
14a R’. Congregati sunt inimici
15a V’. Disperge illos in uirtute [Ps. 58:12]
16a R’. Dixit iudas simoni fratri [1 Mach. 5:17]
17a V’. Et nunc clamemus in cælu [1 Mach. 4:10]
18a R’. Hic est fratrum amator [2 Mach. 15:14]
19a V’. Ecce quam bonum et quam [Ps. 132:1]
20a AN’ VNDE SVPRA.
22a A’. Da pacem domine in diebus nostris
23a A’. Tua est potentia tuum regnum
24a A’. Refulsit sol in clippeos [1 Mach. 6:39]
25a A’. Lugebat autem iudam super.
26a RP’A DE MINORIBUS
27a R’. Vidi dominum se PROPHETIS
28a dentem super solium ex [Isaiah 6:1]
29a V’. Seraphim stabat super so [Isaiah 6:2]
30a R’. Aspice domine de sede sancta
31a V’. Qui regis israel intende [Ps. 79:2]

107. “RA” not visible in gutter; white debris in gutter.
108. Lind. has just “aur” but there is an abbreviation macron above it.
109. Lind. has just “cor” but it has a macron above.
110. Appears to be a dot above the “d,” and a caret mark above the “m.”
111. Title on two lines, almost invisible.
112. Final letter of seraphim is not clear—faint, looks more like an “n.”
R’. *Aspice domine quia facta est*

V’. *Qui dicunt exinanite [Ps. 136:7]*

R’. *Super muros tuos hirusalem [Isaiah 62:6]*

V’. *Qui reminiscimini domini [Isaiah 62:6]*

R’. *Muro tuo in expugna*

V’. *Qui regis israel intende [Ps. 79:2]*

R’. *Sustinus pacem et non*

V’. *Peccauimus cum patribus nostris [Judith 7:19; Ps. 105:6]*


V’. *Misit deus misericordiam suam [Ps. 56:4]*

R’. *Angustie mihi undique [Daniel 13:22]*

V’. *Si enim hoc egero mors [Daniel 13:22]*

R’. *Laudabilis populus quem*

V’. *Qui regis israel intende [Ps. 79:2]*

AN’ VNDE SVPRA

A’. *Vidi dominum sedentem super [Isaiah 6:1]*

A’. *Aspice domine quia facta est*

A’. *Super muros tuos hirusalem [Isaiah 62:6]*

A’. *Muro tuo in expugnabi*

---

11. fols. 65rb18–32

Lent hymn, *Audi benigne conditor* (Hy 55)\(^{113}\)

Scribe C, stint 4, near majuscule;\(^{114}\) fills rest of right column space after F’s work in 10 above; no gloss; no rubric or title.

---

113. Milfull, *Hymns*, 238–41: Lent hymn at Vesper weekdays according to some manuscript traditions.

114. T. J. Brown, 30.

115. Phrase *vel virium* added by another hand above *cordium*. Other ms (Milfull, *Hymns*, pp. 240–41) have *virium*. The *cordium* may be an eye skip repetition from *cordium* in the previous line.

116. Possible erasure of one character after *quide* with some damage to the “e;” see Milfull, *Hymns*, 240.
Quire VIII

26b confer medelam languidis. Sic
27b corpus extra conteri. dona per
28b abstinentiam. ieiuinet ut mens sobria\textsuperscript{117}
29b a labe prorsus criminum; Presta
30b beata trinitas. concede simplex
31b unitas. ut fructuosa sint tu\texttextipa{is}.\textsuperscript{118}
32b ieiuniorum munera. Amen:-

12. fol. 65v1–16

Passiontide Hymn(s) Vexilla Regis (12a, 65v1–8; Hy 67,) and Arbor decora (12b, 65v9–16; Hy 67,)\textsuperscript{109}
Scribe C, continuation of stint 4, minuscule from 65v1;\textsuperscript{120} no gloss; title in top margin \textit{ymnus infra quadragesima} possibly added by another hand. ymnus infra xi\textsuperscript{121}

65v

1 Vexilla regis prodeunt. fulge\textsuperscript{122} crucis mysterium
2 quo carne carnis conditor suspensus est patibvlvm;
3 Confixa clauis uiscera tendens manas uestigia.
4 redemptionis gratia hic immolata est hostia;
5 Quo vulnernatus\textsuperscript{123} insuper mucrone diro lance\textge
6 ut nos lauaret criminæ. manauit unda ex sanguine;
7 impleta sunt quę concinit.\textsuperscript{124} dauid fideli carmine. di
8 cendo nationibus regnauit a ligno d\textaeus;
9 Arbor decora et fulgida. ornata regis purpura
10 electo\textsuperscript{125} digno stipite. tam sancta membra tangere.

\textsuperscript{117}. The ending -\textit{bria} added by another hand into margin, now very faint, especially "ia" (hard to know whether the "a" had a macron to indicate sobriam, which one manuscript has).
\textsuperscript{118}. Last letters after tu- illegible. Lind. has tua, other manuscripts in Milfull have tuis, but the line in her collated edition uses a different base text, with the line reading ut sint acceptabilia.
\textsuperscript{119}. Milfull, Hymns, 274–78. Some hymnals divide Hy 67, Venantius Fortunatus’s Vexilla Regis, between Vespers and Matins at Passiontide, but one ms assigns the whole to Vespers; the second part (Arbor decora) assigned to Matins, although one ms (Harley 2961) has it at Lauds for Invention and Exaltation of the Cross. Durham A.IV.19 treats as two separate hymns with line break and capital letter, although no “amen” is included at 65v8 to conclude the first half of the hymn.
\textsuperscript{120}. T. J. Brown, 30.
\textsuperscript{121}. Top margin, possibly different hand (Milfull, Hymns, 276).
\textsuperscript{122}. Milfull, Hymns, 276, variants include fulgent and fulget; only Durham has fulge.
\textsuperscript{123}. Milfull, Hymns, 276, variants include vulneratur and vulneratus; only Durham has vulneratus.
\textsuperscript{124}. Correction with vel added above concinit, Scribe C hand probably. Milfull notes variants (Hymns, 276), main text is cecinit, but three mss have concinit.
\textsuperscript{125}. Milfull, Hymns, 277–78, electa in other mss.
Beata cuiu brachiis prestium pependit seculi. statera facta
est corpora. prædamque tuit tartari; Fund i\textsuperscript{126} aroma
cortice uincis saporem nectare iocunda. fructu fer
tili\textsuperscript{127} plaudis triumpho nobili; Saluæ ara salue uictima
de passionis gloria. qua uita mortem pertulit: et mor
te uitam reddidit amen:-

13. fol. 65v17–29

Easter hymn (Hy 70)\textsuperscript{128}
Scribe C, end of stint 4, minuscule; gets crowded toward the bottom, end of Quire VIII.

65v

maris rubri \textit{christo} cana

Ad\textsuperscript{129} cenam agni prouidi stolis albis candidi post transitum
mus principi. Cuius sacram corpusculum. in ara
crucis torridum cruore eius roseo gustando uiusimus deo;
Protecti pasce uesperæ; a deuastante angelo; erepti
de durissimo pharaonis imperio; Iam pasca nostram \textit{christe}\textsuperscript{130}
est qui immolatus agnus est sinceritatis azima caro eius
oblata est. O uere digna hostia; \textit{per quam} facta\textsuperscript{131} sunt tartara.
redempta \textit{est}\textsuperscript{132} plebs captiuata reddita uita premia; Consurgit
\textit{christus} tumulo uictor redit de baratro: tyrannum trudens
uinculo et reserans paradisu; \textit{Quesumus} auctor omniuim in hoc pas
cali gaudio; ab omni mortis impetu\textsuperscript{133} tuum defendas popvlvm.
gloria tibi \textit{domine} qui surexisti a mortuis. cum patre 7 \textit{sancto spiritv} in
sempiterna \textit{secula} amen:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{126} Space between letters “d” and “i.” Milfull, \textit{Hymns}, 277–78, other mss have \textit{fundem} or \textit{fundis}; Milfull notes possible erasure in Durham, between “d” and “i.” It appears to be a square or round letter with no ascenders or descenders.
\item \textsuperscript{127} Some erasure here on the end of \textit{fertili}; Milfull says “l” altered from “i” (or vice versa since it looks like a second “l” with an erasure in the middle). Also, “i” has a tail into the left margin.
\item \textsuperscript{128} Milfull, \textit{Hymns}, 286, notes its use in Vespers at Eastertide.
\item \textsuperscript{129} Initial “A” looks like a “U,” top extenders curl outward without connection across the top.
\item \textsuperscript{130} Milfull, \textit{Hymns}, 284, 286, other mss \textit{Christus}.
\item \textsuperscript{131} Milfull, \textit{Hymns}, 285–86, other mss \textit{fracta}.
\item \textsuperscript{132} Milfull, \textit{Hymns}, 285, 287, other mss \textit{redempta} without \textit{est}.
\item \textsuperscript{133} Milfull, \textit{Hymns}, 285, 287, other mss \textit{impetu}.
\end{itemize}
14. fols. 66r–67v

Five field prayers [a-e]  
Aldred, majuscule transitioning into minuscule (fol. 67r4); glossed; ruling highly visible on fol. 66r, less so on later folios.

66r

\[ Xristus Benedictus \]

\[ [a] \] l hælgung
\[ gesceft of’ hrippe f’e fīglum in feoverteno \]
\[ 1 \] creatura super messem pro avibus in XIX \[ 4 \]

\[ god allmaehhte ðec god ricsende \]
\[ 2 \] Deum omnipotentem te deum dominantem

\[ ve biddad dū de svnv dinne hāl’ crist \]
\[ 3 \] depraecamur. qui filium tuum iesum xristum

\[ tvoelf nomvm genomadest f’edon ic gehal \]
\[ 4 \] .xii. nominibus nominasti. ideo adiu

---

2. In upper left corner.
3. Comparable language in the hot iron ordeal adjuration in the original collectar, fols. 54r19–55r5.
4. Anything further of the title is no longer visible.
sigo déc gesceft vætres ðerh pan’
5 ro te creatura aquae per panchielm

done hehengel þ’ sie gebernedo 7 æc
6 archangelum. ut incendantvr atque

geflemedo sie divblas 7 æc flegendo
7 fugantur demones atque uolucre

wvyrmas 7 æc mys 7 æc allo aeterno
8 uermes atque mures atque omnia uene

netno l wihto from vsvm acrvm
9 nosa animalia a nostris segitibvs

in noma god’ fadores 7 bearne 7 gastes halges
10 in nomine dei patris & filii & spiritus sancti

ðu ðe ricsað in worvld’ vorvld’
11 qui regnas in secula seculum⁵

[b]⁶ efi f’e fvglv
12 item præ avibus⁷

sceppend 7 haldend menniscs
13 Creator et conservator humani

cynnes sellend gefe gastlices
14 generis dator gratiae spiritualis

gefend æcræ heæles ðerhsend
15 largitor æternae salutis permitte

gast ðin haligne of’ ðas gescaft
16 spiritum tuum sanctum super hanc creatu

---

5. First part of line 11 left blank so that closing coda is aligned to the right; however, the last word, *seculorum*, is not only abbreviated but written smaller and begins with a minuscule “s.”

6. Comparable prayers in the original collectar: *B. ad omnia quae volueris* (fol. 47v); *In Thalamo* (fol. 53r).

7. Rest of line is blank, setting off the title.
vetres p' gewoepnadv' megne
17 ram aque ut armata uirtute cæ

heofonlices gescildnisse to savles
18 lestis defensionis ad animæ

7 lichomes giiii hale
19 & corporis proficiat sanitatem. per dominum

[c]8 driht' halge' fæder allm'
20 Domine sancte pater omnipotens item alia

ece god derhsend gast dín haligne mið
21 æternæ deus permitte spiritum tuum sanctum cvm

pan' dæm hehengele
22 panchielo archangelo9

66v
p'te gescilde acras vsa frö wyrmv'
1 ut defendat segites nostras a uer

frö flegendum frö demonv' l frö dioblv'
2 mibus a uolatilibus a demonibus a ful

frö legedum frö aelvcm costynge diobles
3 minibus ab omni temptatione dia

derh inceiginege halges nome
4 buli per inuocationem sancti nomnis10

dines hail' crist' dv de ricas mid feder
5 tui iesu christe qui regnas cum patre

7 mid halgym gaste dv liofað in world' vorvld'
6 & cum spiritu sancto uiuis in secula secularvm

8. Comparable texts for 14c include the blessing of beer in the original collectar on fol 56v, and the fol. 57v b. aquae ad uenationem et salis, titled waeter halgunc to don ilce; the only instance of a closely similar prayer that includes the archangel Panchiel is a version of 14c found in Vienna, Nationalbibliothek Cod. lat. 1888, fol. 6; the later RGP and the Red Book of Darley (CCCC 422, pages 306–7) substitute generic angels.
9. This last line (22) on 66v is right adjusted, leaving a blank third of the line on the left.
10. No sign of an abbreviation mark above nomnis to account for the missing “i.”
ve biddas ðec driht' hælga fader
7 Præcamur te domine sancte pater item alia

allm' ece god geriord sed
8 omnipotens æternæ deus. satia semen se

sedlic' þ wil inoma ðinu' pan'
9 minalem quam uult in nomine tuo pa

se ðe is of' alle wæstmo
10 nachihel qui est super omnes fructus

eorðe 7 aer sedo mid feovr'
11 terræ & super semina cum quattuor

7 feovrtigvm ðusendv engla
12 qua draginta milibus angelorum

se ðe ðas gesceæft hvoelchvoegv onfoe
13 qui hâc creatura aliquid sumat

l of' gideled earðe ungiscended
14 uel super effusa terra inlessa per

ðerhvnia þ' te sie gemiclad noma
15 maneat. ut magnificetur nomen

din on allvm earðe l on ælcvm stove
16 tuum in uniuersa terra l in omni loco

þ' te witto hædno l cynno f'ðon ne is
17 ut sciant gentes quoniam non est

oder god butan ðec ðerh god
18 alius deus præter te. Per deum om

allmahtigne 7 ðerh done hlaferd ricsande
19 nipotentem & per dominum dominan

7 ðerh sunv his hel crist
20 tem & per filium suum iesum christum
se de tvoelf aplas genomade
21 qui .xii. apostolos nominuit

67r

nomvm f'don ic halsigo dec gesceft
1 nominibus. Ideo adiuro te creatu

vætres þ' te gehate driht' ne æc yfel
2 ra aque ut iubeat dominus neque malum

ne æc cvild l cvalm ne æc costung in
3 neque ualitudo. neque temptatio in

dissum hrippe gewyrce ab sve
4 hac messe operatur . sed sicut

se wiðirwearda god divl se de aflemed
5 asmadeus demon qui fugitius

is frö galle fisces ðerh raphel'
6 est a felle piscis per raphaelem

ðone hehengel sve sie aflagedo flegendo
7 archangelum sic fugantur uoluc

frö usvm acrv' 7 giðii
8 res a nostris segitibus . & pro

dios gesceft     7 to of fleanne
9 ficiat hæc creatura. & ad effu

ðone divl 7 to ofgesfhtanne
10 gandum demonem & ex pugnan

on nama god' fadores 7 sunv 7 gastes hal'
11 dum in nomine dei patris & filii & spiritus sancti

[e] gesceft to flegendum
12 Creatura ad uolatilia"
da de hrippu usum gesceddad
13 quæ messibus nostris aduersan

7 gefrettad da ðerh god fader
tur & comedunt ea per dominum patrem

allmahtigne ðu de bearn ðin’ tvoelf nomv’
omnipotentem qui filium tuum xii. nomi

 genomadest ic halsigo ðec gescæft blafes
nibus nominasti adiuro te creatura panis

ḥ’ðu sie fyhr bernende vid onsettnvngo
ut sis ignis ardens aduersus insidias
divbles 7 flegendo sue gefleg de widirworda god
diabuli & uolatilia sicut fugit asmadeus de

diul se de fleme is from galla fisces ðerh
mon qui fugitiuus est a felle piscis per ra

ra’ ḋone hehengel sue sie aflegedo
phahelem archangelum sic fugantur uo

flegendo frō acrvm usum on noma god fado’ 7 sunv 7 gast
latilia a segitibus nostris. in nomine dei patris et filii et spiritus

halges
sancti12

67v
gabloedsia gemeoduma driht’アクセ userne ðerh ðas
Benedicereigneris domine segitem nostram per hanc
gescæft wætres ðerh bloedsvng ḩ’ ve
creaturam aquæ & per benedictionem quam bene
gabloedsisad ḩ’te sie frō adverto flegendo heoines fygłas
dicimus ut abiciantur uolucres cáeli & aues

12. The abbreviation “sc” is written under line 21 patris; the gloss is to the right of the “sc” under filii.
Prayer over salt & water for demonic possession

Scribe C, beginning stint 5, mixed majuscule and minuscule; rubrics and some initials in red; no gloss.

67v\(^{15}\)
6 † Hic mittatur sal In aqua. Benedixio
7 salis & aquae. oremus.\(^{17}\) dominus uobiscum
8 Deus\(^{18}\) inuictę uirtutis auctor et insepata
9 bilis imperii rex.\(^{19}\) semper magnificus
10 triumphator. qui aduerse dominationes
11 uires se primis. qui inimici rugientis seuitiam
12 superas. quo hostiles nequitas potens ex
13 pugnas. Te domine trementes ac supplices de
14 precamur ac petimus. ut hanc creaturam
15 salis et aquę dignanter accipias. benignus
16 inlustres. piętatis tuę more sanctifices
17 ut ubicumque fuerit aspersa. per in
18 uocationem sancti tui nominis omnis infesta
19 tio inmundi spiritus abiciatur. terrorque
20 uenenosi serpentis procul pellatur. et pre
21 sentia sancti spiritus nobis misericordiam tuam
22 poscentibus ubique adesse dignetur; per

---

13. This concluding line is centered and seems to indicate completion of the set.
14. Same prayer in original collectar, fol. 59r1–13, glossed by Aldred; Corrêa item 653, p. 233; LM A 2689; Deshusses 1455, pp. 474–75.
15. Left margin, vertical dry point ruling clearly visible (white).
16. Lind. has a cross; hard to see due to staining in upper left corner that extends down the margin this far. Title in red(?), heavily oxidized; clearly a different (metallic?) ink than the red of Aldred's field prayers right above, which is not oxidized.
17. Fading or erasure after “or” with space before “dns.” Some stray letter marks above the “or” and the space to the right. I am guessing a standard abbreviation, oremus rather than oratio for the abbreviation mark in part because it fits with the next phrase, e.g., “let us pray,” and “the Lord be with you.”
18. Decorated capital D extending down a line; red, same as title, but not oxidized on this side.
19. Insertion of ac by a different hand: the “a” looks different from Scribe C’s style, though the ink is similar.
15O fol. 59r–59v13

Similar prayer
Scribe O, glossed by Aldred

59r
21 benedictio sal et aqua hic mittat sal in aquam

59v
meg’
god vnf’cvmens meht’ 7 vnasvndradlic. .des lic
1 Deus. . . 21uirtutis auctor. et inseparabilis


cyning 7 symle micildoen sigfesct
. . . 21rex ac semper magnificus triumphator

dv de widirvordes onweldes megna estif’drycges dv de
3 qui aduerse dominationis uires reprimis qui

fiondes byrstante l21 hroeddne of’svidest dv de da fiondlico
4 inimici ruginantis seuitiam superas qui hostiles

woghsfniso mahtig gisehtende dec driht’ frytendo l bibgiende21
5 nequitas potens expugnans te domine trement

7 boensando ve biddað 7 ve givið p’te giscæf
6 es et suplices deprecamus ac petimus. ut creaturam

saltes 7 vetres wyrdelice onsoh dv rvmodlice giinlihta
7 salis et aque dignanter accipias. Benignus inlust

arfæstnis’ ðin ðeave gihalga dv þe sva hwæt bid ð sie
8 res pietatis tuae more sanctifices. ut ubicumque fuer

astrogden ðerh in’ceigninge ðin’ nom’ aelc vnstydvnis26
9 it aspersa per inuocationem tui nominis omnis infesta

20. Rubricated title; unglossed. Two arms with hands in the bottom right corner appear to embrace or point upward to the end of the line.
21. End of line hard to read in the gutter, but “lic” appears below the end of the word.
22. Relying on Lind. reading of damaged corner; inuictae supplied from other versions.
23. Other versions supply imperii here.
24. Above, but no alternate word visible.
25. Goes into margin and below, relying on Lind. reading.
26. The “nis” is written below.
\[\text{des unclenes gastes fro' sie afirr' fyrhto ac att'nes}\]

10 tio inmundi spiritus abiciatur terrorque uenenosi ser

\[\text{nedres farr sie f'drifien 7 ondverdniis' hal' gastes vs miltheart'}\]

11 pentis proculpellatur et presentia sancti spiritus nobis misericordi

\[\text{din biddendvm egbvoer tovosa gimeodvmia}\]

12 am tuam poscentibus ubique adesse dignetur. per Dominum nostrum Iesum.

Differences in 66v from fol. 59v:27

Title on fol. 59r21 “benedictio sal et aqua hic mittat sal in aquā.” Title in LM A 2689 is Hic mittatur sal in aqua, benedictio pariter.

Line 11 above “se primis” is “reprimis” on fol. 59r3

Line 12 quo is qui on fol. 59r4; LM A 2689 is qui

Line 13 [ex]pugnas is expugnans on fol. 59r5; LM A 2689 is expugnas

Line 13 supplices is spelled suplices on fol. 59r6

Line 14 ut banc creaturam is ut creaturam on fol. 59r6 but LM A 2689 has bane

Line 18 [in]uocationem sancti tui nominis, no sancti on fol. 59r9; LM A 2689 has tui sancti nominis

Last line of fol. 59r12 has per dominum nostrum iesum.


Four house blessings [a–d]

Scribe C, continuation of stint 5, mixed majuscule and minuscule; rubrics and red or other colored titles; no gloss.

67v

23 oratio in domo:

24 [a]28 Exaudi29 nos sancte pater omnipotens eternæ deus et

25 mitere dignare angelum tuum de celis

26 qui30 custodiat foueat protegat uisitet31

27 et defendat omnes habitantes in hoc habi

27. Some of the differences in 66v could be errors while copying from 59r, such as se primis, qui, suplices.

But LM similarities suggest that Scribe C at fol. 66v had another exemplar instead of or besides fol. 59r, such as the expugnas, bane, and sancti.

28. Found in original collectar, fol. 59v14–18 (Corrêa 654). Four differences: third word domine; mittere with two “t”s; sanctum in angelum tuum sanctum de celis; per dominum at end. See also Deshusses 1456, p. 475.

29. Large decorated E but faint and oxidized.

30. Stain in corner, damaging qui and et def- on next line.

31. Blotch or stain on -tet.
Adesto domine supplicationibus nostris et hanc domum serenis oculis tua piętatis inlustra. descendat ut in his manufactis habitaculis cum salubritate manentes ipsi tuum semper sint habitaculum. per. ut si qua sunt contraria in hac domo famulo rum tuorum. uel famulii tui auctoritate maies tati tuae pellentur. per. alia Benedic deus omnipotens locum istum. ut sit nobis in eo sanitas. sanctitas et castitas uirtus uictoria et sanctimonia et humilitas. et bonitas et mansuetudo et lenitas. et plenitudo legis. et oboedientia deo patri. hunc locum et super omnes habitantes in eo. per

Additions to house blessing
Scribe M3, left margin, Old English instructions [a]; left bottom and bottom margin, neumes on Latin song texts [b]; bottom right margin [c].

32. Title in red, faint, some oxidization.
33. Found in original collectar, fol. 47v12–17 (Corrêa 597) and fol. 39v19–60v3 (Corrêa 655). Three differences in 597: benedictio versus benedixio spelling of fol. 68; missing in from phrase ut in his manufactis in other two; has tutum in last phrase nisi [tuum] semper. Three differences in 655: 2nd word nobis; spelling of benedictio (but cannot verify because of stain); no tuum as in fol. 68r6 or tutum as in 597. See also Deshusses 1457, p. 475.
34. Large red initial A, extending down a line.
35. Found in original collectar, fol. 60r4–7 (Corrêa 656). Three differences: third word domine; extra phrase instead of ut si qua sunt contraria has ut si qua sunt adversa si qua contraria; in domo famuli tui does not have alternate in hac domo famulorum tuorum. uel famulii tui. See also Deshusses 1458, p. 475.
36. Initial EX, oxidized, extending down a line.
37. Red alia here at the end of 68v7 and also end of 68r10 both faint.
38. Found in original collectar, fol. 47v18–23 (Corrêa 598). Five differences: second word domine; no sanctitas as in line 12 (fol. 47v phrase in eo sanctas et casti- is an insert in line above); has et between virtus and uictoria; hunc semper instead of adsit in line 15; has permaneat as last word after in eo but it is written below as an addition by someone else, probably by the M3 marginal scribe.
39. Initial decorative B, extending down a line.
40. There appears to be a small “i” added above the “u” of hunc, possibly different nib, more like C’s next set of texts below this line.
41. Other things scattered on 47v, near the top, illegible.
[a] left margin midway, with words written into the initial “A” of Adesto.

Ærest halga water
7 salt. 7 siðþan
sing þonne .Antiphona.
Asparges me domine
mid þæm
sealme.
Miserere mei. 7 þis
ne
7. pax huic  collectan. 42
domui
7 deus misereatur.
7 þisne
 collectan. 43

[b] left margin bottom and along bottom margin half way (to bird)
Siðþan þisne Antiphona
Benedic domine
domum istam
et omnes habitantes in eo quia domine dixisti
pax huic domui benedic domine timentes
te pusillos cum maioribus benediti uos
a domino qui fecit celum et terram 44
uel B . . . di nos domine . . . xii . . . 45

c] 47v23 bottom margin, right, under .per. of last prayer
 .per.
ma
ne
at.
.per.

42. Item 597, the ben. domus beginning Adesto Domine supplicationibus into which this marginalia intrudes into the capital A.

43. Three dot insertion mark; the next item beginning Benedic domine deus omnipotens (item 598), above the B at line 18 is marked with a corresponding signe de renvoi set of three dots. Presumably this is to link “and this collect” to the collect beginning at line 18.

44. Barely legible; see reading in Corrêa 598 and by T. J. Brown, 35.

45. Not very legible at all; see reading in Corrêa 598 and by T. J. Brown, 35.
Vesper prayers, three [a–c]; possibly part of sequence with cross memorials (items 18–20). Scribe C, beginning of stint 6, minuscule; rubrics; filled initials, some red; no gloss. Scribe M3 changes and additions on fols. 68r–72v.

[a]

17 or'/Uespertinę laudis officia;\[50\] dominus uobiscum. et cum spu tu\[51\]

18 persoluentes clementiam tuam domine humili prece deposcimus.

19 ut nocturni insidiatoris fraudes. te protegente uincam .per.

[b]

20 Omnipotens\[52\] sempiternę deus\[53\] uespere et mane meredie\[54\] oremus\[55\]

21 maiestatem tuam supliciter deprecamur. ut expulsis
decordibus nostris pecatorum nostrorum tenebris. ad ueram

22 lucem quę christus est nos facies\[56\] peruenire. .per. oremus\[57\]

[c]

24 or/ Deus lumen æternum.\[58\] et splendor siderum. claritas noxium.\[59\]

25 illuminatio et incomprensus\[60\] tenebrarum; da nobis domine

26 noctem hanc dominicam quietam. pacificam. tranquillam

27 et securam ,\[61\] et si qua domine hodie pecata ignoranter uel

28 scienter admissimus. [clementi miseratione repelle. per\[62\]]

46. For similar sets, see LM A 2647–52 and Ratoldus 2170–78.
47. T. J. Brown, 30.
48. M3 changes in Quire IX between fols. 68 and 72 (T. J. Brown, p. 35): 68r20–27, 28 (clementi miseratione repelle. per); 68v4, 15, 23–27; 69r at top (predicamus); 69v7, 24; 69v11, 32; 69v17 (nel memoriam), 28 (cuthberhti), 29 (quesumus); 70v4, 18, 24; 70v2v4; 71v6; 72v16.
49. Added in left margin and below at line 24, probably hand of Scribe C given the style of “r.”
50. Uespertinę laudis prayer found in Ratoldus 2175; Wulfstan Collectar (vol. 2 in Dewick, Leofric Collectar), 564; and Port. Wulstan 1366 for Sunday Vespers; see Deshusses, vol. 1, 1506, p. 489.
51. The dominus vobiscum et cum spu tuo is oxidized rubric. The spu tu (spiritu tuo according to Lind.) but no abbreviation marks in evidence.
52. Large “O” and oversized Omnis in oxidized ink.
53. Omnipotens prayer also found in Ratoldus 2173; LM A 2647; Port. Wulstan 1362 for Vespers Feria V; see Deshusses 1, 1504, p. 488.
54. Correction (M3) of middle “e,” dot under and “i” added above to make meridie.
55. Rubric, oxidized ink.
56. Correction (M3) of “e,” dot under and “a” added above to make facias.
57. Rubric, oxidized ink.
58. Currently unidentified prayer.
59. Correction (M3) of “x,” dot under and “ct” added above to make noctium. The use of noxium in earlier texts left uncorrected by M3 suggests he was selectively interested in the Durham A.IV.19 additional texts.
60. The et incomprenhsa is lined out, possibly by C.
61. Insertion mark with habere. added above (M3).
62. Added by M3.
18. fol. 68[72]v1–7

Memorial of the Holy Cross, two prayers [a–b]  
Scribe C, stint 6 continued, minuscule; no gloss.

68v  
1 an’ Crucem tuam adoramus domine et sanctam recolimus passio  
2 nem qui in te passus est pro nobis miserere nostri; omnis terræ  
3 or’ Respice domine super hanc familiam tuam per qua dominus noster  
4 iesus christus non dubitauit manibus tradit nocentiam ad  
5 cruce subire tortum. per Antiphona et oratio ad crucem.  
6 Pius ac benignus indulge preces quoque suplicium tuorum  
7 libenter exaudi et postulata concede. omnipotens.

18.M3 fol. 68[72]v left margin top addition by M3:

Antiphona.

63. The cross memorials on fol. 68v1–7 and 17–30 do not seem to match 14 September Exaltation of the Cross prayers in other service books, nor are they in the original collectar (see the six prayers to the cross on fol. 42r–21, items 575–80 and compare LM A 1945–49); four pages are missing before item 575 with unknown material. See also Ælfwine, 44–46 (pp. 122–28) and 50 (pp. 131–33) for prayers and offices devoted to the cross.

64. Vertical parallel double line ruling visible in left margin for most of the page. Something written along the top edge of the page, “orr??ns [h]omo,” could be Scribe C’s hand.

65. Left margin, antiphona abbreviation rubric here and oratio abbreviation at line 3 in different ink; now shows as white against dark stain in upper left corner of ms.

66. 68v1–2 Crucem tuam adoramus domine, antiphon in RGP 2: 334 as part of Good Friday (starts at 304); used in the Port. Wulstan i: 749, part of section 744–49 labeled Antiphone ante Crucem decantandae dum deferitur with the elevation of the cross; see also the private prayers in Port. Wulstan, 2: 18–22, with Latin and Old English. A different antiphon with the same incipit is used in the Wulfstan Collectar (Leafric Collectar, 536) for Good Friday at the elevation of the cross: Crucem tuam adoramus domine et sanctam resurrectionem tuam laudamus et glorificamus eccex enim proper crucem uenit gaudium in uniuerso mundo. Ps. Deus miseretur.

67. Possibly added. Lind. follows with Scribe M3’s left margin addition of A. per signum crucis.

68. 68v3–5 Respice domine super hanc familiam, see the Leafric Collectar 129 collect ad tertiam feria V in cena domini, and 169 collect ad tertiam in inventione sancte crucis; Ælfwine item 46, Devotions to the Holy Cross, sect. 18 (ed. Günzel, HBS 108, p. 127); and the Port. Wulstan item 1781, also for Terce at the Invention of Cross.

69. Erasure of one or two characters after tradi, with two minims after.

70. Correction (M3) of nocentiam with dot under “a” and “u” added above to make nocentium. Correction (M3) of ad, underlined with et added above.

71. Lind. adds here the Versicle from M3 left margin addition: V. Adoramus te christe et benedicimus tebi qui per crucem tuam redemisti mundum.

72. Faint, large P now light colored against dark stain; -ius barely visible. Oxidized ink, as with head words below.

73. 68v6–7 Pius ac benignus currently unidentified.

74. M3 marginal addition of last Versicle goes here, presumably. V. Dicite in nationibus dominus regnauit a ligno.

75. See T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 35.
Per signum

Versiculus. Adoramus te
chrístetebi
dicumtebi
quia per crucem
tuamrede
misti mun
dum.

Versiculus. Dicite in
nationibus
dominus regna

19. fol. 68[72]v8–16

Vesper prayers, three [a–c]78
Scribe C, stint 6 continued, minuscule; no gloss.

68v
7       ALIA79
8       Oriatur domine80 nascentibus tenebris aurora iustitia.
9 ut peracto die tibi supliciter gratias agentes etiam
10 mane dignanter respicias uota soluentes. per.81 ALIA
11             concede82 solem83 iustitiae permanere in cordibus nostri
12 ad repellendas tenebras cogitationum. per. ALIA oratio
13 Uespertina oratio84 nostra ascendat ad aures clementiae
tuae domine sancte pater omnipotens æternæ deus. et discendia glori

77. Wormald (Durham Ritual, ed. T. J. Brown, p. 48) has –dicamus but Brown, 35, and my reading have –dicimus.
79. Oxidized Alia here and below at end of lines 10 and 12.
80. 68v8–10 Oriatur evening prayer, see Ratoldus 2170; Leofric Collectar 67, and the Wulfstan Collectar in Leofric Collectar, 564; see also Deshusses, vol. 1, item 1501.
81. Wormald points out (Durham Ritual, ed. T. J. Brown, 48) that Lind. erroneously places here M3 left margin addition: V. Dicite in nationibus dominus regnuit a ligno. It should be at the end of line 7.
82. 68v11–12 Concede evening prayer, in Ratoldus 2171; LM A 2649 but with a different incipit before concede: Tuus est dies domine et tua est vox (see Deshusses, vol. 1, item 1502); also in Leofric Collectar 68 and Wulfstan Collectar, Leofric Collectar, 564.
83. Concede solem in oxidized ink. Final “c” of Concede appears to be added above “d,” in same ink.
84. 68v13–16 Uespertina oratio currently unidentified.
os a benedixio tua. super nos ut hic et in æternum te
auxiliante semper salui esse mereamur. per.

20. fol. 68[72]v17–30

Memorial of the Holy Cross, three prayers [a–c]
Scribe C, stint 6 continued, minuscule; no gloss.

68v
17 Antifonia ad crucem cum oratio.85
18 Adoramus86 te christe benedicimus tibi qui per crucem tuam
redimisti mundum. Versicus dicite in nationibus ALIA oratio87
19 Adesto88 domine deus noster. et quos sancte crucis lætare fecisti
20 honore. eius quoque perpetuis defende subsidis.89 per.
21 Per90 signum crucis91 de inimicis nostris libera nos
22 domine deus noster; Versicus92 omnis terra adorat93 deus psallat tibi
23 or94 Perpetua quesumus95 domine tua pace custodi. ut96 quos sancte
24 crucis lætare fecisti honore. eius quoque perpetuis
defende subsidus. per. ALIA antiphona Ô97 crux benedicta que
25 sola fuisti digna porta98 regem caelorum et dominum.99 omnis terræ
26 or100 Deus qui praeclaro salutifere crucis honore æterne
27 redemptionis gaudia nobis dicasti. tribue quesumus utoalis
28 ligni tuitioni101 ab omnibus semper muniamur aduersis. per

85. Title in different color; Antifonia is faint red; rest in more oxidized ink.
86. “A” of Adoramus not visible, except perhaps some faint lower lines.
87. Oxidized.
88. Semi-decorated capital A, in the brown ink with red coloring.
89. Correction (M3?) with a hooked comma under to add another “i” to make subsidis.
90. Large capital P extending down a line.
91. On the per signum crucis antiphon, see M3 addition in margin, noted above.
92. V is faint; “o” of next word is darkened, either filled in or corrected.
93. Correction (M3) added “te” above end of adorat to make adorat te deus.
94. Barely visible.
95. Opening two words very faint; relying on Lind.; assume different ink.
96. Correction (C or M3?): ut lined out.
97. Alia antiphona oxidized, faint; “O” appears to be in a different color, is faint. Perhaps the scribe was running out of room and declined to start a new line.
98. Correction: M3 added “re” above to make portare.
99. Four dots here may indicate an insertion or abbreviation, possibly V for versicus. omnis terrae that follows; perhaps added by Scribe M3, similar to omnis terrae at line 2.
100. Barely visible.
101. Word broken up, possibly due to erasure, especially after the “i”: “tu i tione.”
Memorials: [a] Archangel Michael; [b] Blessed Virgin Mary; [c] Michael, with other angels; [d] John the Baptist; [e] Peter; [f] Andrew; [g] Sts Peter, Paul, Andrew; [h] All Saints; [i] Paul; [j] John the Evangelist; [k] confessors; [l] a martyr; [m] all apostles and saints; [n] common of all saints.

Scribe C, continuation of stint 6, minuscule; no gloss; large capitals, some colored in.

Scribe M3 addition of Cuthbert at 69v28 as well as other corrections.

68v
31 [a] antifona 7 oratio ad mihae. .
32 in adiutorium populo dei. V IN conspectu angelorum

69r
1 or/ Da quesumus domine omnipotens deus beati mihaelis archangeli honore sum
2 mo proficere. ut cuius in terris gloriandi precibus adiueuemur in caelis.
3 or/ [b] Maria uirgo semp er lactare quae meruisti christum portare caeli et terræ conditorem. et de tuo utero protulisti mundi saluatum
5 V/ defusa est gratia in labis tuis propterea bene dit xe. oremus
6 Famulorum tuorum quesumus domine delictis ignosce. ut qui placere
de actibus nostris non ualemus. genetricis filii tui domini nostri iesu

102. Archangel Michael, [a] 68v31–69r2 and [c] 69r13–19, see: original collectar festival of St. Michael the Archangel iii kal. oct. (29 September), Corrêa items 437–447; item 444 (fol. 34v1–3) is a close match to [a], also in Port. Wulstan items 1621–1641, item 1627 (Matins); Leofric Collectar, 236–240.
103. Oxidized ink for title has faded.
104. The an mihael also oxidized ink.
105. Both letters have extenders below the line.
106. In top margin, with signe de renvoi indicating insertion into line 2 (Scribe M3?).
107. Marginal insertions of “or,” “V,” “an,” on this page appear to be in brown ink.
108. Space after honore, either due to a pre-existing stain or erasure.
109. Two dot insertion mark above ā, pointing to predicamus top margin correction (M3).
110. Compare to very similar wording in original collectar, item 444 (fol. 34v1–3); Port. Wulstan item 1627 for matins.
111. Blessed Virgin Mary 69r3–13 [b], see in the original collectar: the Assumption of Mary, xvi kal. sept., (15 August), Corrêa items 407–412, item 415 matches 69r6–8 (and Port. Wulstan 1548–1589); the Nativity of Mary, vi id. sept (8 September) items 424–416 with 412 matching 69r10–13, where it is followed by Michael material as here. Mary Clayton, The Cult of the Virgin Mary in Anglo-Saxon England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 64–65 compares this text to the Leofric Collectar (4–5) and Cotton Tiberius A.iii; she also has a translation of this prayer (p. 64 n. 47).
112. Erasure after conditorem, two or three characters.
113. Faint, oxidized.
114. Correction (M3) dot below second “e” and “i” inserted above to make genetricis.
Christi intercessione saluémur. per. antiphona\textsuperscript{15} Beata mater et in nupta uirgo gloriosa regina mundi. oremus\textsuperscript{16}

Concede nos famulos tuos quesumus domine deus perpetua mentis et corporis sanitate gaudère. et gloriosa beatae mariae semper uriginis intercessione. a presenti liberari tristitia. et futura perfriui lætitia. per. \textsuperscript{17} antifona de mihaelo archangelo\textsuperscript{18}

Mihael gabriel raphael cherubin et serafin qui non cessant clamare cotidie dicentes dignus es domine accipere gloriam.\textsuperscript{19}

V/ In conspectu angelorum psallam tibi; oremus\textsuperscript{20}

Deus qui miro ordine angelorum misteria hominumque dispensas. concede propitius. ut quibus tibi ministrantibus in cælo semper asistitur. ab his in terra nostra uita muniat ur.

antiphona Tu\textsuperscript{21} idem uocabitur nomen eius et in natiuitate eius multi gaudebunt. Versiculus\textsuperscript{22} ipse præbunt ante illum in spiritu 7 in uirtute heliæ\textsuperscript{23}

Omnipotens\textsuperscript{24} sempiterne deus da cordibus nostris illam tuarum rectitudine semitarum. quam beati iohannes bapistæ in deserto uox clamantes et\textsuperscript{25} docuit. per. [e] antiphona Beatus\textsuperscript{26} petrus apostolos uidit sibi christum occurrere adorans eum et ait. domine quo uadit uenio roma iterum cruciﬁgi. antiphona Tu\textsuperscript{27} es petrus et super petram ædificabo eclesiam meam et portæ inferni non peruaebunt ad uersus eam. Versus IN omne terram exiuit Deus qui beato petro apostolo tuo. conlatis clauibus regni cælestis animas ligandi atque soluendi ponti ficatad tradidisti. suscipe propitius preces nostras quesumus domine auxilium ut a pecatorum nostrorum nexibus libere

69v

Andreas\textsuperscript{28} christi famulus dignus deo apostolus germanus

---

\textsuperscript{15} Oxidized, not faint.
\textsuperscript{16} Faint, red.
\textsuperscript{17} For fol. 69r17–19: original collectar, Corrêa item 442, LM A 1741, Port. Wulstan 162 (Vespers).
\textsuperscript{18} Red title, oxidized toward end.
\textsuperscript{19} The gloriam extends into the margin, but appears to be Scribe C's hand.
\textsuperscript{20} Oxidized.
\textsuperscript{21} The first three letters of Iohannes are faint, probably in rubric ink.
\textsuperscript{22} Light brown.
\textsuperscript{23} Versicule sentence seemingly written a bit smaller, not exactly lined up with gaudebunt.
\textsuperscript{24} Oxidized.
\textsuperscript{25} Correction (M3) with dot under “e” of clamantes and “i” above to make clamantis; et has dot under, with “e” above to make edocuit.
\textsuperscript{26} The “an” abbreviation of antiphonas in lighter brown; B of Beatus enlarged and colored in.
\textsuperscript{27} The “an” abbreviation of antiphonas in lighter brown (may be oxidized); T of Tu enlarged and colored in.
\textsuperscript{28} Both the “an” and the “A” of Andreas are now white against the dark stain in the upper corner of
petri et in passione socius. Andreas uero rogabat
ad populum ne impedirent pa\textsuperscript{9}sionem\textsuperscript{129} eius;
Maiestatem\textsuperscript{130} tuam domine supliciter exoramus ut sicut ecles
siæ tuæ beatus andræas apostolus tuus exstitit predicator
et rector. ita apud te sit pro nobis perpetuis\textsuperscript{133} intercessor. per
7\textsuperscript{112} Nimis\textsuperscript{133} honorati sunt amici tui deus nimis conforre\textsuperscript{144}
or [g] Deus qui nos\textsuperscript{135} per beatos apostolos tuos petrum
et paulum et andream ad cognitionem tui nominis uenire\textsuperscript{136}
tribuisti. da nobis eorum gloriam sempiternam. et proficen
do celebrare. et celebrando proficere. per. [h] ad omnis sanctis\textsuperscript{137}
Corpora\textsuperscript{138} sanctorum in pace sepulta sunt 7 uiuent nomina eorum / in
æternum\textsuperscript{139}
[i] Sanctæ paule apostoli predictor ueritatis et doctor
gentium intercede pro nobis ad deum qui te elegit.
Nimis\textsuperscript{133} honorati sunt amici tui deus nimis; de paulo apostolus\textsuperscript{141}
predicatione docuisti; da quesumus. ut cuius natalitia\textsuperscript{143} coli
mus huius apud te patrocinia. sentiamus. per. /cubuit\textsuperscript{144}
Hic est iohannes\textsuperscript{145} dilectus discipulus qui supra pectus domini in
cena re
Hic est iohannes amator. caritatis et custos matris eius.
obis orcha\textsuperscript{146} reserasti. presta quesumus. ut quod ille in
auribus excellenter infûdit. intellegentiæ competenis
tæ eruditione capiamus. per. [k] ad confessoribus\textsuperscript{147}
the ms.
129. The “s” added, probably by Scribe C.
130. The “or” abbreviation and “M” are light colored against dark; “or” is barely visible.
131. Correction by Scribe C or M3, with dot under “i” and “v” above to make perpetuis.
132. In left margin beside lines 6 ½ to 7 ½ on three lines, light colored against dark: ad álpos\textsuperscript{9}tolos.
133. Large dark capital “N” with left extender going down a line.
134. Abbreviation mark above the “i” that looks like a rounded check mark similar to that above the “p”
of predicare above.
135. Fading on this first line through Deus qui nos.
136. This caret mark is partly over the “i.”
137. Oxidized ink for this heading.
138. “Cor” of Corpora in red, faded.
139. The eorum in æternum added into right margin, small and stacked with “i’ ætnu” abbreviation above
“eo” abbreviation. The eorum looks like it could be Scribe C, but the in æternum looks like it could be M3.
140. The “v” is red but accent abbreviation mark above it looks brown.
141. Oxidized ink for this heading; title belongs above at line 13.
142. The or/ Ds cuius in red and faded; “or” not clear at all.
143. The l memoriam added above by M3.
144. Added above, smaller, angled line above to set off from previous line.
145. Red and partially oxidized ink for incipit.
146. Line under and two dots over as correction to omit “in” (by Scribe C or M3?).
147. Oxidized color ink for this heading.
25 an/ iustum deduxit dominus per uias rectas et ostendit illi regnum dei.
26 V/ Amauit eum dominus et ornauit eum stola glorię induit.
27 or/ Exaudì domine preces nostras quas in sancti confessoris tui
28 atque pontificis Nomen\textsuperscript{49} comemoratione deferimus.
29 tibi\textsuperscript{50} meritis. ab omnibus nos absolue pecatis. per. [I] ad mætryr
30 or/ Presta\textsuperscript{51} quesumus omnipotens deus ut intercedente beato Nomen mær
31 tyré tuo a cunctis aduersitatis muniamur
32 in corpore et\textsuperscript{52} a prauis cogitationibus nos munde
33 mur in mente. per

7or
1 or/ Adesto domine suplicationibus nostris [m] ad omnes apostolos\textsuperscript{53}
et apostolicis intercessionibus confidentes. nec minas ad\textsuperscript{154}
uersantium. ne\textsuperscript{155} ullo perturbemur in cursu; per.
4 or/ Deus qui per gloriosa bella certaminis ad\textsuperscript{156}acertaminis eorum commemorationem lætitia gaudere
6 ut quorum gaudemus triumphis prouocemur exemplis. per
7 an/\textsuperscript{158} iustorum autem animæ in manu dei sunt 7 non tanget illos tor.’ mor.’

Versiculus gloria 7 honor\textsuperscript{59}

8 or/ Adesto domine suplicationibus nostris per intercessionem omnium
sanctorum tuorum. [n] commone\textsuperscript{160}r omnibus sanctis cantitut.
10 or/ Concede quesumus omnipotens deus ut sancta\textsuperscript{161} nouem ordinibus
angelerum
11 et archangelorum patriarcharum et prophetarum et
tsanta dei genetrix maria sancti\textsuperscript{162}que tui apostoli mætys
22. fols. 70r–71v

Memorials for the Dead [a–j], continues from memorials above (21) and continues below following memorials (23) at the bottom of fols. 71r, 71v, and 72r [k–m].

Scribe C, end of stint 6, minuscule; no gloss.

15 or/ Deus consolationis et pacis respite propitius [a] ad mortuos plur'm /

16 ad precem familiae tuae. et da domine uirtutum ut animæ

17 famulorum famularumque tuarum. qui et que. ab adam

18 usque in odiernum' diem. de hac luce migrauerunt et

19 baptizati siue confessi fuerunt. et in fide catholica

20 perseuerauerunt. et de eorum rebus æclesiae dei ditauuent

21 et de quorum ele[mo]nis sumus consolati. quesumus domine ut in si

22 nibus abrahæ 7 issac et iacob. in illa sanctorum tuorum

23 sede requiescant. mox'que ex mortuis resuscitati

24 tur placeant in regione uiuorum. Versiculus laetamini in domino . . .

25 or/ Presta quesumus domine ut intercedentibus omnium [b] oratio.

26 meritis qui orecontinguius puro corde capiamur. per.

27 an/Uia iustorum recta facta est et iter sanctorum preparatum est. versiculus

lætamini in domino.
28 or/ Sanctorum suffragia\textsuperscript{175} imploremus ut a cunctis domine
29 liberemur offensis. Per [c] Alia oratio\textsuperscript{176}
30 or/ Adesto domine suplicationibus nostris quas in sanctorum
31 tuorum commemorationem deferimus ut qui
32 nostræ iustitiae fiduciam non habemus eorum qui tibi.

\textit{70v}

1 placuerunt meritis adiuuemur. per. [d] ad mortuos plurimos
2 Dilexi quoniaquam. ad dominum leuaui. de profundis. confitebor.
3 domine in toto corde meo. \ldots 7. \ldots \textsuperscript{177}
4 Et sicut in adam omnes moriuntur ita et in chri\textit{st}o i\textit{es}u omnes
5 uiiificantur unus enim quisque in ordine suo in quo
6 uocatus est in eo permaneat. Responsus Requiem æternam dona eis
7 domine 7 lux perpetua lucae eis. Antiphona Audiui uocem de caelo
dicentem beati mortui\textsuperscript{179}
8 In\textsuperscript{180} memoria æterna erit iustus ob auditu\textsuperscript{181} mala non timebit
9 pretiosa est in conspectu domini mors sanctorum eius.
10 Redimet dominus animas seruorum suorum et non derelinquet
11 or/ Fidelium deus omnium conditor\textsuperscript{182} et re [e] plurimorum defunctorum\textsuperscript{183}
demptor. animabus famulorum famularum\textsuperscript{184}
tuarum remisionem cunctorum tribue pecatorum. ut in
12 dulgentiam quam semper optauerunt.\textsuperscript{184} piis suplicatio
13 nibus consequantur. per [f] IN nocte domine 7 in sequente noc\textsuperscript{185}
14 Lauda\textsuperscript{186} anima mea. requiem æternam. iustorum te canitur
15 autem\textsuperscript{187} anima in manu dei sunt 7 non tanget illos. gloria 7 honor
16 or/ Animas precamur quas creasti domine suscipere iubeas
17 in regnum tuum. et in sinu abrahæ collocare facias. 7
18 or/ Deus uita uiuentium. spes mori\textsuperscript{en} [-] [g] Alia oratio ad mortuorum\textsuperscript{188}

\textsuperscript{175} Lind. has only one “f” in suffragia.
\textsuperscript{176} Oxidized ink.
\textsuperscript{177} This entire section from the title Ad mortuos plurimos through the end of this line is barely legible, due to fading and discoloration of the ink.
\textsuperscript{178} Margin contains three lines, white against dark stain: lectio réoi [?] toï [?]. Lind. has just lectio. . . .
\textsuperscript{179} Response and antiphon lines 6–7 in smaller lettering, as earlier. “R” and “An” abbreviations oxidized.
\textsuperscript{180} “In” faded red.
\textsuperscript{181} Lind. has an abbreviation mark ’ after the auditus, but there is no abbreviation mark in the ms.
\textsuperscript{182} This prayer, Fidelium deus omnium conditor (fol. 70v11–15) occurs also in Ælswine 76.39.
\textsuperscript{183} Oxidized title.
\textsuperscript{184} Reduplicating syllable not recorded by Lind., who corrects to optauerunt.
\textsuperscript{185} Title, oxidized, continues on next line end below. (In nocte domine et in sequente nocte canitur).
\textsuperscript{186} “Lau-” in red(?) , barely visible.
\textsuperscript{187} See fol. 70r7 above for same line.
\textsuperscript{188} Title oxidized.
tium. salus omnium in te sperantium; presta domine propitious
ut animae famulorum famularum^que tuarum
a noxis\textsuperscript{89} mortalitatis tenebris absolvete. in perpe
tua cum sanctis tuis luce laetentur; per \[h\] Alia oratio ad mor\textsuperscript{90}
ort/ Ascendant\textsuperscript{91} ad te domine preces nostras intercedentibus
omnibus sanctis agminibus angelorum. ut animæ
famulorum tuorum famularum^que tuarum.
quorum et quarum nomina hic sunt conscripta. gaudia
æterna suscipiant.\textsuperscript{92} ut quos fecisti adoptio
nis participes. iubeas hereditatis tuae. esse consortes. per
[i] ad unum mortuum\textsuperscript{93}

Deus\textsuperscript{94} cuius misericordia non est numerus. suscipe pro anima
famuli tui Nomen preces nostras lucem laetiamque in regione
sanctorum tuorum\textsuperscript{95} in pontificum societate concedas per.
Deus qui in ter apostolicos sacerdo [j] Alia oratio\textsuperscript{96}
tes famulum tuum Nomen pontificale fecisti dig
nitate uiare.\textsuperscript{97} presta quesumus. ut eorum quoque perpetuo adgregetur
consortio. per

Memorials or Suffrages drawn from Masses: Holy Trinity [a]; birth of
one Confessor [b]; one Martyr [c]; many Martyrs [d]; one Virgin Martyr [e];
vigil of one Apostle or Martyr [f]; and common (birth) of one Apostle or
Martyr [g].

\textsuperscript{89} Correctio (M3) underlining noxis and adding above nostrae.
\textsuperscript{90} Title oxidized.
\textsuperscript{91} Compare similar prayer for the dead below, fol. 72r27–29, found also in LM A 2186. The version
here (70v26–31) contains elements (bold) not found in the version below or in other service books, including
Deshusses and Vogel compilations: Ascendant ad te domine preces nostras intercedentibus omnibus sanctis
agminibus angelorum. ut animæ famularum tuorum famularum^que tuarum. quarum et quarum nomina
hic sunt conscripta. gaudia æterna suscipiant. ut quos fecisti adoptionis participes. iubeas hereditatis tuae. esse
consortes. per.
\textsuperscript{92} Space between æterna and suscipiant for unknown reasons; may be erasure.
\textsuperscript{93} Dark oxidized title with wear and tear, some letters not visible; relying on Lind.
\textsuperscript{94} The “or” and D in different ink, faded.
\textsuperscript{95} Gap in tuorum because of patch in the ms., also in next two lines, “in ter” (inter) and “famulum”
(famulum). Patch glued on to this side (recto).
\textsuperscript{96} Title oxidized.
\textsuperscript{97} Correction (M3) adding “ge” above and dot below “a” to make vigere.
Scribe C, stint 7, part majuscule and part minuscule,\textsuperscript{198} rubrics and most initials in red to 74v6;\textsuperscript{199} no gloss.

71r

\[23a\] Holy Trinity\textsuperscript{200}

missa de sancte trinite; \textit{Antiphona}\textsuperscript{201} benedicta sit sancta trinitas

atque indiuisa unitas confitemini ei quia fecit nobiscum misericordiam svam;

Omnipotens sempitern\ae\ deus qui dedisti nobis / ps.’ benedicamus patrem;\textsuperscript{202}

famulis tuis in confessione uere fi dei\textsuperscript{203} etern\ae

tritis gloriam agnoscre. et in potentia maies
tatis adorare unitatem quesumus eiusdem fidei firmi
tate ab omnibus semper muniamur aduersus. per
lectio epistola beati pauli apostoli ad corinteos\textsuperscript{204}
Fratres,\textsuperscript{205} Gratia domini nostri iesu christi; et caritas dei;
et communicatio sancti spiritus; sit et cum omnibus nobis;
sequentia sancti euangelium secundum. iohannem:\textsuperscript{207}
In illo tempore; dixit iesus discipulis sui; Cum autem
uenerit paraclitus quem ego mittam uobis
a patre spiritum ueritatis qui a patre procedit;
ille testimonium perhibebit de me; Et uos testi
monium perhibebitis qui ab initio mecum estis;
Hec locutus sum uobis; ut non scandalizemini;
abque synagogis facient uos; Sed uenit
hora; ut omnis qui interficit uos; arbitretur
se obsequium prestare deo; et hec facient;

\textsuperscript{198} Minuscule used to set off verses from majuscule text.

\textsuperscript{199} New writing campaign evident in different nib, lighter ink, lines slanted down to right; red ink used for the rubrics is not oxidized as in previous section.

\textsuperscript{200} For the opening prayer \textit{Omnipotens sempitern\ae\ deus qui dedisti nobis} (71r10–14) and the \textit{ad complendum} (71v4–6), see Fulda 301–302, 1779, 1784; Ratoldus CCCLXV, items 2035 and 2040; LM A 1920 and 1923; Deshusses, greg. 1806 and 1809; see also \AElfwine 76.1 for the opening prayer and 49 for the Office of the Trinity.

\textsuperscript{201} Majuscule title and in red.

\textsuperscript{202} End of antiphon begun on line 8; all of the antiphon is in minuscule compared to rest of text. Abbreviation ps’ for psalmus.

\textsuperscript{203} Gap between “fi” and “dei” because of patch, glued on to this side.

\textsuperscript{204} Rubric.

\textsuperscript{205} Large initial “F” and all three letters \textit{Frs} in red.

\textsuperscript{206} Left marginal addition, probably Scribe C minuscule, beginning between lines 17–18 extending to top of 19, 4 lines of text: A: domine dominus / noster quad / V: quoniam ele/aeta est. Should follow end of 17.

\textsuperscript{207} Whole line red.
28 [22k]\textsuperscript{109} Animabus quesumus domine famulorum famularumque taurvm.
29 misericordiam concede perpetuam ut eis proficiant.
30 in æternum quod in te sperauerunt 7 credierunt per.

71v\textsuperscript{110} [23a cont]
1 quia non nouerunt patrem ne que me; Sed hæc locu
2 tus sum uobis; ut cum uenerit hora eorum reminis
3 camini; quia ego dixi uobis; of:\textsuperscript{211} benedictus sit deus. V: deus deus meus
ad te delv\textsuperscript{212}
4 ad c’ Proficiat nobis ad salutem in corpori s et\textsuperscript{213}
5 animæ domine deus huius sacramenti susceptio et
6 sempiteræ sanctæ trinitatis confessio. per.
[23b Confessor]\textsuperscript{214}
7 In natale unius confessoris Antiphona Statuit ei dominus testamentum.
Antiphona Os iusti medita\textsuperscript{215}
8 Exaudi domine preces nostras quas in sancti confes
9 soris tui. illius. atque pontificis solemnitate de
10 ferimus. ut qui tibi digne meruit famulari eius
11 intercedentibus meritis ab omnibus nos absolue
12 lectio libri. sapientiæ\textsuperscript{216} l peccatis. per
13 Ecce sacerdos magnus qui in diebus suis placuit
14 deo; et inuentus est iustus; in tempore iræ
15 cundie; factus est reconciliatio; Non est in
16 uentus similis illi; qui consueraret legem excelsi;

\textsuperscript{208} A line across the page divides a section of three lines below in minuscule, labeled in the margin with a cross + post col/mon’ (post-communion) in majuscule. A signe de renvoi after facient in right margin (.) extends down a bit. Lind. places the added text after fol. 71v3 as if it belongs with this mass text, but it belongs with the memorial for the Dead (QIX/X.22).

\textsuperscript{209} CCCC 422 (Red Book of Darley) p. 468 has a similar prayer, preceded by one matching 22L below.

\textsuperscript{210} Red, widely spaced and large letters written in upper margin near the top: in nomine domine cān, unclear whose hand.

\textsuperscript{211} The “of” and following V in red.

\textsuperscript{212} Offertory and Versicle in minuscule, runs into right margin and gutter. Last word Lind. has leuaui, but it looks like “delv” with abbreviation mark over the “l” (marred by bleed through of capital “D” on recto).

\textsuperscript{213} Ad communion abbreviation in left margin in red; large P of Proficiet also in red. Gap between corpori and final “s” due to patch in ms, also creating gap in line above between Offertory and Versicle.

\textsuperscript{214} LM A 1888–1893 for one confessors has different prayers, but the two here can be found in specific confessors masses in other service books. The opening prayer Exaudi domine (71v8–11) is in Fulda 119 for Pope Leo, item 842; Ælfwine 73.20, collect for apostles; and in the Gelasian Sacramentary, In natali sancti Murecci confessoris, xvii Kal. Feb. (ed. Wilson, p. 162). The closing prayer Sumentes domine gaudia (72r13–16) is in the Gelasian Sacramentary, In natali sanctae Agnetis virginis de passione sua, xii Kal. Feb. (ed. Wilson, p. 164). Both prayers occur together in Ratoldus 1566 and 1568 for Natale Sancti Samsonis.

\textsuperscript{215} Title and “A” red, faded; antiphons in minuscule.

\textsuperscript{216} Title very faint; Lind. has “lec. libri. sapientiæ.”
Ideo iure iuranda; fecit illum dominus crescere
in plebem suam; Benedictionem omnium gentium
dedit illi; et testamentum suum confirmavit
super capud eius; Cognouit eum in benedictionibus
suis; confirmavit illi misericordiam suam et
inuenit gratiam coram oculis domini; Magnifica
uit eum in conspectu regum; et dedit illi coro
coram gloriae; Statuit illi testamentum sem
piternen; et dedit illi sacerdotium magnum;
et beatificavit illum in gloria; Funce sacer

Animabus quesumus domine famulorum famularumque
quarum illius.
plene oratio proficat suplicantium ut eas et a peccatis
exuas et tuæ redemptionis facias esse participes. per.

[3b cont]
dotio; et habere laudem in nomine ipsius
et offerre illi incensum dignum;
in odorem suavitatis: † nim δε τὸ γοῦρη γῆρ
on nioða

ecce sacerdos magnus V/ Non est inuentus. Alia inuenit daut ser'
Sequentia sancti evangelium secundum matheum
In illo tempore: Dixit iesus discipulis suis; quis
putas est fidelis seruus et prudens quem
constituit dominus supra familiam suam ut
det illis cybum in tempore; beatus seruus
ille; quem conuenerit dominus eius; inuenerit
sic facientem; Amen dico uobis; quoniam omnia

217. A short curving line under sacer-; next three lines added in minuscule. In left margin: “+ ad complendum.” Lind. places after the reading, line 72r23 suavitatis where there is another cross, signe de renvoi. The text of the ad complendum starts with a large decorative A extending down a line; see LM A 2186, mass for the dead and compare to 70v26–30 above.
219. Stain in upper corner. Large patched hole below, in right side of lines 2–3, which the scribe works around. Four other patched holes on this page, with patch glued on from this side (recto).
220. Scribe C’s Old English note shows a Northumbrian dialect with nioða (see T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 29–30, 54). Scribe C explains that the gospel text below should be put here (e.g., the Matthew passage on fol. 75v should precede the R, V, A), but unclear whether before or after the postcommunion prayer on fol. 71v27–29.
221. Red R, V and A in this line; whole line in minuscule.
222. Red incipit In illo tempore; large initial “I” extends down two lines.
223. Correction (Scribe C?) with descender of “s” extending down between quoniam and omnia as an insertion mark.
12 bona sua constituet eum; communion: beatus seruus qui
13 ad c Summentes domine gaudia sempiternæ par
14 ticipatione sacrae: præsta quessu
15 mus ut beati illius confessoris tui cuius nata
16 litia colimus precibus adiuuemur. per.
[23c Martyr]
17 Ad natale unius martyrum;
18 A/ lætabitur iustus cum Ps/ exaudi deus orationem meam .
19 Deus qui nos beati illius martyr tui annua
20 solemnitate lætiticas. concede pro
21 pitius ut cuius natalitia colimus etiam
22 auras imitemur. per. lectio liber sapientiæ
23 Beatus uir qui in sapientia sua mora
24 bitur; et qui in iustitiæ meditabitur.
25 et in sensu cogitabatur circumspectionem
26 dei; Cybault illum panem uiæ et intellectus:

27 Alia [22m] Ascendant ad te domine preces nostræ. et animas
28 famularumque tuarum. gaudia æterna suscipiant
29 ut quos fecisti adoptionis participes. iubeas his
30 ditatis tuæ. esse consortes. per.

72v [23c cont.]
1 et aqua sapientiæ salutaris potauit illum

224. The beatus seruus qui is in minuscule.
225. The “ad c” in left margin very faint, red.
226. LM A 1872–1877 for a martyr has different prayers with some similar phrasing; more exact match in Ælfwine 73.30 for opening prayer Deus qui nos beati illius martyr (72r19–22), also in Ratoldus 1645 and LM A 1633, for St. Eusbius.
227. Title line in red, faint; next line small letters; red for “A” and “ps.”
228. Line 18 antiphon in minuscule. Large gap between exau- and –di due to a large patch in ms, which also affects next line, m- ærtys.
229. Large D extends down one line.
230. Large decorated B (red letter with brown fill) extends down one line.
231. Correction with an insertion mark between “b” and “i,” letters above are blotched, illegible.
232. Curving line marking end of reading continued on verso; four lines below in minuscule are Alia prayers for the dead that Lind. erroneously inserts after the reading finishes at fol. 72v5.
234. Large A descends below; lines 28–30 hanging indent; minuscule. Ascendant ad te (a common opening, cf. LM A 2634, Fulda 2346) is found in Fulda 454 (item 2556) and 455 (item 2562) in masses for dead but also above at fol. 70v26, somewhat different.
235. Correction with “v” inserted above “o” to make famu[lorum].
236. Word partici- -pes broken due to patch in lower margin.
237. Last, back, page of quire IX, worn and faint; relying on Lind. for some readings. Also, large patched holes, one near the left side of lines 2–3, around which the scribe wrote; another mars the middle of lines 18–19; two others are in the left and bottom margins.
et firmabitur in illo et non fiatetur;
et continent illum et non confundetur;
et exaltabit illum; apud proximos suos; Et	nomine æterno hereditabit illum. dominus deus noster;—
6 A/38 Os iusti meditabitur et sapient' V/ Lex dei eius in corde ipsius.

Sequentia [sancti] euangelium secundum iohannem. 239
In illo tempore; dixit iesus discipulis suis; Amen Amen.
dico uobis; nisi granum frumenti cadens
in terram mortuum fuerit; ipsum solum ma
net; Si autem mortuum fuerit; multum fruc
tum affert; qui amat animam suam; perdet
eam; et qui odit animam suam in hoc mundo in
uitam æternam custodi eam; Si quis mihi
ministrat; me sequatur; Et ubi sum ego;
ilic et minister meas erit. Si quis240 ministra
uerit; honorificabit eum; pater meas;
Sumpis domine sacramentis communion qui uult uenire post me. 241
quesusmus ut intercedente beato illo 242 martyre tuo
ad redemptionis æternæ quiesumus proficiamus augmentum; per.
[23d Several Martyrs] 243
In. . . . . . . . . . . . . . martyrum 244 A/ iudicant sancti gentes
7 dominantur popvlis regnauit dominus deus illorum in perpetuum; p;
salus autem iustorum 245
solempnia recensentes meritis ipsorum
. . . . et precibus. per. Lectio epistola . . . ad hebreos 247
Fratres 248 sancti ludibria et uerbera experti; insuper
et uincula et carceres. 249

---

238. A and V in red, text in minuscule.
239. Very faded red title line. Lind. has only seq. . . euangel' sc'dm iohannem.
240. Correction (M3) with insertion mark and mihi written above.
241. The "co" in red; minuscule for text. Lind. places this communion prayer incipit after the Sump-
tis . . . augmentum text on lines 18–20.
242. Correction with insertion dot between words and "illo" above.
243. LM A 1878–1882 mass for several martyrs has different prayers, but the opening prayer Presta quesu-
mus omnipotens deus ut beatorum martyrum occurs in LM A 1823 in the mass for St. Felicity, also in Ratoldus
1942; ad complendum (fol. 73r19–22) not currently identified; see also Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 3, fo. 243.
244. Title (red) illegible. This is all that Lind. has and should probably read in natale plurimorum mar-
tyrum. Red "A" then small brown ink minuscule for antiphon end of line 21 through 22.
245. Antiphon all in small letters. the "p." abbreviation in line 22, has accent mark over.
246. Capital "P" extends down a line and is brown, not red.
247. This is all that Lind. has. Before precibus, the previous word ends in–mur, probably protegamur
(based on same prayer in LM 1823). Lectio title in red.
248. "F" and possibly other letters of Fratres appears to be in red.
249. Relying on Lind. for lines 26–27 (the latter a half line starting midway).
Quires IX-X - 273

73r  [Quire X]

1 lapidati sunt; secti sunt; temptati sunt; in occasione
2 gladii mortui sunt; Circumierunt in melotis in pel
3 libus caprinis; egentes angustiati afflicti; quibus
4 dignus non erat mundus; in solitudinibus errantes
5 et in montibus et in spelunctis et in cauernis terrę
6 et hii omnes testimonio fidei probati; inuenti sunt
7 in christo iesu domino nostro; R iustorum animae in manu dei sunt
V/ visi sunt
8 Seq' sancti euangeli secundum lucam
9 In illo tempore; dixit iesus discipulis suis; ponite ergo
10 in cordibus uestrīs; non premeditari; quemadmodem
11 respondeatis; ego enim dabo uobis os et sapientiam
12 cui non poterunt resistere et contradicere omnes ad
13 uersarii uestri; trademini autem a parentibus et
14 fratribus et cognatis et amicis. et morte afficient
15 ex uobis; Et eritis odio omnibus hominibus. propter
16 nomen meum; et capillis de capite uestro non peribit.
17 In patientia uestra: possidebitis animas uestrās.
18 of/ exultabant sancti in gloria letabuntur. R iustorum animae in manu;
19 ad com/ Repleti domine martyrum celebritate sanctorum
20 quesumus ut te semper in eorum commemoratione
21 laudemus et tuam semper misericordiam his
22 depreciationibus consequamur. per.
23 Da quesumus omnipotens deus ut qui beata A/ di. . .

250. Quire break shows wear on both 72v and 73r, with parts illegible. The singlet fol. 73 is very thick, and shiny on the recto.
251. Relying on Lind. for words in upper right corner with staining, and elsewhere on fol. 73, especially down the right side, faint due to wear and tear as first page of quire X.
252. Lines 1–2, see Leofric Collectar 325–26.
253. Lind. has just “hi” but I see two minims.
254. Red letters R and V, minuscule text.
255. See Leofric Collectar 324 and 325 for this responsory.
256. Small letters, barely legible.
257. Very washed out red.
258. Title in red.
259. Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 3, fo. 242; this line appears in the mass for one martyr in Tolhurst.
260. Line 18 texts in minuscule.
261. The opening prayer, Da quesumus omnipotens deus ut qui beata (73r23–25) has generic similarities in many commune sanctorum prayers; the post-communion prayer (74r8–10), is found in the Ælfwine Prayerbook 73.72 for the same purpose.
262. Very faint red; Lind. has only In . . . uirginis.
263. Red “A” and then initial lower case “d”; minuscule after that, virtually illegible; Lind. does not have anything.
illius uirginis uel martyr is tue natalicia celebra
mus et annua solemnitate letemur et... ...264

73v265
... amur exemplo.266 per lectio liber sapientiae267
Quasi cedrus exaltus268 sum in libano; et quasi
cypressus in montem sion; quasi palma exal
tum sum in cades; et quasi plantatio rosa in
hiericho; quasi oliua speciosa in campis; et
quasi plantanus exaltata sum iuxta aquam in pla
tes; Sicut canamomum et aspaltum; aromati
zans odorem dedi; quasi myrra electa; dedi
suauitatem odoris; R/ dilexisti iustitiam 7 odisti iniquitatem.269
... ngeli secundum matheum.270

In271 illo tempore; dixit iesus discipulis suis parabolam
hanc; Simile est regnum celorum decem uirginibus
que accipientes lampades suas; exierunt obuiam
sponso et sponse; quinque autem ex eis erant fatue
et quinque prudentes; Sed quinque fatue. acceptis
lampadibus non sumpserunt oleum secum; pru
dentes uero; acceperunt oleum in uasis suis cum lam
padibus; Moram autem faciente sponso; dormi
tauuent omnes et dormierunt; Media autem noc
te. clamor factus est; ecce sponsus uenit exite
obuiam ei; Tunc surrexerunt omnes uirgines ille;
et ornauerunt lampades suas; Fatue272 autem;
sapientibus dixerunt; date nobis de oleo uestro;
quia lampades nostre extinguitur; responderunt
prudentes dicentes; Ne forte non sufficiat

74r273
... nobis et uobis; ite potius ad uendentes; et emite uobis.
dum autem irentemere; uenit sponsus; et quue paraet

264. That is all that Lind. has of this line.
265. Some of the dry point ruling can be seen clearly on this page.
266. Based on Lind; top left corner stained, words illegible. Top margin, center has later pen trial “DNI”
267. Lectio title in red.
268. “Quasi . . . ex—” red.
269. “R” in red; rest in minuscule.
270. That is all that Lind. has; Title in red, very faded.
271. Large red “I” extends down two lines.
272. Cross bar on “F” barely visible; looks like an “s.”
273. This recto side of the folio, like the previous folio, is shiny.
erant intrauerunt cum eo ad nuptias; et clausa est
ianua; Nouissimè ueniunt; et relique uirgines di
centes; domine domine aperi nobis; at ille respondens
ait: Amen dico uobis. nescio uos; uigilate itaque
quia nescitis diem neque horam:- of/ offerunt
ur regi uir . . . 274
Prosit plebi tuę omnipotens deus beate illius. uir Ad com. . 275
ginis uel mēartyris tuę uerneranda solempnī
tas. ut cuius gaudet honoribus protégatur auxilio. per
[23f Vigil of an Apostle or Martyr] 276
In uigilia unius apostoli uel mēartyres277
Concede nobis quesumus omnipotens deus uenturam beati con
fessoris tui . illius. apostoli uel mēartyr.278 solemp
nitatem congruo preuenire. honore et uenientem
digna cēlebrare deuotione. per. lectio liber sapientiæ279
Iustus cor280 suum tradet ad uigilandum diluculo
ad dominum qui fecit illum; et in conspectu altissimi
deprecabitur; Aperiet os suum in oratione; et pro
dilectis suis deprecabitur; Si enim dominus magnus
uoluerit; spiritu intellegentię replebit illum et ipse
tamquam imbres mittet eloquia sapientię suę;
et in oratione sua consilebitur domino; ipse diri
git consilium et disciplinam doctrinę eius;
et secretus eius a ductet; ipse manifestabit
disciplinam doctrinæ eius; et in lege testamenti281

74V

domini282 gloriabitur; Conlaudabunt multi sapien
tiam eius; et usque in seculum non delebitur;
Nec recedat memoriäm eius; et nomen eius re
quiretur a generatione in generationem:—

274. The “of” in red; rest is minuscule, worn away. That is all that Lind. has.
275. Title red, faint.
276. This set combines an apostle or martyr as indicated in the title but also the alternative of a confessor
as mentioned in the first sentence (74r12–13), a prayer that is found in Ælfwine 73.4 and the original collectar
(Corrêa 500) for the same purpose, as well as in the original collectar again, Corrêa 469 (St. Martin), LM
A 1883 (Confessors), Fulda 1567 (St. Remigius), Ratoldus 1840 (Dionisiāus, Rusticus, and Eleutherius). The
closing prayer (74v18–21, Benedixionis tuæ domine intercedente) is found in the original collectar (Corrêa 502,
Apostles), LM A 1888 (Confessor), Ælfwine 73.10 (Apostles), Fulda 1030 (Boniface), Fulda 1371 and Ratoldus
1844 (martyrs Dionisiāus, Rusticus, and Eleutherius).
278. Lind. has mēartyris but I don’t see the “-is” or an abbreviation mark.
279. Title line in red.
280. Iustus and “c” of cor in red.
281. Pen trial in bottom margin, abcd.
282. Dark stain in upper left corner. Upper margin has “gloriabitur” written again, scribe not identified.
Sequentiæ sancti euangeli secundum iohannem

In illo tempore; dixit iesus discipulis suis; Uigilate ergo; quia nescitis qua hora dominus uester uen turus sit; illud autem scitote; quod si sciret paterfamilias qua hora fur uenturus eset; uigilaret utique et non sineret perfodi domum suam; ideoque et uos estote parati; quia nesci putas est fidelis seruus et prudens quem constituit dominus suus super familiam suam ut det illis cybum in tempore; Beatus ille seruus quem conuenerit dominus eius inuenerit sic facientem; Amen dico uobis quoniam super omnia bona sua constituet eum; Benedixioniis tuae domine intercedente beato con fessore uel mærtyre uel apostolo tuo .illo susci pi amus. ut cuius præueniendo gloriam cęlebramus ei supplianti auxilium sentiamus. per.

[23g Common of an Apostle]

† In natale unius apostoli uel mærtyr is .

Deus qui es omnium sanctorum splendor mirabilis quique hunc diem beati apostoli tui .illius. mæt ry rio consecrasti. da eclesiae tuae de eius natalitio sem per gaudere ut apud misericordiam tuam exemplis eius protegamur et meritis. per. lectio liber sapientia. Beatus uir qui inuentus est sine macula; et qui post aurum non habiit nec sperauit in pecuniæ thes an auris; quis est hic et laudabimus eum; fecit enim mirabilia in uita sua; qui potuit transgredi et non est transgressus; et facere mala et non fecit; ideo
stabilita sunt bona illius in domino; et elemosynas illius; et narrabit omnis eclesia sanctorum:- secundum iohannem
In illo tempore; Dixit iesus discipulis suis; Hoc est preceptum meum; ut diligatis inuicem sicut dilexit uos; maiorem ac dilexionem nemo habet; ut animam suam ponat quis pro amicis suis; Uos amici mei estis; si feceritis quæ ego precipio uobis; Iam non dicam uos seruos; quia nescit quid faciat dominus eius; Uos autem dixi amicos: quia omnia quecumque audiui á patre meo; nota feci uobis; Non uos me elegistis; sed ego elegi uos; Et posui uos ut eatis; et fructum afferatis et fructus uester maneant; ut quodcumque petieritis patrem in nomine meo; det uobis; ad complendum:— Da nobis quesumus domine deus noster. beati apostoli tui ills. intercessionibus Subleuari. ut per quos eclessiae tuae superni muneris rudimenta donasti. per eos subsidia perpetua salutis inpendas. per.

secundum matheum

In illo tempore; dixit iesus discipulis suis; parabolam hanc; Homo quidam peregre proficiscens; uocavit seruos suos et tradidit illis bona sua; et uni dedit quinque talenta; alii autem duo alii uero unum; Uni quique secundum propriam uirtutem; et profectus est statim. Habiit autem quinque talenta acceperat; et operatus est in eis et lucratus est alia quinque; Similiter qui duo acceperat; lucratus est alio duorum; qui autem unum acceperat. habiens fodit in terram abscondit pecuniam domini sui; post multum uero temporis; uenit dominus seruorum illorum. et posuit rationem cum eis; Et accedens quinque talenta ac

291. Capital “I” extends down two lines.
292. A seemingly later hand has written “cod” above “sub.”
293. Heading added in middle of top margin. The “s” abbreviation of secundum looks like a cross with a hook right at the top. This is the gospel passage (Matthew 25:14–21) indicated in the Old English note to the Confessor prayers at 72r3–5.
294. Large “I” extends down two lines.
295. The phrase ibs discipulis suis; seems to be gradually angling upward above the line, corrected with parabolam back on the rule.
296. Eye skip possibly caused the omission of qui before quinque.
297. Presumably an error for alia.
ceperat. obtulit alia quinque talenta dicens;

14 Domine quinque talenta tradidisti mihi: ecce alia

15 quinque superlucratus sum; Ait illi dominus eius;

16 euge serue bonè et fidelis: quia super paucæ fuisti

17 fidelis; supra multa te constituam intra in

18 gaudium domini tui; Accessit autem et qui duo talen

ta acceperat et ait; Domine; duo talenta tra

didisti mihi; ecce alia duo lucratus sum; Ait

21 illi dominus eius; euge serue bonè et fidelis; quia

22 super paucæ fuisti fidelis. supra multa te

constituam; intra in gaudium; domini tui;.

24. fol. 76[69]r1–26

Eight Collects for canonical hours [a–h]298

End of Quire X singlet, probably movable

Scribe C, stint 8, majuscule, smaller and tighter size than section 7; no gloss. Capital letters in the gutter may be different ink; some are discolored or faded.

76r [a]299

1 Lumen splendoris tui domine quesumus corda nostra In lumina et tua

2 protexione omni tempore. uitæ nostræ ab omni infestatione ini

3 mici inlesos nos conserva. per ALIA [b]300

4 In hac prima diei hora quesumus domine tua nos reple. misericordia

5 ut per tota die exultantes in tuis laudibus delectemur. per or. . . [c]301

6 Tibi subnexibus precibus christo domino supplicamus qui hora diei
tertia spiritum sanctum apostolis tuis orantibus emisi est eiusdem

8 gratiam participationibus nobis poscentibus iubeas concedere iœu christe

298. Comparable texts include the original collectar, fols. 60r7–61r10 (Corrêa 657–67); Ælfwine, 171–197; and LM A 2573–2652. Exact parallels to these and other texts are noted below. No comparable texts were found in private prayer books such as Nunnaminster, Cerne, or Royal, only Ælfwine.

299. [a] 76r1–3 Lumen splendoris for vespers in Ælfwine 73.190, but here presumably for Prime since the next item is labeled Alia and the one after that is Terce.

300. [b] 76r4–5 In hac prima die hora, Alia (presumably for Prime); also found in the original collectar, Corrêa 657 (fol. 60r7–9) and the Leofric Collectar 69. Alia is dark, faded, possibly oxidized.

301. [c] 76r6–8 Tibi subnexibus precibus, Terce; no parallels located. Dark stain in upper right corner, washed out letters (Lind. has “ora territae”).
per\textsuperscript{302}

9 Domine iesu christe qui multa mirabilia fecisti. et oratio ad sextam.[d]\textsuperscript{301}
10 sexta hora pro nobis in cruce ascendisti et adam de infer
11 no eruisti eumque in paradiso restituisti quesusmus te ut ab omnibus
12 peccatis nostris eripere nos iubeas et in operibus tuis sanctis
13 semper custodias iesu christe. per. oratio ad nonam:.[e]\textsuperscript{304}
14 Nona igitur diei hora ad te domine directa supplicatione
15 que cultoribus tuis diuina monstratur miracula nostra
16 quoque eorum imitatione corda purifica. per. otatio ad completorio\textsuperscript{m}:.\textsuperscript{305}
17 Illumina domine tenebrosa corda nostra et totius noctis in
18 sidias inimici tu repelle ut te protegente ad auroram iterum
19 mente et corpore inconomes peruenire mereamur. per. alia[f]\textsuperscript{306}
20 Noctem hanc inlumina mentibus nostris omnipotens etern\textit{e}us et
tibis excitari ut liberi ab omni opere tenebrarum ad diem
21 clarum te adiuuante peruenire mereamur. per. item alia[g]\textsuperscript{307}
22 Domine iesu christe qui nos redemisti de tuo sanguine\textsuperscript{308} pretioso pres
23 ta nos hic corpore requiescere ut mente et corpore
24 tibi semper uigilemus. per.\textsuperscript{309}

25. fol. 76[69]v1–29

Antiphons, versicles, responds for lections: Kings, Wisdom, Job\textsuperscript{310}

Quire X, last page, too worn to read

Scribe F, three columns, illegible, cannot transcribe.

\textsuperscript{302} End of concedere hard to read under dark stain; \textit{lhs xpe p} is written in right margin, small.


\textsuperscript{304} [e] 76r14–16 \textit{Nona igitur diei hora ad te}. None; no parallels located.

\textsuperscript{305} [f] 76r17–19 \textit{Inlumina domine tenebrosa corda}, Compline; found in original collectar, Corre\textit{a} 245 (fol. 18r18–19), \textit{Ælfwine} 73.193 (p. 174), Leofric Collectar 515, Port. Wulstan 325, and LM A 2611. Darkened ink on title.

\textsuperscript{306} [g] 76r20–23 \textit{Noctem hanc inlumina mentibus}, Alia; no parallels located.

\textsuperscript{307} [h] 76r24–26 \textit{Domine iesu christe qui nos remedi}, item \textit{Alia}; found in the original collectar, Corr\textit{e}a 662 (fol. 60v8–10) and \textit{Ælfwine} 73.194 (p. 174).

\textsuperscript{308} Correction, probably by Scribe C.

\textsuperscript{309} Followed by a later hand, alphabet “a” through “m” clear, fading away to right. In lower margin, left side, another hand has added the abbreviation “Dne.”

\textsuperscript{310} Compare to fols. 64v–65r (QVIII.10), also the work of Scribe F.
Quiere XI (fols. 77–88), 6 sheets, flesh-hair, relatively stiff.

Aldred minuscule fols. 77r-84ra2, 85r-88v, with Cuthbert collects, colophon and memorandum on fol. 84r between in experimental scripts; fol. 84v Scribe E. Single-column on fol. 77rv, double columns from fols. 78r–88v.


26. fol. 77r–11

Hymn for Prime, Iam lucis orto sidere (Hy 7)

Aldred, minuscule; glossed.

77r

1 Incipit ymnus ad primam horam

ðæm tide lehtes abefene tynge god bidde ve boensando þ'te in

2 IAm lucis orto sidere; deum praecamur supplices ut in²

---

1. T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 27, calls it “handsome, decorative…Aldred’s best work.”
2. Stain in upper right corner, relying on Lind. for ut in and -do þ'te in.
Hymn for Terce, *Nunc sancte nobis spiritus* (Hy 8)
Aldred, minuscule; glossed.

---

3. Obscured by stain in upper right corner, relying on Lind. for OE *tunga gimet*. Missing words supplied from Milfull, *Linguam re-[frenans]*.

4. Missing word supplied from Milfull, *visum*.

5. Relying on Lind. for end of line, esp. last word of OE.


8. See note in QXI.29 (Hy 10) below about glossing *paraclito* with *rummode*.

9. Milfull, *Hymns*, 129, notes that the doxology is a combination of two lines and could not have been sung this way. After the Hy 7 ending *Deo patri sit gloria*, Durham adds a line found in Hy 1 (Milfull, *Hymns*, 109).
Incipit ad tertiam horam ymnus

nv hel’ vs gast’ an fador’ mid svnv gimeodomia

Nunc sancte nobis spiritus unus patris cum filio dignare

gearv gibeara vsu’ eft gidaeled brioste

promptus ingeri nostro refussus pectore

mvø tunga doht ondget mægen ondtnise ðerhleodria

Os lingua mens sensus uigor confessionem personat.

gibeorna fyr lvfu gelehta lust l ða nesta

flamescat igne caritas accendat ardor proximos.

gionn la” fæder arwyrdesta 7 fædor’ gimacca ancend

Presta pater piissime” patrisque compar unice

mid gaste rvmmodum 7 nv 7 in ecnise

cum spiritu paraclito et nunc et in perpetuum.12

Hymn for Sext, Rector potens uerax deus (Hy 9)
Aldred, minuscule; glossed.

Incipit ymnus ad sextam horam

riscend mehtig sodsaste god se ðe l ðu ðe gimetgad giscesfa

Rector potens uerax deus qui temperas rerum

wrixla leht arlic ðv gileres 7 fyrv’ middæglicv’

uices splendorem mane instruis et ignibus m . . . 13
gidrysne ða lego giciidana fró do baeto
22 dies extinge flammis litium aufer calorem
sceððendra gibrenge helo lichoma & sod sibb
23 noxium confer salutem corporvm uteramque pacem
efnheorta’ l gionn faed’ arfæsta gimacca
24 concordiam.\textsuperscript{14} presta pater piissime patrisque compar vnice . . . s. ’p . . . \textsuperscript{15}.

29. fol. 77vi–8

Hymn for None, \textit{Rerum deus tenax} (Hy 10)
Aldred, minuscule; glossed.

77v
1 \textit{l giscæfta} l\textsuperscript{16} Incipit ymnus ad nonam horam
\textit{ðinga god strong megen vnymbvoendedlic in ðec ðerh}
2 Rerum deus tenax uigor inmotus in te per

\textit{wvnigende lehtes singal tido gilimplicv’}
3 manens lucis diurna tempora successibus

gimerende \textit{l gef breht efen’ ðem lif}
4 determinans.\textsuperscript{17} largire clarum uespervm quo uita

\textit{nænig in styde gifeuillez ah meard deaðes halges ece}
5 nusquam decidat. sed prēm\textsuperscript{18} mortis sacrè per

\textit{instondað wuldur gionn fæder arfæsta}
6 ennis instat glora. Præsta\textsuperscript{19} pater piissime

\textsuperscript{14} Concordium is cordium in other mss (Milfull, \textit{Hymns}, 131).
\textsuperscript{15} Hard to read, heavily abbreviated; relying on Lind. for OE. Lind. has \textit{cum spiritu} at the end, but Milfull suggests \textit{et spiritus paraclitus amen}.
\textsuperscript{16} Alternate reading for \textit{rerum} (\textit{ðinga}) added above with a line separating \textit{giscæfta} from the title; it appears from this that the red title was added after the gloss, since the title is indented unlike the others. Same red ink for titles and gloss.
\textsuperscript{17} Lind. has \textit{determinans}, but it is an “e” ligature to the “t” not an “i,” as Milfull, \textit{Hymns}, 133, notes.
\textsuperscript{18} Correction to prēm, “i” inserted with colon insertion mark, “vm” added above.
\textsuperscript{19} Closing line from Hy 3 (Milfull, \textit{Hymns}, 118).
fadores ac grimaca daem maca mid gaste ruymode

7 patrisque compar unice cum spiritu paraclito

7 in ecnisse

8 et nunc et in perpetuum amen.

30. fol. 77v9–13

Eastertide hymn, *Rex christe clementissime* (stanza 11 of Hy 72, *Aurora lucis rutilat*)

Aldred, minuscule; glossed.

77v9 ymnus de resurrectione iesu christi domini nostri

<et cinig crist ruymode dv hearta vsra gibye>

10 Rex christe clementissime. Tu corda nostra posside

<et det de herenisso gibyrelicu ue gelda ælc' tide>

11 ut tibi laudes debitas reddamus omni tempore.

<uvldvr dv drihten du de arise from deadvm gilic mid>

12 Gloria tibi domine qui surrexisti a mortuis una

<halgv' gaste in eco wvorlodo>

13 cum sancto spiritu in sempiterna sæcula amen—

31. fol. 77v14–18

Hymn for Vespers Sunday eve, *O lux beata trinitas* (Hy 1)

Aldred, minuscule; glossed.

---

20. *Rummode* glossing paraclito (a Greek loanword into Latin), glosses below (and normally) clemens. Hy 3 with this doxology glosses spiritu paraclito with gaste frofer (Milfull, 117).

21. A small minim added above final “e” of unice, in dark ink, although unice is correct. The other manuscript editions in Milfull end with *Pater piisime*.


23. Same gloss as for paraclito above.

24. Gloss anticipates word on next line.

25. Other manuscript editions in Milfull end here.
la leht eadga drinisse 7 aldorlic’ annisse ðæm tide
O lux beata trinitas et principalis unitas iam
sol recedit ignibus infünde lumen cordibus
Te mane laudent carmina. te deprecemur uespere
te nostra supplex gloria per cuncta laudat secula. Amen . . .

Episcopal Benedictions
M2, minuscule with Caroline elements, early 11th century, Durham

Omnipotens deus sua uos clementia benedicat et sensum uobis
sapientie salutaris infundat ; AMEN.
Catholicę fidei uos documentis enutriet. et in Sanctis operibus
perseuerables reddat. AMEN Gressus uostros ab
errorne convertat et uiam uobis pacis et caritatis ostendat
Quod ipse prestare dignetur qui cum patre et Spiritu Sancto uiiuit
et gloriatur deus. per omnia secula seculorum.

The “am . . .” is small and headed into the margin; it could have been added later if he initially intended to add the third, doxology verse from this hymn (Milfull, 109).
29. Decorated O.
30. Ben. Æthel. has in uobis (74r13).
31. Ben. Æthel. has enutriet (74r17).
32. Ben. Æthel. ends with AMEN in red (74v2).
33. In Ben. Æthel., quod ipse (with a gold “q”) ends the set of prayers, whereas Scribe M2 continues with the closing formula prestare dignetur . . . In other cases, Ben. Æthel. adds more to the formula, up through dignetur (cf. fol. 69v18) or fully in several places (cf. fol. 63v1–13), although different from here.
33. fols. 78r–79va

Capitella (suffrages) for Prime\textsuperscript{34} Aldred, minuscule; glossed.

78r

\emph{onginnad heafydcvid to pim}

\begin{enumerate}
\item Incipiunt capitula\textsuperscript{35} ad primam\textsuperscript{36}
\item \textit{Pater noster qui es in caelis}
\item \textit{Et ne nos inducas in temptationem}
\item R. Sed libera nos a malo.
\item Utui anima\textsuperscript{37} mea et lauda\textsuperscript{38}
\item Errau sicut ouis quae periiit
\item Carnis ressurrectionem
\item in uitam \textit{ecvum Sodlice}
\item \textit{Repleatur os meum}\textsuperscript{43}
\item \textit{ut possim cantare gloriam tuam}
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{34} Gallican Capitella; see Tolhurst, \textit{Hyde Abbey}, vol. 6, 30–36; also \textit{The Benedictine Office}, ed. Ure, 81–95. The version here lacks the suffrages labeled \textit{pro fidelibus defunctis}, \textit{pro fratribus nostris absentibus}, and \textit{pro afflictis et captiuis} found before the capitular office in Tolhurst, \textit{Hyde Abbey}, vol. 6, 35–36; although see the Little Hours below (QXI.36).

\textsuperscript{35} Looks like \textit{capitula}, with first “u” erased to modify to an “i.”

\textsuperscript{36} Note title, in red, is centered above both columns. This is also a rare instance of a glossed title. In the bottom margin of fol. 78r under the right side of column a, a later hand has added some pen trials, including the name \textit{ricardus} (somewhat messy). The gloss over \textit{primam} appears to have an “i” inserted over the “p” to make “pim.”

\textsuperscript{37} Ps. 118:175–176; \textit{Benedictine Office}, 87.

\textsuperscript{38} Lind. supplies ending to form \textit{laudabat}, but there is no abbreviation mark in the ms.

\textsuperscript{39} The “pat” inserted later above “o” of \textit{omnipotentem}, in brown ink.

\textsuperscript{40} Abbreviation mark above final “i” of “cli.”

\textsuperscript{41} The word \textit{ecvum} is over \textit{uitam}, with \textit{life} added above \textit{ecvum}.

\textsuperscript{42} Note here the gloss of even the \textit{amen}.

\textsuperscript{43} Ps. 70:8; \textit{Benedictine Office}, 91.
giendig geongo mino in svoēðv’
12 Perfice gressus meos in semitis
dīnu’ ṭe ne sie ymboendo svoēðo mino
13 tuis ut non moueantur uestigia mea
ic giceigde f’don giberdest mec god
domi‘ne. deus meus illuminā tenebras mea
14 Ego clamaui quoniam exaudisti me deus
gibeg earo din me
15 inclina aurem tuam mihi
f’don giinlihted dæcellle min
domi‘ne. deus meus illumina tenebras mea
dæcellle forvm min’ word din
16 Quoniam tu inluminas lucernam meam
driht’ god min giinlihta diostro mino
domi‘ne. deus meus illuminā tenebras mea
17 Lucerna pedibus meis uerbum tuum
18 Lucerna pedibus meis uerbum tuum
driht 7 leht’mvoēðu minv’
domi‘ne. et lumen semitis meis
7 ic to de driht’ giceide 7 arlic gibed
19 Et ego [ad te domine] clamaui et mane oratio
min f’ecyme de
20 mea preueniet te . .
voegas dīno dryht’aedeava me
21 Uias tuas domine demonstra mihi
7 of’svoēðo dīno giler mec
22 et super semitas tuas edoce me
23 col. b

girihte mec in soďfaest’ din’
2 Dirige me in ueritate tua
7 giler mec f’don dv arđ hēl’ min
3 et doce me quoniam tu es salutaris meus.
esť gimyndga milsa
4 Reminiscere miserationum
dīnra dryht’ 7 miltheartnisa
5 tuarum domine. et misericordiarum

44. Final “o” added below.
45. The “e” in mea is small and low with hook below, possible added.
46. The “ds” abbreviation at end of the line is a bit crowded.
47. Final “o” is below “n.”
48. Final “t” preceded by an abbreviation mark is below the “h.”
49. Inserted in small hand above in brown ink and glossed after in red.
50. Ps. 87:13; Benedictine Office, 89.
51. A worn or grayish spot over mihi and affecting its letters, while OE me is written to the right of the blot, which must have been there already.
52. Ps. 24:4–7 through line 11; Benedictine Office, 89.
53. Upper right corner badly stained.
dintræ dæ de firo' vorvulde sindon
6 tuårum quæ a seculo sunt
gyltinga gigodhades mines
7 Delicta iuuentutis meæ.
7 of'giovvinisso mino
8 et ignorantias meas
ne gymiynes du driht'
9 ne memineris domine.
eafti micle milsa
10 Secundum magnam misericordiam\textsuperscript{14}
din' gymiynes min' god
11 tuam. memento me deus
gidoem driht' sceðdende mec
12 ludica dominæ\textsuperscript{15} nocentes me
aseht du da onfehtendo mec'
13 expugna inpugnantes me
gegrip voepeno 7 sceld
14 Adprehende arma et scutvm
7 aris in fulvme me
15 et exsurge in adiutorium mihi
ofsend voepengidære\textsuperscript{16} 7 bilve
16 Effunde frameam. et conclvde
viddir da da dæ\textsuperscript{17} mec gioehatas
17 aduersus eos qui me persequuntur.
giinlihta dem da de on diostro
18 Illuminare his qui in tenebris\textsuperscript{18}
7 in scya deades sittes
19 et in umbrâ mortis sedent.
to girihtanne fotæ vsra on vegi sibbes\textsuperscript{19}
20 ad dirigendos pedes nostros in viam pacis
fro' deiglu' minv' giclænsa mec driht'
21 Ab occultis meis mundæ me domine
7 fro' vtacvndv' spær esne dinv'
22 et ab alienis parce seruo tvo

\textsuperscript{54}. A narrow elongated patched hole in the ms page caused the scribe to make a break in “mis-eri” and in the next line between “me” and “ds.”
\textsuperscript{55}. Ps. 34:1–2 through line 15; Benedictine Office, 90. The Vulgate has nocentes, but both Lind. and Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 6, 32, have nocentem.
\textsuperscript{56}. The “gi” is added above in the middle of a space between the two parts of the word.
\textsuperscript{57}. A black ink spot mars this word, blocking the “e” of dæ. Possibly the dark ink used by the messy pen trial “Ricardus.”
\textsuperscript{58}. Note here and elsewhere on this page the severe abbreviation (of tenebris to “te”) while the OE gloss is a complete word (diostro).
\textsuperscript{59}. The gloss sibbes is in the margin, worn and faint; the first “b” is not clearly evident.
fro' cerr onsion ðin fro' syn'

23 Auerte faciem tuam⁶⁰ a peccatis 
miv' 7 allo unreht' mino gidilge
24 meis 7 omnes iniquitates meas dele⁶¹

78va

hearte clene gisceap' i' mec god⁶²
1 Cor mundum crea in me deus
   gast reht in niva in' madv⁶³ minv'
2 et spiritum rectum innoua in uisceribus meis
   ðy les ðv f'drifa mec fro' onsione ðinv'
3 Ne proicias me a facie tua
   7 gast halig ðin ne gini' fro' mec
4 et spiritum⁶⁴ sanctum tuum ne auferas a me
   agef⁶⁵ me glædnisse halvoende' ðines⁶⁶
5 Redde mihi látitiam salutaris tui
   7 gast aldôrlc gîtryme mec
6 et spiritu principali confirmâ me
   ginere mec dryht' fro' menn yflv'
7 Eripe me domîne⁶⁷ ab homîne malo
   fro' voere vnrehtvisv' gifria mec
8 a uiro iniquo libera me
   ginere mec of fiondvm minv'
9 Eripe me⁶⁸ de inimicis meis
   god min 7 fro' arisendum
10 deus meus et ab insurgentibus
   on⁶⁹ mec ales mec
11 in me libera me
   ginere mec of ðem vyrc' vnrecht⁷⁰
12 Eripe me de operantibus iniquitatem

⁶⁰. Ps. 50:9- through line 6; Benedictine Office, 91.
⁶¹. This line added in smaller hand, an extra line compared to column a, either to finish the sentence
   and start on the next page with a new capital letter, or possibly added later if the phrase was inadvertently
   omitted on the page turn.
⁶². Gloss line written a little higher above first line; god written below in mec.
⁶³. Lind. has in 'nadi' minv'.
⁶⁴. Damage to this corner hard to read.
⁶⁵. Hard to read due to staining of ms.
⁶⁶. Added below, to right of “t” in Latin abbreviation of tui. Lind. has expanded the Latin to sanctam
   tuam, but the text of Ps. 50:14 is salutaris tui, which Aldred glosses with the equivalent Old English.
⁶⁷. Ps. 139:1; Benedictine Office, 91.
⁶⁸. Ps. 58:1–2 through line 12; Benedictine Office, 92.
⁶⁹. The “n” of on is washed out. Also, narrow rectangular patch between do and ms extending between
   lines 10 and 11 (on recto as well); patch is on this, the verso, side, recto shows hole is more rounded.
⁷⁰. Final “t” written below “h.” Unclear why he avoids going into the margin between the columns for
   just one letter since on the lines below, the gloss goes further into this margin.
7 of verum bloda gihæl mec
13 et de uiris sanguinum salua me
 \[sae\] salm ic cuoedo nome ðinv'
14 Sic psalmum dicam\textsuperscript{71} nomini tuo
god in worlde world p'ë ic gelde oest min\textsuperscript{72}
15 deus in sæculum sæculi. ut reddam uostum meum
    gihær ysig god halvœnd' userne
16 Exaudi nos deus\textsuperscript{73} salutaris noster
    hyht allra gimeære[o]\textsuperscript{74} eordes
17 spes omnium finium terræ
    7 on sae fearr
18 et in mare longe . .
god in fulltvme min bhiald
19 Deus in adiutorium meum\textsuperscript{75} intende
driht' to helpanne mec dydest
20 domine ad adiuuandum me festina
    halig god halig strong halig 7 vndeadlic\textsuperscript{76}
21 Sanctus deus sanctus fortis. sanctus et inmortality
    lombe godes ðv ðe nimes syn' mid\textsuperscript{77}
22 Agne dei\textsuperscript{78} qui tollis peccata mundi
    gimilsa ys
23 miserere nobis

\textsuperscript{78vb}

\textquotedblleft gibloedsa savel min\rightline{1}
1 Benedic anima mea\textsuperscript{79}
driht' 7 allo ða ðe innaða mino
2 dominum et omnia quæ interiöra mea
    gibloedsa savel min driht'
3 Benedic anima mea dominum
    7 nelle ðv ðe ñeotta alle efiseleniso his
4 et noli obliuisce omnes retributiones eius\textsuperscript{80}

\textsuperscript{71.} Ps. 60:8; Benedictine Office, 92.
\textsuperscript{72.} Gloss "min" written below, beside Latin "m" abbreviation.
\textsuperscript{73.} Ps. 64:15; Benedictine Office, 92.
\textsuperscript{74.} The "o" added above final "e" in same hand; dot below the "e" to mark error.
\textsuperscript{75.} Ps. 69:11; Benedictine Office, 82.
\textsuperscript{76.} The "lic" is below.
\textsuperscript{77.} Hard to read gloss.
\textsuperscript{78.} Notice vocative here instead of the usual Agnus dei.
\textsuperscript{79.} Ps. 102:1–5 through line 15; Benedictine Office, 92.
\textsuperscript{80.} Note again extensive abbreviation of end words but with full OE gloss. Also, glossed word his is written below, beside final Latin word.
se de miltheort bid allum
5 Qui propitius fit omnibus
    unretvisissv' dinu'
6 iniquitatis tuis
    se de hæleð alle adlo ðino
7 Qui sanat omnes languores tvos
    se de alesde of losvist
8 Qui redemit de interitv
    lif ðin
9 uitam tuam
    se de gifylled in godv'
10 Qui replet in bonis
    lust ðin
11 desiderium tuum
    se de gisigfæstade in milse
12 Qui coronat te in mi
    7 miltheartnise
13 seratione et misericordia
    efi ginivad bid sve
14 renoabitur sicut
    earn gigoð ðin
15 aquila iuuentus tua81
    ic ondeto drið' 7 ðe
16 Confiteor domino et tibi
    broðer f'don ic syngade sviðe
17 frater quia ego peccavi nimis
    in smeavnge 7 in girioðe 7 1 in sprèc82
18 in cogitatione et in locu
    7 in wyringe 1
19 tione et in operatione
    7 in monigv' hehsynnv'
20 et in multis criminibus
    in ðem allvm yffvm
21 in quibus omnibus malis
    gismeaiga ic mahtf' ðon
22 excigitar potui prôpterea

81. Note lack of abbreviation so that the phrase takes several lines; verses are reversed here from Psalm 102; Qui coronat . . . should precede Qui replet . . . (Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 6, 34).
82. With this vel alternative, he extends into the gutter; Lind. has "7 girioðe l in sprèc." But it looks like another ond (7) after girioðe, then below it a vel sign, followed by "in," then below that a word I cannot read but which Lind. has as sprèc with an accent over the "c." Note also "1" in next line of gloss with no alternate word offered.
bido dec broðer gibidd\textsuperscript{83} f'e mec
23 precor te frater ora pro me
synnfullne
24 peccator\textsuperscript{84}

79ra

t milsend sie de broðer
1 Miserator sit tibi frater
allm' god 7 f' gese de
2 omnipotens deus. et demittat tibi
alle synne dino bilio
3 omnia peccata tua prete
rendlica ondveardlica 7 toveardlica
4 rita presentia et fvtura
7 alle hebsynno 7 ac
5 et omnia criminata atque
divblica synna da de du givorhtest
6 scelera quæ gessisti a iu
fro' gigodhade dín vǐd in ḏas
7 uentute tua usque in hanc
eldes tid 7 alese
8 aetatis horam. et liberat
dec god fro' alcvm voerce yflvm\textsuperscript{85}
9 te deus ab omne opere malo
7 gihalda dec god in alc\v'
10 et conseruat te deus in omne
voerce godv' 7 derhlæde dec
11 opere bono et perducat te .:
[12 left margin: .I nos deus/ pariter]\textsuperscript{86}
god to life éce
12 deus ad uitam æternam . . .
gimeodumia driht' M [de\v] dissu'
13 Dignare domine die isto\textsuperscript{87}
butan synne vsig gihalde
14 sine peccato nos custodire

\textsuperscript{83}. Second “d” added above; possible erasure below.
\textsuperscript{84}. Runs to 24 lines to finish this text. The addition of peccatori after ora pro me is found in the Book of Nunnaminster, in a confession added in a late tenth century hand on fol. 41r (ed. Birch, 97): ora pro me peccatori with宁静 peccatori then added in lighter ink.
\textsuperscript{85}. Final “vm” written below.
\textsuperscript{86}. Marginal addition is in dark ink, but the three dot insertion mark above it and the matching one at the end of line 11 are in the red ink of the gloss.
\textsuperscript{87}. Benedictine Office, 93, has different ending.
gicerr vsig god halvoen' vsa

15 Conuerte nos\(^88\) deus salutaris noster
7 fro' cerr iorra din fro' vs

16 et auerte iram tuam a nobis
driht' giber gibedd min

17 Domine exaudi\(^89\) orationem meam
7 ceir min to de derbyme\(^90\)

18 et clamor meus ad te perueniat
he alra helend

19 Ipse omnium saluator\(^91\)
besih of' vsig ðea

20 respice super nos famu
dino þ' te ðv gimilsia

21 los tuos. ut miserearis
vsers' ðv de mið feder 7

22 nostri qui cum patre et
gaste halgv' liofað 7 ricsað god

23 spiritv sancto uiuis et regnas deus.

79rb

\(efi\) besih on esnv' ðinv'

1 Respice in seruos tuos\(^92\)
7 in voerco din' giriht

2 et in opera tua dirige fi
bearno hiora 7 sie leht\(^93\)

3 lios eorum. Et sit spl
driht godes vs' of' vsig

4 endor domini dei nostri super nos
7 voerco honda vsra

5 et opera manuum nostrarum
giriht

6 dirige . . .

wvldvr ðam feder 7 ðam sunv

7 Gloria patri et filio
7 gaste halgvm

8 et spiritui sancto.

---

88. Ps. 84:4.
89. Ps. 101:1; Benedictine Office, 94.
90. Final “e” below.
91. Fol. 79ra19–79rb20 is presumably the Capitular Office noted by Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 6, 36.
92. Ps. 89:16–17 through line 6; Benedictine Office, 95, capitular office, where the Gloria follows as it does here (Pater noster precedes).
93. Slightly below and to right of Latin “spl.”
girihæ 7 gibalga
9 Dirigere et sanctificare\(^{94}\)
7 gibalda gimeodvma ðv
10 et custodire digneris
driht' god cyning heofnes 7 eorðe
11 domine deus rex cæli et terræ
tom [deg] 7 degibvemlice heorta
12 hodie et cotidie corda
7 lichoma vsra on voegi
13 et corpora nostra in uia
dinv' 7 in voerce bibo'da
14 tua et in opere mandatorum
dinra ð' te her 7 in ecnise
15 tuorvm ut hic et in ætternum
ðerb ðec symle halo vosa
16 per te semper salui esse
ve giearnia hælend'
17 mereamur. Saluator
middang' ðv ðe midd feder
18 mundi qui cum patre
7 gaste halgv' liofad 7 ricsad
19 et spiritu sancto uiuis et reg
god ðer alle vorulda vorld'
20 nas deus per omnia secula seculorum
ic cvæd driht' milsa me
21 Ego dixi domine miserere mei
gibel savel min
22 sana animam meam
f'don ic syn'de ðe
23 quia peccavi tibi\(^{95}\)

\(^{94}\) Compare through line 20 Benedictine Office, 95 capitular office prayer with some differences; comparable to Compline at 83ra4.

\(^{95}\) The word tibi is stretched out with lots of spaces in second half of line, rather than trying to finish the sentence before the page turn as he has done earlier.

\(^{96}\) Ps. 102:17.
7 ceir min to ðe cyme
4 et clamor meus ad te perveniat
   milsa me god æfi’97
5 Miserere mihi98 deus secundum magnam

34. fol. 79va6-b2

Two collects for Prime [a–b]99
Aldred, minuscule; glossed.

79va
æfi’don fylges gibedd to pim
6  Postea sequitur oratio ad primam100
god  ðu  ðe  to  frvma  ðis’
7 [a]  Deus qui ad principium huius
dæges usig ðerhcyme dydest
8  diei nos peruenire fecisti
dinu’ usig ðel magne
9  tua nos salua uirtute
   ð’te in ðassu101 to nængv’
10  ut in hac die ad nullum
    ve gibega synne
11  declinemus peccatvm
    ab symle to dinvm soð
12  sed semper ad tuam ius
    fastris’ doende vserne
13  titiam faciandam nostra
    f’ecyme soðspreco
14  procedant eloquia .per.
    driht’ god allm’102
15 [b]  Domine deus omnipotens qui nos
    in ðassu’ tide arlica
16  in hanc horam maturi
    æft’ra ðerh næht
17  nam secundum per noctur

97. Note severe abbreviation of Lat. magnam to an “m” and no OE gloss on it.
98. Ps. 50:1; Benedictine Office, 94.
99. Neither found in the original collectar or in Scribe C’s fol. 76r collects for Prime. Fol. 79va7–14 [a] occurs in the Benedictine Office, 94, but with a different opening line, Domine sancte pater om. aet. deus, but same text as lines 8–14.
100. Title in red; final “am” of primam is below.
101. No gloss for dir, perhaps understood in referent ðassum.
102. No gloss for qui nos.


licamistodærhcyme

18
nas caligines peruenire
dydest gihald usig

19
fecisti conserua nos
tovdegdeahalleteido

20
hodie per omnium horarum
rymo7dërhhvedosgytila

21
spatia et per certa mo
tides7f'e

22
menta temporis et pro
dirëmilthearthnise

23
tva misericordia

79vb

symle do usig dërhwvniga103

1
semper fac nos perma
unascendado

2
nere inlessos . . per

35. fol. 79vb3–14

Collect for Sunday Prime104
Aldred, minuscule; glossed.

79vb

3
oratio in die domini ad primam105
gilefvebid’alm’god

4
Concede quasumus omnipotens deus
p’teđadeerestes

5
ut qui resurrectionis
drihtenlichesymboltido

6
dominicæ sollemnia
biggeonga vegisomniga

7
colere congragemur
dërhinceigence dinesgastes

8
per inuocationem tuispiritus

103. The dër is written above wvniga.
104. Also found in original collectar, Corrêa 197 (fol. 14v13–21), for Easter, where a full doxology is not
included as it is here.
105. Title in red, unglossed.
from deaðe saveles eft
9 a morte animæ re
arisa ve maegi ðerh
10 surgere ualeamus. per
þ’ilca driht’ user bael’
eundem dominum nostram iesum
11 sanv ðin se ðe ðec mid ðiofæd
filium tuum qui tecum uiuit
12 7 ricsæd god in annisse
ac regnat deus in unitate
dæs ilcan gastes halg’ ðerh allo
eiusdem spiritus sancti per omnia secula\textsuperscript{106}

36. fols. 79vb15–80va9

Capitella for Little Hours of Terce, Sext, and None.\textsuperscript{107} Two suffrages included: [a] \textit{pro fidelibus defunctis} (fol. 80rb11) and [b] \textit{pro fratibus nostris absentibus} (fol. 80rb15).\textsuperscript{108}

Aldred, minuscule; glossed; increase to 25+ lines.

79vb
15 Incipiunt capitulæ
ad tertiam et sextam
17 et nonam horam\textsuperscript{109}
faeder vserne ðv ðe arð in heof’
Pater noster qui es in cælis
7 ðy læs vsig gilæde in cost’
et ne nos inducas intemtationem
helpe vserne in nome
Adiutorium nostrum in nomine
driht’ se ðe dyde heofon 7 eor’
domine[i]\textsuperscript{110} qui fecit celum et terram
ic cvoed driht’ milsa
22 Ego dixi\textsuperscript{111} domine miserere

\textsuperscript{106}. Squeezed in tight, no gloss.
\textsuperscript{107}. Gallican; see Tolhurst, \textit{Hyde Abbey}, vol. 6, 39–42.
\textsuperscript{108}. Tolhurst, \textit{Hyde Abbey}, vol. 6, 41 lists two suffrages, one \textit{Pro fratibus nostris absentibus} and the other \textit{Pro afflictis et captivis}. See also QXI.38o and QXI38s below for the same headers with fuller sets of materials for each.
\textsuperscript{109}. Title in red ink, unglossed.
\textsuperscript{110}. Correction of final “e” to “i” added above in red gloss ink with red dot below the “e.”
\textsuperscript{111}. Ps. 40:4; \textit{Benedictine Office}, 96, Terce.
min hel savel min fon ic syngade de
mei. sana animam meam\textsuperscript{112} quia peccavi tibi

8ora

\textit{from degolissvm minv' geclensa}
\begin{itemize}
  \item Ab ocultis meis\textsuperscript{113} munda
  me domine et ab alienis
  parce seruo tuo
  givoend vsig la\textsuperscript{114} god halvoendes\textsuperscript{115}
  Conuerte nos deus\textsuperscript{116} salutaris
  userne 7 fro' cerr iorre
  noster. et auerte iram
din fro' vs
tuam a nobis.
givoende driht' vid p'
Conuertere domine\textsuperscript{117} usque quo
7 boenlic vaes dv of'
et deprecabilis esto super
esna dino
seruos tuos.
hal do esnas dino
Saluos fac seruos tuos
god min hyhtendo on dec
deus mens sperantes in te
gimyndig voes dv somnv
Memor esto congrega
nges dinre p'
tionis tuæ. quam
dv gisceope\textsuperscript{118} from' frvma
creasti ab initio. .
eg' driht' of sodfæsto
Oculi domini super iustos.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{112} Severe abbreviations here, bottom line smudged, but the “m” abbreviation for meam is below, in dark ink.
\textsuperscript{113} Ps. 18:12; Benedictine Office, 98, None.
\textsuperscript{114} Added vocative; see fol. 77r17 above and note there.
\textsuperscript{115} The “des” is above the word.
\textsuperscript{116} Ps. 84:4; cf. Benedictine Office, 100.
\textsuperscript{117} Ps. 89:13, reversed here, should follow next verse, et deprecabilis (Tolhust, Hyde Abbey, vol. 6, 40); see also Benedictine Office, 96, Terce.
\textsuperscript{118} Looks like an “i” between “o” and “p” of gisceope.
et aures eius in preces eorum giondetað de driht’
Confiteantur tibi domine alle voerco dinno 7 balga’ din’
onmia opera tua. et sancti tui gibbonediga de
benedicant tibi. 
driht’ hal do cynig
Domine saluum fac regem 7 giher usig on degi
et exaudi nos in die dona ve giceigad dec
qua inuocauerimus te halne do folc
Saluum fac populum dinne driht’ 7 bloedsa
tuum domine et benedic erfevardnisse dinu’ l dinra
hereditate tuae

7 girica hia 7 abef
et rege eos et extolle hia vid in ecnisse
illos usque in æternum gimyne du ysra driht’
Memento nostri domine in in velgicvoeminise folces dines
beneplacito populi tuui

119. The “ra” is written below.
120. Ps. 27:9.
121. The “vel” is written beside dinu’ but dinra is written below extender of “e” of Lat. tua (Lind. has dinra?). There is a space between the “i” and the “a.” Seems to be a grammatical problem in the Latin: here- ditate is abl. sing. f. but should be dat. hereditati (looks like a minim stroke has been added on the front of and below the “e”). Tua is dative or genitive sing. f. so dinum is dative sing. masc. or neuter; while dinre is dat. or gen. sing. f. and dinra is gen. plural f, m, n. Assuming dative case of the Latin, is he confused about the gender of the noun because of the error in hereditati? The only other instance of erfevardnisse in his glossing is at fol. 29v13 hereditas (nom.). See also below at fol. 81ra11 for hereditatę tuae glossed erfevardnisse dinra.
122. Dark stain, relying on Lind.
123. Dark stain, relying on Lind. for last word and driht’ gloss above.
124. Dark stain, relying on Lind. for last word and last two words of gloss.
giniosa vsig in halvoendu’ din
uisita nos in salutari tuo.
sie driht’ milheart’ din
Fiat domine misericordia tua
of’ vs sue sue
super nos quemadmodum
ve gilyhton on ðec
sperauimus in te
aedeava vs driht’ milsa’
Ostende nobis domine misericordiam
din 7 halvoend’ din sel vs
tuam et salutare tuum da nobi;
f’e gileaffullv’ vnliggendvm
[a] Pro fidelibus defunctis
rest ece gef
Requiem æternam dona
him driht’ 7 leht ece
eis domine et lux perpetua
gilehta ðæm
luceat eis . . .
f’e broðrv’ usum ondveardv’
[b] Pro fratribus nostris absentibus
halo do esnas dino
saluos fac seruos tuos
god min hyhtende on ðec
deus mens sperantes in te
send him driht’ fultyme
Mitte eis domine auxilium
of hâlgy’ of sio giscild hia
de sancto. et de sion tuere eos
nobt giðii se fiond
Nihil proficiet inimicus
on ðæm 7 bearn vnrehtnises
in eis. et filius iniquitatis
ne tosette giscêdðe him
non adponat nocere eis
gimeodomia driht’M [deg] ðissum
Dignare domine die isto

125. Dark stain, relying on Lind. for end of gloss.
126. The “n” abbreviation crammed in small.
127. Title in dark ink. Compare to Vespers at fol. 81va10–12.
128. Title in dark ink. Compare to end of Vespers at fol. 81vb13–21.
bvtan synne vsig gihalde

sine peccato nos custodire
sett driht’ gihalda

Pone domine custodire
mvde minv’

ori meo .

80va

7 duru l dor130 ymbfest’
et hostiam circumstan
valerum minum
tiae labis meis.
in elcum stowe ricsvnges
In omni loco domina
his gebloetsa
tionis eius benedic
sauel min dryht’
anima mea dominum
driht’ giher gebed
Domine131 exaudi orationem
min 7 ceir min
meam et clamor meus
to de derhcyme
ad te perueniat.
gemils me god
Miserere mihi deus

36x. fol. 80va10–11

Rubric referring to three collects132

129. Squeezed in an extra line, just two words, though, and the text continues on the reverse. Also, custodire in line above seems to have an abbreviation mark above the “r” for unclear reasons.

130. The word duru is unclear, plus the use of “u” instead of “v” is odd in this section; the l dor is above. Aldred seems to use duru and dor interchangeably and as alternatives with each other or with gætt when he glosses hostia, inanua, and porta in Durham A.IV.19 and in the Lindisfarne Gospels (see DOE entries for dor and duru).

131. The right extender of the “D” goes up into the previous line in front of anima.

132. The rubric is clearly written with plenty of space, not something added later. It appears to offer directions for where to find collects to accompany the Little Hours capitella preceding (36) which lack collects at the end. It could refer to the three Vespers collects in the following material, one immediately after (fol. 80va12–22) and two after the Vespers capitella at fol. 82ra7–b1, labeled at fol. 82ra6 with rubric oratio sequitur; however at least the first two prayers explicitly mention vespers and reflections on the end of the day. F. Wormald, Durham Ritual 49, suggests looking back to Prime collects on fol. 79v (QXI.34–35); despite the fact that the rubric says to “look below,” the Prime prayers would be better candidates for adapting to the
Aldred, minuscule; partially glossed.

80va

gisoec beniōda

10 Require infra collet

11 tiones tres¹³³

37. fol. 80va12–22

Vespers Collect³⁴
Aldred, minuscule; glossed.

80va

gebed ðegle ær

12 Oratio secreta ante

forward efornlices

13 initium uespertinæ

herenis’

14 laudis³⁵

dedo vfair ecelica t³⁶

15 Actus nostros hodiernos

ve biddad in velgecuemnise

16 quesumas in beneplacito uni

ancendes bearnes ðines gerihbas

17 geniti filii tui dirigas

7 gestionæ 4v allmaeht’ god

18 et gubernas omnipotens deus

od p’ ve eft gebrenga

19 quousque referamus

de ðoncuengo heghalo

20 tibi gratias incolomes

efelnlicv’ tidvm

21 uespertinis horis d3⁷

Little Hours. Alternatively, the message could be to look below for the three Vespers collects separated from one another by the capitella, on the assumption that a collect would be used at the end not at the beginning of the service as found in QXI.37.

¹³³. Lines 10–11 in red for title; glossed only on instruction to “look below,” not on the title.

¹³⁴. Not found in original collectar; unidentifed in other service books and prayer books, although given the pattern of missing or different incipits in the other collects (34 and 39), these prayers may occur elsewhere.

¹³⁵. Lines 12–14 in red for title; note unusual gloss of a title (red on red).

¹³⁶. No alternative word given; unusual use of ecelica to gloss hodiernos.

¹³⁷. Probable erasure of two letters, “ce,” after “di,” perhaps a change of mind to break the word here.
Capitella for Vespers,\textsuperscript{138} with suffrages labeled for: all grades of clergy [a]; our pastor [b]; our king [c]; our bishop [d];\textsuperscript{139} all Christian people [e]; for peace and health of the church [f];\textsuperscript{140} our brothers and sisters [g]; those travelling on a journey in Christ [h]; those navigating [i]; all adversaries and our slanderers [j]; those in discord [k]; penitents [l];\textsuperscript{141} our giving of alms in this world [m]; the infirm and captives [n]; the faithful who have died [o]; our sins and negligence [p];\textsuperscript{142} ourselves [q]; our benefactors [r]; our absent brothers [s].\textsuperscript{143}

Aldred, minuscule; glossed; no rubric for section but individual titles [a–s] in dark ink.

\textit{god in fulltyme min}

Deus in adiutorium meum\textsuperscript{144}

bihald driht’ to helpe

intende. Domine adiadi\textsuperscript{145}

mec oefistig

\textit{iuuandum me festina}\textsuperscript{146}

\textit{wvldur ðæm feder 7 ðæm svnv}\textsuperscript{147}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{138} Celtic rather than Gallican in origin, with four of the suffrages associated with Bangor Antiphoner and Rule of Columbanus: \textit{pro episcopo nostro, pro fidelibus defunctis, pro benefactoribus nostris, and pro afflictis et captisuis}, although the latter is not labeled as such but falls within QXI.38s. See Tolhurst, \textit{Hyde Abbey}, vol. 6, 19–30; Roper, \textit{Medieval English Benedictine Liturgy}, 11–14; and Port. Wulstan, p. 92.
\item \textsuperscript{139} After [d] and before [e] other versions have suffrages for the abbot and for the fraternity (Tolhurst, \textit{Hyde Abbey}, vol. 6, 21–22), unnecessary here in a secular community.
\item \textsuperscript{140} Peace and unity of the church in other versions (Tolhurst, \textit{Hyde Abbey}, vol. 6, 22).
\item \textsuperscript{141} Added later in the margin.
\item \textsuperscript{142} New section in other versions of intercessions for the community, \textit{Oratio Communis Fratrum} (Tolhurst, \textit{Hyde Abbey}, vol. 6, 25).
\item \textsuperscript{143} Other versions label the prayers between fols. 81vb–82ra4 \textit{Pro afflictis et captisuis}, and follow with \textit{De martyribus} and \textit{Ad martyres} materials not included here before the concluding \textit{Miserere mei deus} (Tolhurst, \textit{Hyde Abbey}, vol. 6, 26–27).
\item \textsuperscript{144} Ps. 69:1, standard in most hours; cf. \textit{Beneddictine Office}, 96–98 for Terce, Sext, None; 82 for Prime.
\item \textsuperscript{145} Lind. has \textit{ad adiuuandum}, but the ms clearly has “adiad” although the second “a” looks like a “u” corrected with a long mark over the top and the final “d” is faint. It is as if he started to do “adiu-” instead of “ad.”
\item \textsuperscript{146} Final two letters squeezed in small, with the “a” under a small and elevated “n.”
\item \textsuperscript{147} The \textit{svnv} is broken in half, with the final “nv” below.
7 gaste halgo’ sva væs
et spiritui sancto. Sicut erat in\footnote{148. Long mark over in indicating an abbreviation (for the next word, principio?), unglossed.} fæder userne ðv ard on heof”
Pater noster qui es in cælis
7 dy læs usig ingeleade
et ne nos inducas
in costvnge
in temptationem
helpe vserne
Adiutorium nostrum\footnote{149. Ps. 123:8; Benedictine Office, 99, Vespers.}
on nome driht’ se ðe
in nomine domini qui
dyde l worhte heofon 7 eorðe
feceit cælum et terram
ic cvoed driht’ milsa
Ego dixi\footnote{150. Ps. 40:4; Benedictine Office, 99, Vespers.} domine misere
me hel savel
re mei sana animam
min f’don ic syngade ðe
meam quia peccavi tibi
ædeav vs driht’
Ostende nobis domine
milheartynsse ðin
misericordiam tuam
7 halvende ðin
et salutare tuum
sel us
da nobis.
seven’s alcvm hade
Pro omini gradu
ciricelica
æcclesiastico.
sacerdas ðino god
Sacerdotes tuí deus
gegearvad sôdfest’
induantur iustitiam
7 halga’ ðines sie glado
et sancti tui lætentur
fore biorde userne

21 [b] Pro pastore nostro
  eadig se de oncnavaed
22 beatus qui intellegit
  ofer armne 7 dorfend
23 super egenum et pauperem
  on deg yfle gifriade
24 in die malo liberuit
  hine driht'
25 eum dominus . . .

81ra

f'e cynige vsum [l userne]151 driht'
1 [c] Pro rege nostro Domine sal
  hal do done cyning 7
2 uum fac regem et ex
  geber vsig on degi dam
3 audi nos in die qua
  ve geceigad dec
4 inuocauerimus te.
  f'e bisco' vsum hal
5 [d] Pro æpiscopo nostro. Saluum
  do esne din
6 fac seruum152 tuum
  god min hyhtende in dec
7 deus mens sperantem in te153
  f'e allvm folce crist
8 [e] Pro omni populo cris
  enra hal do
9 tiano. saluum fac
  folc din driht'
10 populum tuum domine
  7 gebloedsa erfevardnise
11 et benedic hereditate154
  ðinre 7 gericsa da ilco 7
12 tuæ. et rege eos et

---

151. Added above line. No ablative in OE, so he gives dative (usum) and then adds accusative (userne); see vel divina at fol. 80ra25.
152. Lind. corrects to ‘seruum’ but the first letter is clearly an ‘f’ identical to the ‘f’ in fac before it.
153. The ‘ite’ with abbreviation mark very small.
154. Lind. has ‘hereditati’. The ms looks like either an “ç” or an “e” with an “i” correction under it, in the same dark ink. See above at fol. 80ra24 for the same psalm verse.
ab eum vid in

extolle illos usque in

ecnisse

ae t eum . . .

f‘e sibbe 7 haelo

Pro pace et sanitate

dere cirica sie sibb

ae clesiae. fiat pax

in magnae divin 7

in uirtute tua. et

ginehtsumisse in tunv’

habundantia in tur

divin’

ribus tuis.

f‘e brod’rum 7 soest’nvm

Pro fratibus et sororibus

usvm f‘e brodr’

nostris. Propter fratres

minv 7 dem nestvm

meos et proximos

minv’ ic biom spreced sib

meos loquebar pa

of de f‘e hvs

cem de te. Propter domvm

godes mines ic sohte godo de

dei mei quessiuvi bona tibi

f‘e geong doendvm in cris

Pro iter agentibus in christo

155. Lind. notes this reading of tunum as clear in the ms, which it is. The Durham Ritual Glossary lists it as tur[lum] as a seemingly correct gloss of Latin turribus (but this is the only instance listed by the glossary). Bosworth and Toller note that tur is attested in the Chronicle only from after the Norman Conquest as influenced by French and thus question its use in Durham A.IV.19. Aldred apparently does not have tur as an option for Latin tower and uses instead OE tun (manor, habitation). On the other hand, torr is attested in OE as a Latin loan word; Bosworth and Toller note that the native word is stipel. But stipel does not occur in the Durham Ritual Glossary as used by Aldred. A second meaning listed for torr is the Celtic sense of a rock or outcropping (no Northumbrian examples given). Also, it is worth noting that the Latin turribus is broken at a line into tur-ribus and that the first “r” at the end of line 18 seems to have been added on or squeezed in and is stylistically an OE “r” not the Latin “r.”

156. The “a” is added below the “n.”

157. Relying on Lind. for “in cris” due to staining in corner.

158. The in christo is not in other versions (Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 6, 23); in the next heading [i], pro navigantibus, “fidelibus” as found in other versions is omitted, but the in bonis that follows may be part of the title.
la drie hæle mec do

2 Ó domine saluum me fac

la drie hæl farnige

3 ó domine bene prosperare

fē roendvm on godum

4 [i] Pro nauigantibus\textsuperscript{159} in bonis
gerher usig god halvoend’ vs’

5 exaudi nos deus salutaris noster

hyht allra gmæro earðes

6 spes omnium finium terrē
ton sae fearr

7 et in mare longe

fē allvm oehendvm

8 [j]\textsuperscript{160} Pro omnibus aduersantibus

7 teanevidendum us

9 et calumpiantibus nobis

drie hælend crist dy las dy gisette

10 Domine iesu christe ne sta

dæm dis on synn

11 tuas illis hoc in peccatum

nuton fēdon hved doas

12 nesciunt enim quid faciunt\textsuperscript{161}

fē dæm slitendum sib

13 [k] Pro discordantibus. pax

godes div of’sviðas alc

14 dei quæ exsuperat omnem

foelnise l\textsuperscript{162} 7 gibalda

15 sensum et custodiat

hearto 7 lichoma dara

16 corda et corpora illorum

in sibe sodlice fē hrosendv’
in pace\textsuperscript{163} amen [l] Pro poenitentibus\textsuperscript{164}

\textsuperscript{159} No period to indicate end of title, just abbreviation mark; unclear whether in bonis is part of the title or the beginning of the prayer, which normally starts with exaudi, since neither the “in” nor the “c” of exaudi are capped in any way.

\textsuperscript{160} The omnipibus and nobis are not in other versions (Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 6, 23).

\textsuperscript{161} The “t” is added below the “n.” Enim abbreviation is two vertical lines crossed through.

\textsuperscript{162} Another “vel” without an alternate word.

\textsuperscript{163} Other versions are slightly different: Pax dei qui exsuperat omnem sensuum corda uestra et intelligen-
cias nostras in christo iheu (Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 6, p. 24).

\textsuperscript{164} Added in the margin, extends beside lines 17–20; same hand, but small, with black ink for both Latin and OE gloss. He must have discovered the skipped text after the column was finished and even after the gloss was complete. The gloss is to the right of the Latin, not always following the Latin line breaks; the Latin is in OE script (note “v” instead of “u”).
convertere  

domine  

usque quo  

7 deprecabilis  

esto super  

servos  
tuo  

\[f\text{'e aelmisv'us}\]  

18 [m]  

\[\text{Pro elemoisinas nobis fā}\]  

doendvm in ðissv' middan'  

cientibus in hoc mundo  

tostregd gesalde dór  

20  

Dispersit dedit pav  

\[fendvm 7 sódfiést' his vvnas\]  

peribus. et iustitia eius manet  
in vorvld vor'ld hearta his  

22  

in sæculum sæculi. cor' eius  
\[f\text{'e vntrymigv' 7 gedeadvm}\]  

23 [n]  

\[\text{Pro infirmis et captiuis.}\]  

7 geceigdon to driht'  

et clamauernt ad dominum  

\[\text{mid ðy voeron } - 170 \text{ gecost' 7 of' ned'171}\]  

25  

cum tribularentvr  

dec neceasitabus  

\[\text{hira alesde hia}\]  

26  

eorum liberauit eos  

\[\text{165. Missing 's' on tuo.}\]  

\[\text{166. The words nobis and in hoc mundo not found in other versions (Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 6, 24); other versions also have a suffrage pro grācias agantibus preceding this one.}\]  

\[\text{167. Damage to 'c' of hoc and 'm' of mundo.}\]  

\[\text{168. The abbreviation of Ps. 111[112]:9 is so severe here that Aldred misreads cornu as cor and glosses it accordingly as heart. Pasperibus and eius in line 21 have an ‘-us’ abbreviation (‘3’) that is unusual for him (above, he used the more question mark style of an elevated comma with a dot below). Also, the eius here at the end of line 22 is a circle with a horizontal line through it, which might be an ‘e.’}\]  

\[\text{169. Seems to be a long mark over the first ‘i’ of captiuis, for some reason.}\]  

\[\text{170. This mark in the red brown ink of the gloss occurs above the ‘ant’ of tribulantiur. Lind. has tribulantiur but notes, p. 220, that it should be tribularentur (Ps.106:13).}\]  

\[\text{171. The gloss ned’ is written beside the Latin below the gloss of:}\]  

\[\text{172. Final ‘vr’ of tribulaniur extended as if ending, but then he continues with an effort to squeeze in the rest of the sentence on this page, using an ‘et’ sign and severe abbreviation of neceasitibus. Line 26 added below, in center, is also smaller and severely abbreviated, as is the end of line 25. He tends to want to finish a text or sentence when it involves a page turn, but is less concerned about an overrun to the next page not involving a page turn (e.g. fols. 81v–82r).}\]
menigo costungo
1 Multæ tribulationes
sōðfæstra 7 of ælvm
2 iustorvm et de omnibus
ðæm gefriade hia driht'
his liberabit eos dominus
driht' gehalda alle bano hiora
3 Dominus custodit omnia ossa eorum
enne of ðæm ne bid gebrocen
4 unum ex his non conteretur
f'e geleaffillum vnlifiendv'
5 Pro fidelibus defunctis
on gemynd eco' bidon
6 [o] in memoria æt erna erunt
sōðfasto from hernise yflv'
iusti ab auditu malo
ne ondredad
7 non timebunt.
8 Requiem æternam dona
him driht' 7 leht ece
eis domine et lux perpetua
gelihta him savlo ðara
9 luceat eis. Animæ illorum
7 hiora gehreaste
10 illarumque requiescant
on sibbe sōðlice
11 in pace. amen.
12 ðy les ðv selle driht' dearv'
13 Ne tradas domine bestis
savlo ondентendo de
14 animas confitentes tibi

173. Note again “3” style “-us” abbreviation here and below.
174. Compare fol. 80rb11–14 (36a) to fol. 81va0–11.
175. The “t” is below the “n.”
176. Lind. notes, p. 220, that it should be bestiis.
177. Lind. has ondentendo, but the “en” is clearly identical to the “en” later in the word.
178. Over the second “a” is an abbreviation mark, similar to one later in the line over the last “e” of confitentes, a horizontal line, with a thin descender from the right end, but unclear what it signifies in either case.
savo dörfendra dînra

17 animas pauperum tuorum
dy les dy f'gete in ende
18 ne obluiiscaris in finem
f' e synnum 7 gemeleasnisu'
19 [p] Pro peccatis et neglegentiis
ysvm dy les dy gemynedge
20 nostris. Ne memineris
vrehtra vsra aldra
21 iniquitatum nostrarum anti
recone vsig f' e foe
22 quaram cito nos ante
miltheartnisse
23 cipiat misericordia
dîn f' don dörfendo avord
24 tua quia pauperes fac
enso ve aron sviðe
25 ti sumus nimis.

8tvb
f' e vsig seolfa

1 [q] Pro nobismet ipsis.
help vsig god halvoende'
2 adiuua nos deus salu
userne f' e worðvunge
3 taris noster propter honorem
nomes dînes driht' ales
4 nominis tui domine libera
vsig 7 miltheart vas dy
5 nos et propitius esto pec
synnum vsvm f' e nome dînv' driht'
6 catis nostris propter nomen tuum domine
f' e veldoendvm vsvm
7 [r] Pro benefactoribus nostris
driht' efi sel f' e mec
8 Dominus retribue pro me
miltheartnisse dîn in vorl'd
9 misericordia tua in seculum
onseade driht' engel
10 Inmittit dominus angelum
on ymbgeonge ðara ondredenda
in circuitu timentium
bine 7 genere bia
eum et eripiet eos
f’e brodr’ isvm fro’ voesenv’
Pro fratribus nostris absentibus
halo do esnas
Saluos fac seruos
dino god min hyhtendo in ðec
tuos deus meus sperantes in te
send him driht’
Mitte eis domine auxi
fulvm of halgv’ 7 af sione
lium de Sancto. et de sion
gescild bia noht gevæxo
tuere eos. Nihil profi
l giðu se fiond in ðæm
ciet inimicus in eis
7 svnv vnrehtvisnis
et filius iniquitatis non
ne tosette gescedde ðæm
adponet nocere eis
sett driht’ gehald
Pone domine custodiam
mvdâ minv’ 7 dor
ori meo et hostiam
ymbstondennisse valeru’ minv’
circumstantiae labis meis
in alcv’ stov ricsunges his
In orni loco dominationis eius

gebloedsa savl min driht’
benedic anima mea dominum
driht’ geber gebed
Domine exaudi orationem

179. The “enda” is written below.
180. Compare to 36b (fol. 80rb15–22).
181. The “in te” is below, small, and marked off from line 16 by a vertical to horizontal line.
182. End of labis and also meis a bit crowded in.
39. fol. 82ra6-b11

Two Vespers Collects [a–b]\(^{183}\)
Aldred, minuscule;\(^{184}\) glossed.

\(^{183}\) Neither is found in the original collectar or in Scribe C’s collects on fol. 76r, but under a different incipit, see Gratias tibi agimus, Domine Deus omnipotens, qui nos uiuentes in Ælfwine 73.191, which is similar to the first part of [a].

\(^{184}\) This text seems more widely spaced, with 23 lines in each column, a blank line between the two collects (line 18), and large capital letters to start each prayer (lines 7 and 19); he also reverts to other abbreviation style for “–us.”

\(^{185}\) Title in red, majuscule caps. See fol. 80vo10–11 rubric (QXI.36x) for possible connection.

\(^{186}\) Ds quite large, with the D extending up to the miserere of line 5.
vnascendado

17 inlessos. per
18 [blank]
19 [b] Esto nobis propitius
20 omnipotens deus. ut si ali
21 quid incongruum
22 aut ineptum roga
23 re et petere ausi

82rb

ve sindon ne besib dv ne ae\(^{187}\)
1 sumus. non aspicias neque
onfob dv iorra l vråd ah\(^{188}\)
2 assumas\(^{189}\) iratus sed
in god gevoend dv\(^{190}\)
3 in bonum conviertas.
\(dv\) de symle godscipe
4 qui semper bonitatem
\(dv\) giwnne 7 allo de dec giwendo
5 prestas. et omnes te pe
\(arfastlice dv gihelpes\)
6 tentes pie adiuuas
\(derh driht\) uerne helend criste
7 per dominum nostrum iesium christum
\(bearne dinv\) se de de mid
8 filium tuum qui tecvm
\(liosad god in annise\)
9 uiuit deus in unitate
\(daes ilca gastes halges derb\)
10 eiusdem spiritus sancti per in
\(endeleaso vorvulda vorl\)
11 finita sæcula sæculorum. amen

\(^{187}\) Relying on Lind. for \(ne ae\) due to ms staining.
\(^{188}\) Relying on Lind. for \(ah\) due to ms staining.
\(^{189}\) Double “ss,” although the first one looks like an “f” and may reflect the style of exemplar, as with the change in “us” abbreviation noted above.
\(^{190}\) Relying on Lind. for \(dv\) due to ms staining.
Hymn for Compline, *Te lucis ante terminum* (Hy 11)\(^{191}\)
Aldred, minuscule; glossed.

82rb

12 ymnus ad complendum\(^{192}\)
dec lehtes ær gemære
13 Te lucis ante terminvm
dinga scapend ve biddas
14 rerum creator pos
p'ë wvnvlco rvmmmodnise\(^{193}\)
15 cimus. ut solita cle
sie ðv aldormon to
16 mentia sis presul ad
gibœaeld
17 custodiam.\(^{194}\)
fearr gifære hia svoesno
18 Procul recedant somp
7 nehta scinelico
19 nia et noxium\(^{195}\) fantas
done fiond æc vserne
20 mata hostemque nostrum
gœryc ðy les gewidlado
21 comprime\(^{196}\) ne pollua
sie lichomo
22 ntur corpora.
gionn feder se arwyrðesta
23 Presta pater piissime\(^{197}\)

---

\(^{191}\) Milfull notes (*Hymns*, 134), that this hymn, which dates back to the Old Hymnal, is for Compline in summer, while #12 is for winter, although in a non-monastic hymnal, #11 is for weekdays only. Aldred's gloss is significantly different from the Durham Hymnal (Durham Cathedral Library B.III.32) that Milfull reproduces.

\(^{192}\) Red title. Title in Milfull, *Hymns*, is *Ymnus Ad Completorium*.

\(^{193}\) The “-nise” below.

\(^{194}\) Note how hymn verse ends midline and next verse starts a new line with a capital letter; similarly with next verse.

\(^{195}\) Lind, p. 220 n., suggests correction to *noctium*, which is what Milfull has as normative, noting the use of *noxium* here in the Durham Ritual (E) and also in C (CCCC 391). The OE gloss is *naht*, night rather than a gloss on noxious. Also, the previous line, sompnia is spelled in Milfull without the "p."

\(^{196}\) Lind. and Milfull have *comprime* but "n" is clear.

\(^{197}\) All other versions in Milfull have *omnipotens* (*aldmihtiga*), not *piissime*. 
82va

\[\text{ðerh hel’ crist driht’ se ðe dec mid}\]
1 per iesum christum dominum qui tecum
   \[\text{in ecnise ricasd mid}\]
2 in perpetuo\textsuperscript{198} regnat cum
   \[\text{halgum gaste}\]
3 sancto spiritu. amen.

41. fols. 82va4–83rb10

Capitella (Gallican) for Compline\textsuperscript{199} with two collects (fol. 83ra3–13 and fol. 83rb1–10).

Aldred, minuscule; glossed; no rubric.

82va

\[\text{fader userne ðv ard in heof’}\]
4 Pater noster qui es in caelis
   \[7 \text{ðy læs usig ðv giled in}\]
5 Et ne nos inducas int
   \[\text{costunge ab ales usig}\]
6 emptationem. sed libera nos\textsuperscript{200}
   \[\text{ful tymme userne in noma}\]
7 Adiutorium nostrum in nomine
   \[\text{driht’ se ðe worhte heofon 7 eorðe}\]
8 domini qui fecit caelum 7 terram\textsuperscript{201}
   \[\text{fro’ geheld morgenlicvm}\]
9 A custodia matutina
   \[\text{við to næht}\]
10 usque ad noctem.
   \[\text{gebyhte isrl’\textsuperscript{202} on driht’ of ðis’}\]
11 Speret israel in domino ex hoc
   \[\text{nv 7 við in world}\]
12 nunc et usque in seculum

\textsuperscript{198}. Milfull, \textit{Hymns, perpetuum} is in all other mss.
\textsuperscript{199}. See Tolhurst, \textit{Hyde Abbey}, vol. 6, 37–41. These are all psalms with no intentions or suffrages for particular groups.
\textsuperscript{200}. The “nos” squeezed in small.
\textsuperscript{201}. The “terram” abbreviated, squeezed in small, not as much as “nos” above.
\textsuperscript{202}. Appears to be the same abbreviation as the Latin (\textit{isrl}) but with the “s” and “r” reversed in the OE gloss script.
gif inæ in busincil
13 Si introiero in taber
l\textsuperscript{203} hves mines
14 naculum domus meæ
gif ic astigo on legir
15 Si ascendero in lectum
breadinges mines gif ic sello
16 stratus mei. si dedero
slep l svoefen\textsuperscript{204} egvm minv'
17 sompnum oculis meis
7 brvvm minv' slep
18 et palpebris meis dormitationem
7 rest dvnwoengv' minv'
19 Et requiem temporibus\textsuperscript{205} meis
oð þ' ic mitto stov
20 donec inueniam locum
driht' busincil l\textsuperscript{206} gode ia'
21 domino tabernaculum deo iacob\textsuperscript{207}
ic gelefo in gode feder
22 Credo in deum patrem
allm'
23 omnipotentem\textsuperscript{208}

82vb
sceppend heofnes 7 eorde
1 creatorem cæli et terræ
lichomes erest
2 Carnis resurrectionem
in lif ece
3 in uitam æternam. amen
eft se afyelled muð min in here'n
4 Repleatur òs meum\textsuperscript{209} in lavde

\textsuperscript{203}. Another "vel" without an alternative; duplicated below at line 21, tabernaculum glossed \textit{busincil vel...} " These are the only two instances of \textit{busincil} in Durham A.IV.19.
\textsuperscript{204}. Note "vel" here with an alternate word. Hymn above (fol. 82rb18) glosses \textit{sompnum} with only svoefen.
\textsuperscript{205}. Heavy abbreviation here; also of dormi in line above. Note misspelling \textit{temp/oribus} with an “i.”
\textsuperscript{206}. Compare line 13 above.
\textsuperscript{207}. Squeezed in small.
\textsuperscript{208}. Note \textit{omnipotentem} spelled out and not abbreviated, with space left over, goes to next column, which includes more of the creed than is normally included in an incipit.
\textsuperscript{209}. Abbreviation of \textit{meum} to “mm,” the abbreviation mark is in the ink of the gloss. Also, \textit{lavde} at the end of the line is a bit crowded.
ðin þe ic megi singa wvlvr
tua. ut possim cantare gloriam
gibloedsad arð driht' god
Benedictus es domine deus
fadora vsra 7 hergiendlic
patruum nostrorum et lau
7 wvldorlic
dabilis et gloriosus
7 of’ hebbendlic in vorvl’
et superexaltatus in secula
gibloedsad arð ðv de gisceavas
Benedictus es qui in
da niolnisse 7 gesitites
tueris abysos. et sedis
of’ che211 7 hergendlic212
super cherubin. et lau
7 wvldvrlíc
dabilis et gloriosus
7 of’ hebbendlic in vorl’
et superexaltatus in secula
bloedsiga ve ðone fæder
Benedicamus patrem
7 ðone svnv 7 ðone gast helga
et filium et spiritum sanctum
herga ve 7 of’ ahebba ve
laudemus et superexal
hine in vorvlda213
temus eum in sæcula
gibloedsiga 7 gehalda
Benedicat et custodiát214
vswg god fæder allm’
nos deus pater omnipotens
se ðe worhte heofon
qui fecit cælum
7 eorde se 7 allo
et terram mare et omnia

211. Note lack of translation of non-Latin names; compare Panchiel in the field prayers at fol. 66r5, 22, and 66v9.
212. Gloss of lau(-dabilis), hergend- breaks with –lic below it.
213. Looks like a long mark over the final “a” of vorvlda, not in Lind.
214. Prior to this verse, later versions add Dan. 3:56 and another verse (Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 6, 38).
da de in dem aron
23 quæ in eis sunt.

83ra
gemeodvma drih' næhte ðissv'
1 Dignare domine [die] nocte\[215\] ista
butan synne usig
2 sine peccato nos cus
gehalda
3 todire. Oremus.\[216\]
gerihta 7 gehalda
4 Dirigere et custodire
dv gimeodvma driht' god cynig
5 digneris domine deus rex
heofnes 7 eorde in ðisser
6 cæl ac terrë in ista
næhte hearto 7 lichoma\[217\]
7 nocte corda et cor
usa b' ðerb ðec
8 pora nostra. ut per te
halo vossa ve magi
9 salui esse possimus
hælend middangeard'
10 saluator mundi qui
mið feder 7 gaste
11 cum patre et spiritu
halgo lifoð 7 ricsað
12 sancto uiuis et regnas
god ðerb allo vorl'
13 deus per omnia secula
gesett driht' gehald
14 Pone domine custodiam
muðe minv' 7 dor
15 ori meo et hostiam
ymbstondennisses væler'
16 circumstantiae labes

215. Correction in dark ink, underlining die and replacing it above with nocte; the gloss is added after the correction. Aldred must have forgotten he was working on night hours and wrote day initially, then immediately corrected himself.

216. No gloss; this is the header for the collect, Dirigere et custodire, also found at Prime (QXI.33, fol. 79rb9). Other versions include before the collect a series of psalms from Prime not included here (Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 6, 38–39).

217. Final “a” of lichoma is below.
in alcvm stote blafard

17 In omni loco domina
scipes des bloedsa

18 tionis illius benedic
savel min driht'

19 anima mea dominum
driht' geber gebedd

20 Domine exaudi orationem
min 7 ceir min

21 meam et clamor meus
to de cyme

22 ad te ueniat . . .
ic hof ego mino

23 Leuauic oculos meos

24 ad montes to morv'
lehtes armorgenlic allo
9 lucis auroram cuncti
arise ve gefeande
10 surgamus gaudentes. per d’.

42. fol. 83rb11–21

Seven Penitential Psalms (incipits) for Prime [a–g]226
Aldred, minuscule; glossed; rubric unglossed.

83rb
11 hii sunt .vii. psalmi
12 poenitentiales ad primam horam227
   dy les in velme ðinv’
13 [a] Domine228 ne in furore tuo .i.229
    eadgo ða ðara f’gefeno aron
14 [b] Beati quorum remisæ sunt
     drih’ dy les in iorre ðinv’
15 [c] Domine ne in ira tua .ii.
     milsa me god æfi’
16 [d] Miserere mihi deus secundum
     drih’ geher gebedd min
17 [e] Domine exaudi orationem meam
     7 ceir min to ðe cyme
18 et clamor meus ad te ueniat
    of grvndvm ic geceigde
19 [f] De profundis clamavi
     drih’ geher gibed
20 [g] Domine exaudi orationem
     min earvm onfoh
21 meam auribus percipe

226. Psalms 6, 31(32), 37(38), 50(51), 101(102), 129(130) and 142(143).
227. Title in red ink, unglossed; horam is in right margin, small, and elevated. There appears to be something below it and primam, two or three letters possibly beginning with “o” and ending in “n,” potentially a gloss of .i. (one) in line 13.
228. Abbreviated Dne is in red ink of title; no evidence of gloss.
229. Note use of numbers here at at line 13 to differentiate the two identical psalm incipits.
Incipits of special psalms labeled for: Tierce, 8 [a]; Sext, 5 [b]; None, 8 [c]; Vespers, 3 [d]; all times of prosperity [e]; and for practice [f]

Aldred, minuscule; partial gloss on titles.\(^{230}\)

\(^{230}\) Variations in format compared to earlier: glossing titles not texts; titles are in red ink, with a dark gloss, for contrast; some initial letters of psalm incipits also in red (fols. 83va13, 87vb1–7, 13–15), perhaps done at the time of the titles and the rest filled in with black at the time of the gloss; extensive abbreviations at the end of lines in order to keep the incipit to a single line, sometimes abbreviating the familiar psalm words to a single letter.

\(^{231}\) Title in red ink, unglossed.

\(^{232}\) Title in red ink, unglossed.

\(^{233}\) Variant spelling: miseriatur for miseratur.

\(^{234}\) Abbreviated first word, Ds for Deus, appears to be added in the left margin in front of In te. There is a large space after te, an erasure of three or four characters. An early erased letter has an ascender, a later one has a descender. It could be ds, if In te Deus was changed to Deus in te (’I’ of in te is cap). The ’D’ is in an OE style. T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 36 identifies this as a twelfth century hand changing the incipit from Gallican to Romanum; see also fol. 83vb5 below.

\(^{235}\) Different abbreviation mark than above for domine, more the lightening stroke.

\(^{236}\) Different word order from Vulgate, Domine deus meus in te speravi.
Domine quid multiplicati sunt [Ps. 3]
Deus deus meus respice in me [Ps. 21]
Deus noster refugium [Ps. 45]
Exaudi deus orationem meam cum tribulor [Ps. 63]
Saluum me fac deus quoniam intrauerunt [Ps. 68]

Si te In tribulationibus
Fro' gode f'leten ðv ongetest
a deo derelictum intelleg
gebegdum hearte
as conpuncto corde
gesing das salmas
decanta hos psalmos
in herenise godes to tid
in laudem dei ad horam
non
nonam . . ,

Usque quo domine obliuisceris mei [Ps. 12]
In te domine speraui non confundar i. [Ps. 30]
Deus auribus nostris audivimus [Ps. 43]
exaudi deus orationem meum et ne dispexeris [Ps. 54]
Miserere mihi domine quoniam conculcavit [Ps. 55]
Miserere mei deus miserere mei [Ps. 56]
uoce mea ad dominum clamaui [Ps. 76 or 141]
ux mea ad dominum et intendit mihi [Ps. 76]
eifi wvt onfoendum smylt

Post autem acceptam qui

237. Dne in red. Many of the “d” letters in the last few pages have been the kind open at the top, perhaps a style in the exemplar.
238. Addition of “in” compared to Vulgate.
239. First letters in lines 1–7, 13–15 are in red.
240. The second psalm with this incipit is Ps. 70.
241. Lind. has Exaudi but the initial is not capped and the “u” is missing; at end of line, “dis” abbreviation is presumably variant for dispexeris.
242. Despite shortening with abbreviation marks on mihi, domine, and quoniam, the last word runs into the right margin and is lighter. The lighter brown ink, wider nib starts with dnoe or possibly the abbreviation mark over “m” of mihi. The concul in particular looks like a different hand, not Aldred’s. Lighter background suggests possible erasure. See end of line 8 below for a similar addition, as well as 13–14. As with fol. 83va7 above, T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 36 identifies this as a twelfth century correction from Gallican to Romanum incipit.
243. Vulgate deus.
244. Last abbreviated word (“m” with vertical “i” above) is in right margin, lighter color, as in line 5 above. The “m” looks like Aldred’s insular gloss “m.”
nisse 7 ednisse
etem ac prosperitatem
das salmas to eferne
hos psalmos ad uespervm
on herenise godes gesing
in laudem dei decanta
Benedicam dominum in omni tempore [Ps. 33]
Benedic anima mea dominum [Ps. 102 or 103]
Exaltabo te deus meus rex [Ps. 144]
7 in alcmn tiide ednisses
16 [e] Et in omni tempore pros-
symle ymmon
peritatis semper ymnvm
dara drea cnehtana
trium puerorvm
in laudem dei decanta
Benedicite
omnia opera domini dominum [Dan. 3]
gif bigeonga dec dv weell.
Si exercere te uolueris
on godcvndvm herenis' gesing
in diuinis laudibus decanta

84ra
1 Beati inmaculati in uia
2 qui ambulant in lege domini [Ps. 118]
3 [blank]

44. fol. 84ra4–b18
Four Collects for St. Cuthbert [a-d]

245. Title in red, dark gloss.
246. End of this line and one above, fade into the right margin; similar ink issues to lines 5 and 8 below. In line 13, “tem” is faint, but could be wear. In line 14, hard to read after “d” of abbreviated dominum. The “d” is Aldred, but there are some added letters after that in a fainter ink.
247. Note that this last line of the title, a stock phrase, is left unglossed. Note also the mixture of two different styles of “d” in these texts, some the open top, others not.
248. Half line left blank; appears to be an erasure.
249. A lot of wear down in the bottom and right margin, near the trough; relying on Lind. for some final words and gloss, which he also was unable to read fully. Possibly this page was worn more because of use on the facing page, 84r with the Cuthbert collects and colophon.
250. Last word squeezed in small.
251. For comparison, see Fulda Sacramentary 41, p. 31: [a] is identical except for omission of facias at
Aldred; minuscule, new writing stint;\textsuperscript{252} unglossed; two column with blank lines between prayers; untitled; four large initials.\textsuperscript{253}

\textit{84ra}

\begin{verbatim}
4 [a] Omnipotens sempiternæ\textsuperscript{254} deus
5 qui in meritis sancti tui
6 cuthberhti\textsuperscript{255} sacerdotis
7 semper es et ubique mirabi\textsuperscript{256}
8 lis. quesumus clementiam tuam
9 ut sicut ei eminentem
gloriam contulisti sic
ad consequendam mise
ricordiam tuam eius
nos precibus\textsuperscript{257} adiuuari. per.
[blank\textsuperscript{258}]
15[b] Deus qui nos sanctorum tuorum
temporali tribues
commemoratione gau
der. presta quesumus ut beato
cudberhto pontifice
intercedente in ea nume
remur salutis\textsuperscript{259} in qua
illi sunt gratia tua
gloriosi. Per . . . \textsuperscript{260}
\end{verbatim}

\textit{84rb}

\begin{verbatim}
1 [c] Deus qui sanctorum tuorum\textsuperscript{261}
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{fol. 84ra13; [b] substituted \textit{salutis for sorte salvati}; note use of \textit{pontifice} and \textit{sacerdote} with Cuthbert's name. See also Hohler, “The Durham Services on Honour of St Cuthbert,” 158.}

\textsuperscript{252. Letters are smaller, thinner nib, tighter overall; right column is a bit darker and a wider nib than the left.}

\textsuperscript{253. Initials are unusual in shape and may have been done after the prayers or modeled on an exemplar.}

\textsuperscript{254. Lind. has \textit{sempiterne}, but it looks like an “æ” at the end, with the “a” partially erased and a dot below it.}

\textsuperscript{255. Notice spelling of Cuthbert’s name here in line 6 with “th” but below in line 19, spelling with “d” as it is in the next two collects in column b.}

\textsuperscript{256. Hole made from the other side by Scribe E’s erasure (fol. 84v10) mars the “r.”}

\textsuperscript{257. Lind. notes (220) that Aldred “seems to have omitted \textit{facias} before \textit{precibus}. See Fulda Sacramentary, 31.}

\textsuperscript{258. Some evidence of stray ink marks toward the gutter; possible erasure, but could be other reasons for discoloration in this space.}

\textsuperscript{259. Lind. notes (220) that Aldred has \textit{salutis} instead of \textit{sorte salvati}, and references John Lingard, \textit{The History and Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church} (London, 1845), vol. 2, 365.}

\textsuperscript{260. In this last line of the second Cuthbert collect in the first column, somewhat worn, the descendents of the “s” in \textit{gloriosi} and “p” of \textit{per} extend down far, touching almost the barely legible memorandum. Lind. thinks the latter was erased before the Cuthbert text was added.}

\textsuperscript{261. Right upper corner damaged, almost transparent with letters from the verso showing through even in the facsimile.}
libenter suscipis uo
luntates intercedente
beato cudberhto sa
cerdote familiam
tuam *quesumus* domine misera
tionis tuæ dextera
semper et ubique protege. per.
[blank]
Deus qui *sanctorum* tuorum aput
té gloriam permanentem
fidelium facis devote
ne claescere presta *quesumus*
ut beatu cusdberhtus
sequentibus sibi beneficia
dignanter inpendat. et pro
populo tuo intercessor
existat. *per dominum.*

45. 84ra23–26

Memorandum or dedication
Aldred, variable style; very worn.

84ra

Deus omnipotens
et (?) Maria et Helena et sanctus
Cudbertus . . . te
gelanidon [Aldred].

46. fol. 84rb19–26

Old English Colophon
Aldred, minuscule, smaller than collects (44).

84rb

Besuðan wudigan gæt æt áclea
on westsæxum on laurentius
mæssan daegi. on wodnes daegi
ælfsige ðæm biscope in his
getèlde aldred se p’fast

---

Antiphons, versicles, and responsories for the first four Sundays in Advent, incomplete.263

Scribe E, one column, unglossed; starts at the very top and leaves little in the way of margins on the sides, top, or bottom, and squeezes the last word on, as if he only had this page available.

3 R.’ Missus est gabriel.270 U’. Aue maria. R’. Aue maria.271

263. Thompson, Rituale, xi, specifies for Matins (night office) and Lauds on the first three Sundays in Advent but that the fourth Sunday is only partial.
264. Damage to upper left corner with staining.
265. Isaiah 30:27.
266. The second numeral “I” is tall with a horizontal top and appears to be added in the space between ui and Ecce. The color of the “uii” is slighter lighter, like the abbreviation mark over “dni,” whereas the “dni” and the periods on either side of “uii” are darker. Thus the final “I” of “uii” (7) may be an addition, possibly an insertion mark, or a correction to indicate the first Sunday in Advent.
267. Ezechiel 17:12. Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 1, fo. 3v has ecce rex tuus veniet as part of the antiphon for 1st Sunday Advent Lauds gospel reading (e.g. Your king comes . . . ). See Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 1, fo. 9v, 3rd Sunday in Advent, third day, Matins invitatorium.
268. R: Aspiciens a longe through V: Tollite portas in line 3 are in Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 1, fo. 1v under 1st Sunday of Advent, Matins, 1st Nocturn, first reading.
270. R: Missus est gabriel and U: Aue Maria are in Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 1, fo. 1v under 1st Sunday in Advent, Matins, 1st Nocturn, third reading.
272. R: Salutarem in Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 1, fo. 2v, 1st Sunday in Advent, 2nd Nocturn, reading 7 responsory, but different versicle after. Here it is followed by U: Preocupemus (not found in Tolhurst).
274. No abbreviation mark over con but after it (con-); Lind. has conseciptum. R: Ecce uirgo concipiet (Is. 7:14 and in Gospels) in Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 1, fo. 3, 1st Sunday in Advent, 3rd Nocturns, reading 10; different versicle follows. Here, U: Tollite repeats from earlier.
275. R: Obsecro domine in Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, 1st Sunday in Lent, third Nocturn, reading 11; different versicle follows. Here, U: A solis ortu repeats from earlier.


277. Lind. starts a new section with In laudibus. From here through line 10 ending with Ecce ueniet profeta is the first Sunday in Advent Lauds (Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 1, fo. 3v) all of the antiphons, but no psalms; Tolhurst entry has the psalms, as well as the chapter reading, hymn, and further versicles, responsories, and oratio that follow in the service. Here it is unclear if what follows this section is starting 2nd Sunday in Advent; note line 11 Ne timeas maria below.

278. Most of the antiphon As are cap tall inverted v-shaped, but a few appear as lower case style, either a or a. 279. Space for a few characters between profeta. and U’. First an erasure of what appears to be an A (antiphon), then a space where there is a small cut, a hole right before the U’. The cap A with a dot after it is also erased, but no sign of an erased abbreviation mark above it. On the recto, this cut mars the word (fol. 84ra?) at the “r.” E erased his mistaken “A” but also accidentally tore a hole, then resumed with U’. Like the erasure marks, the cut is angled right (!) with a bit of a hook at the bottom or scrap edge ofvellum, possibly scraping with his right hand. No sign of ink on the cut (if it had been done with the nib). The edge of the cut shows edges under more to the recto than the verso. 280. U: Emitte agnum in Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 1, fo. 5, 1st week of Advent, second day (feria secunda), Lauds, versicle after the hymn. A: Spiritus sanctus that follows here, unclear where it comes in.

281. Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 1, fo. 3v Memoria de sancta maria after Lauds, 1st Sunday in Advent; possibly used elsewhere in Advent. See also, Roper, Medieval English Benedictine Liturgy, 255, Antiphon at Matins/nocturnes, Office of the Virgin in the Worcester Antiphoner.

282. From here through line 19 to Lauds, see 2nd Sunday in Advent (Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 1, fo. 6v–8v) Vespers and Matins.


285. U: Israel si me audieris in Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 1, fo. 9, 2nd week of Advent, second day (feria secunda), matins first reading versicle after R: Ierusalem cito.

286. Abbreviation dns in same dark ink added above Ecce with an insertion mark in lighter ink between Ecce and ueniet. 287. R: Ecce dominus ueniet et omnes sancti in Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 1, fo. 7v, 2nd Sunday in Advent, Matins, 1st Nocturn, reading 3; unable to locate previous U: Israel si me audieris. U: A solis ortu that follows is not found in Tolhurst but repeats from earlier here. 288. R: Ierusalem surge in Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 1, fo. 8, 2nd Sunday in Advent, Matins, 2nd Nocturn, reading 8; U: Leua in circuitu follows as it does here.


R'. Egredietur dominus.\textsuperscript{293} U'. Deus a libano. R'. Rex noster adueni.\textsuperscript{294}

U'. Ecce agnus dei. In laudibus.\textsuperscript{295} A'. Ecce in nubibus caeli.


A'. Beata es maria. Illa.\textsuperscript{297} A'. Non auferetur sceptrum.\textsuperscript{298}

R'. Ecce apparebit.\textsuperscript{299} U'. Ecce dominator. R'. Betlem ciuitas.\textsuperscript{300} U'. Deus a libano. R'. Qui uenturus est.\textsuperscript{301}

U'. Exion species. R'. Suscipe uerbum.\textsuperscript{302} U'. Aue maria.

R'. Eegipte noli.\textsuperscript{303} U'. Ecce dominator. R'. Prope est\textsuperscript{304}.

U'. Qui uenturus est. R'. Descendet dominus.\textsuperscript{305} U'. Exion.

R'. Ueni domine et noli.\textsuperscript{306} U'. A solis ortu. R'. Docebit nos.\textsuperscript{307}


Quomodo fiet istud. R'. Canite tuba in sion.\textsuperscript{310}

34 R’. Non auferetur.311 U’. Pulchriores sunt. R’. Me oportet312
35 U’. hoc est testimonium. R’. Ecce iam uenit plenitudo313

48. fols. 85ra–86rb9

Notae Juris: ha sunt notas predestinatas (“Legal notations: these are prede-
termined notations”); approximately 225 entries of legal and other abbrevia-
tions, alphabetical by first letter only.314

Aldred; minuscule, 2 columns; titles in red;315 glossed.

85ra
1 Hae sunt notas predestinatas316
Æt odba
2 A~p . aput . a~ . aut.
wv’ ecnvng
3 at~ . autem . Ac~o . auc
gescir l317
tio . ai~m . actionem

311. R: Non auferetur sceptrum in Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 1, fo. 13, 4th Sunday in Advent, Matins,
Nocturn 1, reading 4; V: pluchriores sunt follows as here.
312. Have not found this R and its U in Tolhurst.
313. This last half line, and the beginning of lines 34–35 have suffered wear. The word plenitudo is di-
vided, with the “do” below. R: Ecce iam uenit plenitudo found in Tolhurst, Hyde Abbey, vol. 1, fol. 14v, 4th
week in Advent, 2nd day, Lauds Antiphon.
314. T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 51; Thompson, Rituale, xi, xix–xx; W. J. P. Boyd, “Aldrediana XXV:
315. Some smearing of the red, affecting fol. 84v as well. On fol. 85r upper right corner, a V shaped
patch; serious staining that affects the whole ms but is clearly worse in the later quires (as if something
soaked the corner from the bottom up). On fol. 85r upper right corner appears to be marginalia but it may
be ink bleed from 84v. Also in right margin of fol. 85r between lines 12–17, may be some very faint marginal
text or has been scraped.
316. Title in red, unglossed; “as” of last word written above “at” of predestinat. For what follows (Lind.
only has the unabbreviated word with the gloss above it), I have put the abbreviated word as abbreviated,
using the tilde that closely matches the abbreviation sign used throughout (except in a few cases, as noted, or
where an equivalent typeset character exists). I have placed it after the letter over which it occurs or between
letters over which it occurs. The unabbreviated word follows, but where those include ending abbrevia-
tions, I have added the missing letter in italics, as done with earlier text; for OE I have used, like Lind.,
an apostrophe to indicate an abbreviation mark in an OE word. With the Latin, periods occur between words,
sometimes with space on either side, sometimes closer to the beginning of the next word. I have left spaces
around all periods, since that seems to be the predominant pattern.
317. Note lack of alternate. Lind. notes, 220, that Stevenson has gestir, but Lind. rejects that reading. The
Durham Ritual Glossary has giscir and only this instance. Also, a preexisting cut or crack runs through here
(right end of a column, lines from lines 2–4, although it does not go all the way through at the top; as if
something cut it from this side rather than the other). Aldred has avoided writing where this cut is. The vel
symbol is right before this cut. In line 3, he has glossed ecnvng with the “g” falling after the cut. Also, near
the cut, below it, runs a vertical light line that seems to mark the right edge of the “a” column, visible to at
least lines 13 or 14. A similar line runs along the right edge of column “b” as well, but it is double parallel
lines about a ¼ inch apart. The rest of the folios do not appear to have vertical ruling of this type.
frēme
5 A-f . affectus . ag-s. au
   Caser caseres
6 gustus . ag-i . agusti .
   aer
7 An- . ante . ap-li . amp
   f'ðor scort
8 lius . bs- breuis . bm-
   Scortne vel
9 Breuem . be- bene . bt-
   Eadig god
10 beatus . bn- bonus .
   godra
11 Bn- o bonorum . bf- bene
   velfremming gifeht
12 ficium . bl bellum
   hearte intinga
13 C. cor . c- causa . co-
   Cvð ðæs
14 cognita . cu- cuius
   ðem ongegn
15 Ci- cui . C CONTRA
   mid f' an ongegn
16 c) cum . encontra
   portver romanisc
17 Cir-. ciues romanus
   hehysyn
18 cri-m crinem: c-fs- .
   ondetende
19 Confessus . Css- . car
   leofiste heone ongegn
20 issimus . en contra

---

318. Close approximation of this abbreviation mark, which looks like a backward C or close parens, subscripted. The one in the next line is lower case “c” with a similar curved mark. In Lindenbrog, p. 289, the abbreviation sign itself (somewhat resembling a long comma or a close parens) is the symbol for con while a more hooked version is the sign for contra; in neither case is it preceded by a “c” as here with contra. Capelli does not have anything similar.

319. The prefix “en” is added in front and angling up, seemingly afterward. The “e” is hard to distinguish in relation to the “c” with some extra mark in front of the “e.” Looks almost like an ampersand. Lind. has “en contra.”


321. Lind., 220, notes “sic,” should be crimen.

322. The first of the two “s”s may have been added after the “c” of confessus.
of don æfι どn
21 Dd-. deinde . d-. dein
mid by geafo
22 d-.323 . dum . . . dotes
sellad at nesta
23 dt- dant . dm-324 demum

85rb

gecvoeð cvoeð
1 d325 dixit . d- dicit . dr-
bid gecvoeden gesealla
2 dicitur . de- dare
facon is
3 dl dolus . . . E- . est . ee-
voere giboden’
4 esse . edi- edicti . et-
wvt’ f’don
5 Etiam . er- ergo . egr-s
foerde fordon
6 egressus . N326 enim . .
awordno to doenv’
7 Fa- facta . fo facto
vere fleende
8 fut- fuerit327 . fu- . fugiens328
doad beren/de329
9 fa- u faciunt . fe feta
awordeno aron giselig’
10 fa-s facta sunt . fx- felix
gifæstnad lufe
11 Fen- fensum . fc- fide

323. Appears to be a hook on this abbreviation mark, something like a 7.
324. Dark stain over the “d” of “dm-” matched by a similar blot of dark material on fol. 84v31, so a later spill of some kind.
325. The “d” is very open with a small horizontal abbreviation mark above, different from the tilde abbreviation mark above the “d” in the next word, dicit.
326. This abbreviation looks like a large wide “N” open at the top with a minim in its bowl. Essentially, the “N” looks like a backwards 4 open at the top, with the extender going below the line. See fol. 87vb line 3.
327. Space in the middle of fuerit between the “e” and the “r.” No evidence of an erasure, but a horizontal line extends from the “e” toward the “r” across the space and some smudging appears below. Perhaps he started to write fuer and then corrected.
328. End of word (“iens”) squeezed in small at end of line, actually in the zone of the parallel lines marking the edge of the column. This is the first time he has violated the column mark; when he does it again in lines below, he squeezes less, but never transgresses the second, right line. This still leaves considerable margin space in the ms.
329. Gloss is to the right of the word, split into two lines (beren/de).
beboden bearne rehtes
12 commissum . fi- filio iuris
strongi gesetted
13 Fo- forte . f- fundi .
geleafa sunu
14 f- 330 fides . f-l filius
broder
15 Fr- frat-er 331 . fua-t
Ves gaius 332
16 fuerat . G- gaius .
gigladade
17 G- 333 . gauisetus . gn- .
Cynn gestrionde
18 genus . gg- gignit . gi-
Gefea gefe
19 Gaudium . gr- gratia
wulnor cynn
20 gl- gloria . g . gentem .
erfeward dassu'
21 H- h. heres . h 334 . hac . h
to dege 335 diuss'
22 hodie . h 336 huic . he-di
erfevardise dis dios
23 hereditas . h 337 hoc . h- hec

Diosne diisses in
1 h- 338 hc- hunc . hs- huius . I in
ingesetted p de ilca
2 is- institutus . id- idem .

330. This “f” with abbreviation mark above looks the same as the one in the previous line for fundi.
331. Unclear why there is a tilde mark above the “t” of frater.
332. Note personal name, transliterated in the gloss.
333. This “g” does not look appreciably different than the one in the previous line. Note also that the
Latin gauisetus seems odd: the participle gavisus from gaudere can hardly be declined with an extra “–et” in
it. Lindenbrog does not have gavisus, gauisetus or gaudere, although gaudium abbreviated “G.” occurs in the
Notae Papianeae (Keil, Grammatici latini, iv, p. 320).
334. Stain on the “h” and period before it.
335. Note he does not use the dege rune.
336. “h” followed by a small minim superscript.
337. “h” followed with one dot above and one beside.
338. A first letter is unclear in this corner, due to staining. To the right of the v-shaped patch, it looks
like a lower case “h” with a small “c” above it (possibly in red); but if so, there is then no word identifying it,
since the next item is the “hc-” abbreviation followed by hunc. It may have been an alternate abbreviation.
reht befun' rehtes
3 ii- ius intigi . i.i. iuris iu
gesvorenes reht romwalal
4 randi . lq- ius quiritum .
vnreht eft dome339
5 ii- in iure . it- item . ido- iudi
Cvodice suide micil
6 cio . ig- . igitur . ing- . ingens
3a hvile betvien
7 ll340 interim . l inter .
Gefoqä da geheno
8 Kapt- kapite . kd- kadu
begeongenise
9 ca . k- . kalendas . kr- . ka
Lufv gidefnæd leht
10 ritas . . Li- c licet . lm- lu
Æ glad
11 men . lx- lex . l- lætus
stan341
12 lp- lapis . lg- legem . lp- s
gylten c ic besvico
13 lapsus . ld- ludo . . . Mo-
Nv honde
14 modo . m- m . manus . misa342
sended hond
15 mittit . ms- manus . mg-
mara bebovm
16 magis . mi- s mandatis
honde gesended me
17 mn- s manu343 misa . mi- . mi
Min doht
18 hi . m- . meum . mt- mentem
gypped
19 mf- s manifestum . mi-s

339. Some of these glosses, including this one, are very faint. The red ink has faded or blurred. Possibly damp.
340. Double minims crossed through with one horizontal stroke.
341. No gloss readable, but faint red staining evident; Lind. p. 220 note, suggests æ.
342. Thin lines above and below the word, indicating recognition of an error for the abbreviation for mitti, not misa (noted by Lind., 220). Line 17 has manu misa glossed honde gesended. The Lindenbrog. list has both together "mn- m" for manumitti and "mm- s" for manu missus. Note also the periods between the two words, where normally the periods are between sets.
343. An "a" inserted above, over erasure of an "i" (narrow minim).
deaðes tide
20 mortis . tempore\textsuperscript{344} . mx-s
Maast yfel
21 maximus . ml- malum
gefestnad
22 mo-m monumentum . md-s
Bebodvm gebod
23 mandatis . md-m md-atvm\textsuperscript{345}

85vb\textsuperscript{346}

vif
1 mlr- mulier . mlm- mu-
wifmonna no\textsuperscript{347} nu
2 lierum .N. nec . n\textsuperscript{148} nunc
no les ic leto
3 N\textsuperscript{a} nihil hominus . n-
Nis ne ac
4 non . n-q' neque . nr-
user' noht
5 noster . n-\textit{1} nihil . np-o non
ne mehge\textsuperscript{350} butan ænigu'
6 potest . n-s nisi . n\textsuperscript{735} nem .
\textit{huoeder} gedæfnað\textsuperscript{352}
7 \textit{N}\textsuperscript{353} num . Ot-et oportet
alcvvm allvm
8 oi- omni . omb- omnibus
allmæhtig
9 om-p omnipotens . obp-
scoma
10 obprobrium . offm-

\textsuperscript{344} Here again a period between two words that define a single abbreviation preceding them.
\textsuperscript{345} The “a” appears below the “m”; apparently forgot the letter, as there is no evidence of erasure.
\textsuperscript{346} A crack or slice in the page center near the beginning of the b lines extends downward from line 2 to line 4; Aldred has worked around it, indenting these lines to avoid it (lines 3–4 are indented more than 2). It is visible on the recto as well and seems to have been sliced from that side.
\textsuperscript{347} Lind., 220, corrects to \textit{ne}. After the “o” of \textit{no}, there appears to be very faint “2” shaped mark, very thin nib. Doesn’t really make it an “e” though.
\textsuperscript{348} Abbreviation mark looks like an elevated dot attached by a line to the “n.”
\textsuperscript{349} Similar to fol. 85b line 6 for \textit{enim}, wide open \textit{N} with a minim “i” inserted in its bowl, but also a subscript and very small “a” under its right leg (for \textit{hominus?}). No parallel in Lindenbrod, or Capelli. See nihil in line 5 below.
\textsuperscript{350} Lind. changes to mehe; there appears to be a dot above the “h” indicating an error.
\textsuperscript{351} Abbreviation mark above the “n,” looks like a number seven.
\textsuperscript{352} Lind. has gedæfnað, but it clearly has a crossed “d.”
\textsuperscript{353} Same “N” as above, but with first leg crossed diagonally in upper part.
hernise endebred'

officium or-d ordinem

æfi' f'edon ðerh æfi'don

post propter per post

ærist fruva f'e

pi- pri p/ pru pro

f'a ær ðerh

p- præ p_ per po-p

Folc fēh

populus pec- peccunia

hremíð l ðægi

p-1 plangit pt- potest

agnvng

ps- m possessionem

cesertvn' synd

pr-i pretorium po- pro

Rigne fe froefriend l

prio pro-cs proconsul

syndvæ

plm-_ pruiilegium p- fl-

feder hiwisc ðægð

pater familias p-u- prouincia

f'huon p'

qr- quare q quod qn-

don' ðone

quo- qm- quem

86ra
dona læs

q- m- quo minus q-mo

Hvv ðone

quomodo qu-am quam

hv l svae 'soðlice

admodum qd- quide

354. The “o” superscript above “p.”
356. Unable to reproduce these standard “p” abbreviations. “p/” has a slash through the “p.” “p” has the
left tail extender. In the next line, “p_” is a crossed “p.”
357. The “prouincia” is crowded into the right margin.
358. The “q” has a tail that circles around to cross its extender.
359. The abbreviation “qn-” from line 22 is here also abbreviated as quo with a line over the “o”; Lind.
does not unabbreviate. End of this line has space, but rather than add the next abbreviation, he has length-
ened the “e” of quem into the “m” and then left two dots and space.
360. The “o” above the “m.”


1. The first abbreviation, for *qua*, "q" with a line over it, also has a thin slash through the bottom extender. The second abbreviation, for *quam*, is a "q" with both a line over it and a clear line through the extender.

2. The “i” inserted between and above, possibly a corrected error rather than an abbreviation.

3. The *we biddas* gloss assumes "qs" is an abbreviation for *quaesumus*, not *quasi*, which the following *swæ* appears to correct (DOE notes *we biddas* in the gloss is of *quaesumus*). See discussion in chapter 5.

4. Two apparent abbreviations for *qui*. See discussion in chapter 5.

5. Lind. has *b’ b’e* as the gloss of *quod*, but in the ms, the *b’e* is over the next Latin abbreviation, leaving considerable space, albeit with a “q” extender from the line above in the way.

6. This line has "q" with a line over it for *qua*, “q” with a diagonal s-curved line through its extender for *quod*, and then “q” with a curving line swinging to right and down crossing through the extender for *questio*.

7. Lind. notes that the smudge above this word is “ea” correcting the “æ.” The “a” of the ash is a bit faint; “ea” is clear above it.

8. The “r” has a thin slash mark above it.

9. Another “r” with a slash through it.

10. Unclear why the switch with *res* to *æht* instead of *ding*.

11. This abbreviation looks like double “s” but the second “s” has a curled “o” flourish in front of it and a long mark over it.

12. An “s” with a minim above it.
Sve seofanfalllice

17 sicut spe- septies.
   ah aei
18 s- sed sc- secundum
   Helo hybt
19 s-t salus s-p spes
   Ódde ondwere
20 su- siue s374 sententia
   Sie sve
21 sis375 sint s-i sicut sn-
   Butan tiid
22 sine T- tempus Tc376
don driga bid
23 tunc t-377 ter t378 tur

86rb
d379
1 t, tum tr- tres tm-t
gecydnisse to try-
testamentum te381 testa
isse b'an
3 mento tt- l tm- tantum
   sodlice tiid
4 tn- tamen tp- tempus382
   odde svoelce hvoedre
5 u- uel u-u uelut uo383 ue
   Sod butan tua
6 ro384 um385 uerum ud-1 uide
gibedd dorfest
7 licet ux- uxor ut- utilis.

373. The "lice" is written below because the gloss ran over into the margin (he started it above the middle of the Latin word, rather than near its beginning).
374. The "s" has a line horizontal line crossing its lower extender.
375. This second "i" is a minim over the second "s."
376. The "c" is over the "t."
377. A "t" with a line over it and a thin slash through it.
378. A "t" with the top horizontal line ending in a curve upward on the right, like a curly single end-quote.
379. Very smudged and faint red before driga, could be bleeding of the red gloss from elsewhere.
380. A "t" with a large comma after it.
381. The "o" above the "t."
382. Note tempus here twice.
383. The "o" above the "u."
384. Faint red smudges above, may be an erased gloss or just red bleeding from elsewhere.
385. The "m" is above and slightly to the right.
49. fol. 86rb10–86va16

[a] De octo pondera de quibus factus est adam, on the eight pounds of materials from which Adam was made (fol. 86rb10–fol. 86va5); [b] two questions (fol. 86va5–16), Dic mihi cur non aequales sunt duas anhelae and Dic mihi unde flavescat ventus.389

Aldred, minuscule, 2 columns, glossed.390

86rb

ymb æhta pvnd of ðæm

10 [a] De octo pondera de quibus aworden is adam

factus est adam392

æhto pvndo of ðæm

12 Octo pondera de quibus aworden is adam pvnd

13 factus est adam . pon

lames of ðon aworden393

14 dus limi . inde factus

is flæsc pvnd fyres

386. This abbreviation has been added above the period, and squeezed in (dark ink). Gloss of previous word goes above it (thus gloss was done after the Latin).


388. No sign of an abbreviation mark above it, but some kind of wide scrape made by a square-ended or angled instrument.


390. Faint brown letters visible on many of the last few pages, not a palimpsest but facing page offset due to damp. See for example fol. 86v between the columns; fol. 86va23 last blank half line; blank section in fol. 87vb bottom.

391. The “e” of “de” is clear, very close to “q” of quibus, but the “d” is not very visible, although the area is faint (not much room for the “d,” squeezed in or added later). Pondera appears to be accusative plural following de rather than ponderibus. Pondera in line 12 is presumably nominative plural, glossed with Old English nominative or accusative plural *pundo* for *punda*.

392. The title lines (10–11) in red ink. Line 11 is indented, after possible scraping or erasure.

393. Note change in spelling for *aworden* from a win to a “v.” The *Durham Ritual* Glossary, p. 90, lists *aworðed* as a gloss of *fieri*; DOE *awurpan* headword, lists it as a Northumbrian usage of *woorpan* to gloss Latin passive with a past participle, with of course all references to Aldred’s handiwork; in non-Northumbrian usage, *awurpan* has a negative sense, to be worthless. From the DOE list, it appears that *win* is his norm, especially in the Lindisfarne gloss, but that occasionally in the *Durham Ritual* he uses “v” or once, “u.” Although unlikely, Aldred’s use of “v” for “win” could be a grammatical response to *factus* at the end of a line break, before seeing the *est* on the next line.
15 est\textsuperscript{394} caro. pondus ignis.
of don read is blod
16 inde rubeus est sanguis\textsuperscript{395}
7 hat pond saltes
17 et calidus. pondus salis
of don sindon salto tehero
18 inde sunt salæ la
pond deawes
19 crimæ. pondus roris.
of don aworden is svat
20 inde factus est sudor
pond blastmes of don is
21 pondus floris inde est
fagung eg\textsuperscript{396}
22 uarietas oculorum
pond volcnes of don is
23 pondus nubis inde est\textsuperscript{397}

86va\textsuperscript{398}
of don is vnstydfullnisse [l vnstadol/fæstnis\textsuperscript{399}]
1 inde est\textsuperscript{400} instabilitas
dohta pond windes of don
2 mentium. Pondus uenti inde
is oro cald pond
3 est anhela frigida. pondus
gefe of don is doht l\textsuperscript{401}
4 gratiæ inde est sensus
Monnes sægi me f’hvon
5 hominis\textsuperscript{402}. [b] Dic mihi cur

\textsuperscript{394}. He does not use \textit{est} abbreviation here, as above and below (division sign with a curved reverse c above; which is not the abbreviation used in the notae above); perhaps because of a line break between \textit{factus} and \textit{est}. See line 23 below.
\textsuperscript{395}. The “u” is added above the “i” as a correction.
\textsuperscript{396}. The “c” added as correction above.
\textsuperscript{397}. Again, \textit{est} not abbreviated, maybe because it is at the end of a page. See line 15 above.
\textsuperscript{398}. This page, especially the first column, shows a lot of wear and is faint in places, making the gloss particularly difficult to read. The left margin, near line 7–10, has some faint stray marks, possibly erased text in brown. One dark mark to the left of line 7, like an angled arrow, may be a later mark.
\textsuperscript{399}. This alternative is presented in the margin at the beginning of line 2, next to \textit{mentium}, written small on two lines. See discussion in chapter 5.
\textsuperscript{400}. The \textit{inde est} is repeated, with gloss, from bottom of previous page. Gloss in this corner is very faded. Note that the instances of \textit{est} are not abbreviated in the rest of this text, but the abbreviation appears again in the two questions that follow.
\textsuperscript{401}. Note \textit{vel} without alternative.
\textsuperscript{402}. “About the eight pounds of which Adam was made. The eight pounds of which Adam was made: A
no efno sindon twoega
6 non æquales sunt dūæ
orodo odor f’ðon
7 anhelae . alia enim cali
hat is 7 odor cald
8 da est et alia frigida
p’ is f’ðon oder is of fyre
9 id est quod alia est de igne
7 odor is of winde 7 ðis
10 et alia est de uento . et hoc
getacnad p’ of ðæm illcv’
significat . quod de illis
awordeno sindon gastos sæge
12 facti sunt spiritus .
me hvona geblawai
13 mihi unde flauescat
wind p’ is of seraphin
14 uentus id est de seraphin
of ðon is acvoeden seraphin
15 inde dicitur seraphin uen
windana
torum .

49x. Comparison texts:

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 326, pp. 135–36
p. 135
15 DIC MIHI FRATER UNDE FUIT FACTUS ADAM .

pound of earth, from which was made flesh; a pound of fire, from which blood is red and hot; a pound of salt, from which are salt tears; a pound of dew, from which sweat was made; a pound of blossom, from which is the variety of the eyes; a pound of clouds, from which is instability or variability of thought; a pound of wind, from which is cold breath; a pound of grace, from which is the sense or . . . of man.”

403. Abbreviation for enim is two minims crossed through with one stroke, not the abbreviation used in the notae above, fol. 85rb6.

404. Some appearance of a partially erased letter between de and igne.

405. “Tell me why the two breaths are not equal. Therefore one is hot and the other is cold. It is that the one is of fire and the other is of wind. And this signifies that from these are made the spirit.”

406. Note that both times he spells out seraphin in the gloss, repeating the Latin.

407. In the notae, fol. 85rb1 has “dr~” abbreviation for dicitur.

408. “Tell me whence the wind blows. It is from the seraphim, hence it is said seraphim of the winds.”

409. Transcription from manuscript, courtesy of the Parker Library, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College. Also printed in James, Catalogue, 145. Numerals and initials are in red, as are the bottom comma portions of semicolon abbreviations, although some are oxidized. The space after numerals and initials suggests red portions added later (see also p. 136, line 19 below).
Ego dico tibi de octo partibus fuit factus. prima pars de limo terræ. Secunda pars de marë. Tertia pars de sole. Quarta pars de nubibus cæli. Quinta pars de uento. Sexta pars de lapidibus terræ. [Septima pars de spiritu sancto] Octaua pars de luce mundi. Si uís exertere sub sequi sententiam. prima pars de limo terræ inde est caro eius. ii pars de mare inde est sanguis eius; iii pars de sole super traxerit erit que piger in omnip. aste; Si de mare super traxerit sapiens erit bellus & speciosus; Si de nubibus cæli super traxerit erit leuis & lux uriosus; Si de uento super traxerit fortiter & iracundus; Si de lapi dibus terre super traxerit erit durus ad parandum & ad curendum & auarus & latro; Si de spiritu sancto super traxerit erit bellus & sp eciosus & repletur de diuina scriptura; Si de luce mundi super traxerit erit electus & praeclarus; cv- factus fuit adam. & non erat nomen eius uocauit dominus. iii. angelos suos et dixit eis. Ite. querite nomen istius hominis; A ngelus michael ha biit in oriente et uidit stellam cuius nomen anatholim. et tulit inde. A. et adduxit ante dominum; A ngelus gabri el abiit in occidente & uidit stellam cuius nomen erat disscis. & tulit inde. D. & adduxit ante dominum; A nge lus raphael abiit in aquilon & uidit stellam cuius nomen erat nomen erat archtus et tulit inde. A. et adduxit ante dominum; A ngelus uriel abiit in meridiano & uidit stellam cuius nomen erat stellam. cuius nomen erat mensebrion. et tulit inde. m. et adduxit ante ante dominum; Et dixit ad uriel dominus. lege litteras. et dixit uriel. ADAM et dixit dominus sic uoca bitur nomen eius.
Dialogue of Solomon and Saturn from Cotton Vitellius A.xv, fol. 87r

Saga me þæt andworc þe adam wæs of geworht, se ærustan man.
Ic þe secge of viii punda gewihte.
Saga me hwæt hatton þage.
Ic þe secge þæt æroste wæs foldan pund of þam him wæs flesec geworht. Oðer wæs fyres pund; þanon him wæs seo æðung gesæld; feorðe wæs wolcnes pund; þanon hym wæs his modes unsædelfæstnes gesæld. Fifte wæs gyfe pund; þanon hym wæs gesæld sefa and gedæng. Sýxste wæs bloesmena pund; þanon hym wæs eagena myssenlicyns gesæld. Seofoðo wæs deawes pund; þanon him becom swat. Eahfeðe wæs sealtes pund; þanon him wæron þa tearas sealte.

50. fols. 86va16–87ra10

Ancient Titles and Offices: [a] De dignitabus romanorum (fol. 86va16–vb16), an explanation of eleven Roman imperial offices; [b] the names for kings in different ancient or Biblical cultures (fol. 86vb17–23); and [c] the magistratus sive tristatus in Egypt (fol. 87ra1–10).420

Aldred, minuscule; double column; glossed.

86va

ymb gemeod

[16] De digni

nisu' romanisc' 

tatibus romanorum

hasere se de hæs

[18] Imperator qui impe421

haldað menigna

[19] rium tenet multorum

419. The Prose Solomon and Saturn and Adrian and Ritheus, ed. and trans. J. E. Cross. and T. D. Hill, McMaster Old English Studies and Texts 1 (Toronto, 1982), 26, 67–68: Tell me the substance from which Adam, the first man, was made. I tell you, from eight pounds weight. Tell me what they are called. I tell you, the first was a pound of earth from which his flesh was made. The second was a pound of fire; from this his blood was red and hot. The third was a pound of wind; from this his breath was given; the fourth was a pound of cloud; from this his instability of mind was given. The fifth was a pound of grace; from this was given his understanding and thought. The sixth was a pound of blossoms; from this was given the variety of his eyes. The seventh was a pound of dew; from this he got sweat. The eighth was a pound of salt; from this his tears were salt.


421. The title, beginning on the second half of line 16 with De digni-, is in red and continues up to the end of line 18, where the final “e” of impe- is brown ink. Line 18 (Imperator qui . . . ) starts with an enlarged capital “I” that extends upward to line 17 and below almost to line 19. Lind. renders the title just De dignitabibus romanorum (lines 16–17).
Folca hergas larwv l

populorum. Consul
de æfi’ra l nest fro’ hes
secundus ab imperato
er f’elatwa vnder
re. Proconsul sub con
hereges larwv ves
sule fuit .

86vb

beh aldormenn of’ ne here
Patricius super exer
gesetted bið
citum constituitur .
heretoga æfi’ra from’ ðæ’
Dux secundus a pa
behaldrorn’ ðæh sie vngeic
tricao licet dissimi
wordvnge hegheroefsa l hereto/ga
lis honore. Comes
drittig ðvsendo warana
xxx milia uirorum
gehaldd heb sceiremmn
tenet. Procuratores
oder’a intinga
aliarum causarum
underondfoendo hvndrad mon’l latwv
susceptores. Centu
se ðe hvnteantigvm cemp’
rio qui. c. militibus
fore is londhebbende l his/ cynnes/ latwva
preest. Tribunus

422. Note absence of alternative for vel; also vel with alternative in next line.
423. He ends the column on the half line, rather than starting the next item in the list, Patricius.
424. Note use of vel plus an alternative. This runs into the margin, with heretoga below “-roefa” and beside Comes; heretoga breaks after the “o” (in the gutter) with the “-ga” below. Several of the glosses run deep into the gutter.
425. Runs into the margin, with latwv below and beside Centu.
426. The “q” is oddly formed, with a zigzag opening, similar to line 13 below, a capital “Q.”
427. This vel alternate runs into the margin and breaks twice to run three lines; the last word is thus beside the gloss to line 12 and has a wiggly line under it separating it from the Latin word of line 12. Also, this last word, latwva, has been corrected to insert the “v” (more like a sloppy “u”).
fro’ ðon þ’ f’ e bid his strylnde\textsuperscript{428}
12 ab eo quod pressit tribui.
fifig monna latuw se de fistig\textsuperscript{429}
13 Quinquagenarius qui. i.
cempum f’ e is tea mon’ latuw
14 militibus pressit. Decanus
of’ teno oðde of megsceire\textsuperscript{430} is
15 super . x. l decurio\textsuperscript{431} est
aldormon’ of’ teno
16 Princeps super . x
mið hebrew’ gecoreno\textsuperscript{432}
17 \[b\] Apud hebreos christi
cyningas bidon geceigdo
18 reges uocantur .\textsuperscript{433}
mið egiptum allo cyningas\textsuperscript{434}
19 Aput ægiptios . faraones
mið romanescu’ casaras 7 ricsa’s\textsuperscript{435}
20 Apud romanos cessares 7 cuiu[?]\textsuperscript{436}
mið siriscum ælce cyning
21 Apud syrios antiochi .\textsuperscript{437}
mið p’sa alle cyningas
22 Apud persas arridi .\textsuperscript{438}

\textsuperscript{428} He has gone to great trouble to squeeze strynnde in because it runs into the merged descender of the “s” in line 11 and the ascender of “b” in tribui, on the other side of which is the overrun gloss from line 11. The “-nde” is below the “y,” with the “-de” on the other side of the merged s-descender and b-ascender.

\textsuperscript{429} Runs into the margin, with half the word below, faint and into the gutter.

\textsuperscript{430} Lind. notes second letter is not clear. Probably an “e” but looks somewhat like an “o.”

\textsuperscript{431} Bosworth and Toller note that Aldred seems to have taken decurio as two words in megsceire (mægscir).

\textsuperscript{432} Note translation of Christ here to gecoreno, chosen, rather than his usual transliteration of Christ as crist. The Durham Ritual Glossary shows other uses of gecoren-, as for example, election.

\textsuperscript{433} Boyd, “Aldrediana XXV,” 45, says “the Latin is wrong in form and mostly wrong in substance” and proceeds to analyze the Hebrew words for king, of which this use is very limited. On the OE gloss, Boyd (46–47) calls it “an accurate paraphrase.”

\textsuperscript{434} Boyd, “Aldrediana XXV,” 47, discusses this gloss of Pharaoh in relation to Greek and Latin as well as Egyptian history, concluding that “the Latin and its gloss are fully intelligible from the Biblical tradition.”

\textsuperscript{435} The gloss runs into the margin, but is faint and in the gutter. Lind. has 7 ricsa’s which he thinks stands for ricsaras, also listed as ricsares in the Durham Ritual Glossary.

\textsuperscript{436} Lind. does not have cuiu and says the Latin is illegible. The et abbreviation and cuiu is faint and in the gutter.

\textsuperscript{437} Boyd, “Aldrediana XXV,” 47, sees this Latin use of antiiochi for Syrian kings as “an intelligible mistake,” taking a common proper name of the Seleucid dynasty of Syrian kings (Antiochus) as the title king. He also notes, though, that Aldred’s gloss of “each king” captures the more accurate sense that each king had this proper name.

\textsuperscript{438} Boyd, “Aldrediana XXV,” 48, tracks the possible source of this word as Persian for king (which is actually šar), probably a personal name mistaken for the title, as with Syrian antiiochi. He posits Philip Arthidaeus or a corruption of Darius.
miō philȋst eghvoelec cyn'

23  Apud philistim mei\textsuperscript{439}.

87ra\textsuperscript{440}

\textit{in egipte aldordom l lardom}

1 [c]  In ægypto magistra

\textit{l rotnisse ḯa}

2  tus siue tristatus . quos

\textit{ve aldormen' getrah}

3  nos principes inter

\textit{tado ve sindon of Ḟem}

4  pretati sumus . De quibus

\textit{ae on exodes boc ve liorniād}

5  et in exodo legimus

\textit{ḏa gecoreno vpstigendo}

6  Electos ascensores

\textit{ridenda f e Ḟem}

7  tristatus . pro quibus

\textit{letines bilvitnise}

8  latina simplicitas

\textit{driffaldo stondendo}

9  ternos statores

\textit{of'ledde}

10  transtulit .

5ox. Comparison text:

Jerome, \textit{Commentaria in Ezechielum}, VII, xxiii, commentary on Ez. 23:23–27\textsuperscript{441}


\textit{Electos ascensores tristatas} (τριστάτας), pro quibus Latina simplicitas, \textit{ternos statores}\textsuperscript{442} transtulit.

---

\textsuperscript{439} Boyd, “Aldrediana XXV,” 48–49, has no useful suggestions for \textit{mei} or its gloss (“each king”), other than pointing out that it is not the known Philistine word for king.

\textsuperscript{440} Some of the glosses are very faint in this column.

\textsuperscript{441} PL 25:219; see also Rabanus Maurus, PL 110:745C and Fridegodus, PL 133:1007.

\textsuperscript{442} Note in PL: “Mendose etiam post Victorii emendationem Martianus retinuit \textit{statores}, quod non secundi post regiam dignitatem gradus, sed infimi potius officii est nomen, ab equo in sternendo derivatum. \textit{Statores} vero nostri quoque praferunt mss.”
51. fol. 87ra11–87va15


Aldred, minuscule; double column; glossed.

87ra

ymb hadum ðaere cirica
11 De gradibus æcclesii
dorweard
12 æ .i.445 Hostiarius
d ða in aldvm gecydnise
13 qui inueteri testam
dorweardas ða ðe
14 ento . ianitores446 qui
geliniað447 in hvs tem
15 excubant in taber
gle godes
16 naculo dei448 .ii.
redere rederas
17 Lector . lectores
f’longe f’eboderas449 l
18 dudum precones l
ceigeras frvma
19 clamatores initium
fro’ witgvm ðæm is gecvoed’
20 a profætis quibus dicitur
ceig ðy las ðv geblinne
21 clama ne cesses450

444. On fol. 87, angled cut along the bottom appears to be original, leaving a mark on fol. 86v; ruling on fol. 87v with 25 rather than 23 lines in column a, appears to be closer lines starting from next text beginning fol. 87va16; blank lines fol. 87vb16–25 and letters from later scribe there; blank area has faint lettering from offset.
445. Title in red up through the H of *Hostiarius*. The rest of the Roman numerals in this section are brown ink with red boxes drawn around them.
446. Isidore (PL 83:794) and Pseudo-Alcuin (PL 101: 1232) have *ianitores* from Ezra 2:42.
447. An “i” added as correction.
448. A phrase found under deacon, Amalarius 7 (PL 105: 825)
449. The “a” is a correction above an “e;” Lind. notes the correction from *f’eboderas*.
hælsere sæged
22. iii. 451 Exorcista 452 refer’t
iosep done cynig
23 iosephus 453 regem

87rb

salom’ gedohhte 454
1 salomonem 455 excogitas
ac his cynn
2 se suamque gentem do
gelerde vnderdia’ 456
3 cuisse .iii. Subdiaico
     da de mid crecu’ embihtmen
4 nus qui aput grecos eppi 457
diacon’ gceiged bidon
5 diaconi 458 uocantur . et
     mid ebrecsv’ in degnvng men’ 459
6 aput hebreos in ezra
diacon’
7 nathinnaei .v. Diaco
     da de mid hebrevm diaco’
8 nus qui apud hebreos le
    of stynd levvs
9 uitæ 460 de tribu leui ges
    geberon da aerce
10 tarent arcam 461 .vi.
    measp’eost crecise is f’don
11 Præspi[by]t’ 462 grecum 463 est quia

451. Number added in left margin, surrounded by a red line drawn box.
452. Raban Maur (PL 107:304) is the only one who has Josephus in this sentence.
453. The “h” (which Lind. omits) has two dots over and below to indicate the error.
454. This gloss line at the top of the column is faint; same with line 2.
455. Solomon also is referenced in Isidore (PL 83:793) and Pseudo-Alcuin (PL 101: 1232).
456. Unable to read after vnder- because of heavy staining on this and the next line. The glosses for lines
3 and 4 run into the margin and may be on two lines each.
457. Lind. notes this is probably for “hypo-.”
458. Hypodiaconus, see Isidore (PL 83: 790) and Raban Maur (PL 107: 303-04).
459. Lind. notes that the compound degnvng men should gloss nathinnaei rather than ezra and refers to
Ezra 2:43 and Neh. 11:21 (see also 1 Chron. 9:2); as used by Isidore (PL 83: 790) and Pseudo-Alcuin (PL 101: 1232). The word is translated temple servants in more modern English translations, but the King James has
461. Also Isidore (PL 83: 789) and Pseudo-Alcuin (PL 101: 1232) under Levitaram. Possibly this got
lumped in or came out of Diaconus.
462. Corrected above the “i” with a “by” to make præbyter.
463. Any references to Hebrew tradition ends here.
aeldro fro’ eldo crecas

seniores aetate. greci
measa p’stas geceigad

presbyteri uocant. vii.

bisc’ crecisc is noma

Episcopus graecum. est nomen
voeres no wordunges of don

operis non honoris. inde
acvoeden is ofer

dictum est. epis super

insecawre

scopus inspector.
f’don bisc’ of’ in

ideo episcopi superin

sceawras genomado bidon

spectores nominantur. Ī. 466

hehbisc’
viii. 467 Archiepiscopus

all crecisc latin’
totum grecum. Lati

aldormon of’

ne princeps super

insecawra

inspectorum...

87va 468

ode heb bisc’ se de

siue summus episcopus qui

ac ēm bragle gebrvc’
et pallio uteretur.

brycgwyrcende ī’ is brycge folc

3 viii. 469 Pontifex 470 id est pons popu

464. A dot over the “s” indicating error (Lind. has epī).
465. Superinspectores is in Bede (PL 92: 986A) and Nicolaus I (PL 119: 973A).
466. This “Ī.” with a tilde over it is not recorded by Lind. It is in dark ink, not the light ink used for the
numbers, as appears in the next line (viii). Is could be either the number 1000 or the abbreviation for id est.
467. This number is in brown ink but red circled rather than with a square around it like the others.
468. This column has 25 lines, unlike the preceding double column folios consistently having 23. No
evidence of ruling. Folio 87 is also cut along the bottom at an angle, causing a mark on fol. 86.
469. This numeral and the next (“x.” on line 5) are in the margin, in brown ink, and without boxes or
lines around them. Also note on this page two errors that Lind. notes with sic! This page ends with room
on it, blank lines in column b (except for some later stray letters?), yet he ran to 25 rather than 23 lines in
column a.
470. Pseudo-Alcuin, PL 101: 1236 and also 1233.
es to heofnæ ric
4  li ad cæleste regnum
   hod bisco' crec'
5  x. Chore episcopi. 471 grece. core
   on lxadin scir' bisco'
6  latine uicari episcopi
   das in scir' 7 londv' ge
7  hii in uicis et uillis con
   Settedo  hebbendo
8  stitiuti472 . habentes li
   geleafo gesetta
9  centiam constituere
   had da leassa473
10 gradum minorem non pre
   no measa psa' ne ac diaco'
11 sbiterum neque diaconum
   f'e wisdom l witn474  das bis'
12 propter scientiam episcopi in cu
   in das lond is
13 ius regione est . 475
   pa' se de ac fæder
14 Papa476 qui et pater pa
   fædera l fæder oedles477
15 truum . uel pater patriæ

52. fol. 87va16-b15

Interpretation of sacred names (Interpretatio nominis sacerdotum)478
Aldred, minuscule; double column, glossed.479
g. = graece l. = latine

87va
16 Interpretatio nominis sacerdotvm
sacerdissu’ nome
17 Sacerdos huic nomine
gebrycade ves melchi’
18 functus est melchise
7 aaron etrist
19 dech et aaron . primus
in a sacerdichad
20 in lege sacerdotalem
nome onsfeng 7 freo
21 nomen accipit et libe
His sac’
22 ri eius. Sacerdos no
genomad bid ððaða’ ac meas’
23 minatur qui et presbiteri
ngenomad aworden is
24 nuncupate factum est
p’ meas’ 7 bisco’
25 quod presbyteri et episcopi

87vb

sac’ bidon genomado
1 sacerdotes nominatur.
bebøder fad’ crecis 7 led’
2 Patriarha . pater .g. et l.
ab ac ebresec’ pat’
3 sed et hebraice abba

---

480. Title in red, not glossed. The “tv” with an abbreviation mark over it is below, next to the OE gloss of line 17. Lind. has put tum after nomine in line 17.
481. Lind. notes sic.
482. Lind. has ða ða but there are two “eths” at the beginning.
483. No visible abbreviation mark; Lind. has presbiteri.
484. Lind. has nuncupati but it looks like an “e.”
485. Lind. notes it should be nominantur.
486. Lind. leaves like this; but the abbreviation used here and below, “g. 7 l.” is used to indicate Greek and Latin, spelled out in the previous text.
487. Note the gloss of Hebrew abba with the Latin pater rather than OE fader. See Boyd, “Aldrediana XXV,” 50–51, who compares it to Lindisfarne glosses. He notes that Aldred may have decided to make the difference from the previous line clear by using pater instead of fader. He also notes Aldred’s ignorance of the difference between Hebrew and Aramaic that Jerome notes in regards to abba.
ar’ on cregesc 488 alduh on ladin
4 Archus .g. princeps .l.
metro’ on crec’ hehfæstn’
5 Metropolitanus .g. polis. 489
on ladin burg oððe ceast’
6 .l. urbs uel ciuitas
acolu’ on crec’ væx biornen/de 490
7 Accoluthus 491 .g. 492 cerarius.
to redanne godspell
8 ad recitandum euangelium.
piste’ on crec’ gitriwa on ladin’
9 Pisteuus .g. fidelis 493
ðrow’ on crec’ giwitnis’ on ladin’
10 Martyr .g. testis .l.
’p’ is drovnges 7 blodes
11 id est 494 passionis et sanguis 495
克里斯 epi’ on crec’ on ladin’
12 chris’. Epiphania 496 .g. lá. 497
Ypping  ypa’
13 manifestatio. Ypa
on grec’ on ladin’ gægngeong 498
14 pante .g. la-t obbatio 499
’p’ is da aldo folcv’
15 id est antiqui plebi 500

---

488. Note addition of “g” in this OE gloss spelling of Greek.
489. Final “s” running into the gutter, as does gloss.
490. Runs into gutter; “de” below.
491. Accoluthus (Greek akolouthos, ακόλουθος, follower, light bearer) for Latin acolytus, acolyte. Note that the gloss uses the same word abbreviated, transferred into OE. See also Bosworth and Toller and DOE under acolitus, citing Ælfric’s Letters (1 and 2).
492. Note use of a tilde over the “g” abbreviation of Greek here.
493. Note the absence of “in latin” (.l.) although there is space for it and the gloss is there for it.
494. Note here and in line 15, idiosyncratic abbreviations for id est. Compare to fol. 86v9 and 14, with a standard “i.” Here he uses “i.” followed by the abbreviation sign for est (division sign with curve mark above). Then in line 14, he spells out id followed by the est abbreviation.
495. Lind. notes sic.
496. These last two items, epiphania and ypapante, do not seem to be from the same type of list of names or titles. That may account for the different abbreviation of Latin in lines 12 and 14: he is copying from a different source.
497. Note anomalous use of “la” with a tilde over the “a” for latine. Also in line 14, he abbreviates to “lat” with a tilde over the “a.”
498. Deep into gutter, last letters not quite visible: gægn-geong glossing obviation meaning to meet up against; oppose, resist; gægnum glossing obviare at fol. 22r14 is only instance of gægnum in Bosworth and Toller.
499. Lind. notes this is equivalent to obviation.
500. A scooped letter, “u” or “i,” has been inserted in dark ink between the “i” and “s” of plebis. Grammar: antiqui plebis is genitive singular; aldo folcum may be dative plural.
Two letters at approximately line 18, middle, large “c e” pen trial.

Names of the apostles’ burial places (*Nomina locorum in quo apostoli requiescunt*)

Aldred, minuscule; double columns, glossed.

---


502. Note this is a single text on a single page, after a page that ended early and was messy; returns to 23 lines, but has to add 24 to finish Stephen in column b.

503. Title in red and blurred; no gloss.
tamia\textsuperscript{504}

potamia.

se eadga ioh\textsuperscript{'} apl'

Beatus iohannes apostolus

7 godsp\textsuperscript{'} gereste

et euangelista requieuit

in \dener byrig on megh\dah assia

effeso. in prouincia assia

se eadga iohan\textsuperscript{'} se bae'

Beatus iohannes babbris

gereste\dah in ceast\dah a

ta requiescit in ciui

ginomad sabasta

tate nomine sabasta

se eadga petre ap'

Beatus petrus apostolus

gerestes rome

requiescit rom\ae

on megh\dah tuscia

in prouincia tuscia

88rb

se eadg pavl\textsuperscript{'} ap\textsuperscript{505}

Beatus paulus apostolus

gerest\dah rom\ae on megh\dah

requiescit rom\ae in pro

campan'

uincia campania .

se eadg\textsuperscript{'} andreas ap'

Beatus andreas apostolus

gereste\dah in \dener byrig on

requiescit patras in pro

meg\dah achaia

uincia achaia .

se ead\textsuperscript{'} iacob ap'

Beatus iacobus apostolus

geresta\dah hierv\textsuperscript{'} on

requiescit hierv\textsuperscript{'}alem in pro

\textsuperscript{504} Note the gloss splits the name in a different place.

\textsuperscript{505} Whole first line of gloss is faint. Gloss on line 2 is also hard to read.
megð syria

9 uincia si(y)ria\textsuperscript{506}.
se ead’ barthol’

10 Beatus Bartholomevs
ap’ gerestað licaio in ðer byr’

11 apostolus requiescit licaonia
on megð armenia\textsuperscript{507}

12 in prouincia armenia
dé\textsuperscript{508} ead’ thom’ ap’ gerestað l gires/te æt frvn/la\textsuperscript{509}

13 Beatus thomas apostolus requiescit
in ðer byrig on india saracina

14 emina in india saracenorum
se ead’ philip’ ap’ gerestað

15 Beatus philippus apostolus requi
in ðer byr’ on megðe

16 escit eru’apo\textsuperscript{510} in prouincia
se eadga simon frigia

17 Beatus symon frigia\textsuperscript{511}
chan’ ap’ gerest’\textsuperscript{512}

18 channaneus apostolus requiescit
in ðer byr’ on londe ðio is gecvoed’

19 in rintho in terra qua dicitur
se ead’ mathias partho\textsuperscript{513}

20 Beatus mathias parthorum
ap’ gereste hierv’ on

21 apostolus requiescit hiervsolima\textsuperscript{514} id est\textsuperscript{515} in
megðe siria

22 prouincia syria
se ead’ stefan’ de f’ma drovere

23 Beatus stephanus primus martyr

\textsuperscript{506} The “y” is added above, at an angle.
\textsuperscript{507} Whole line of gloss very faint.
\textsuperscript{508} Beatus is glossed with dé instead of se.
\textsuperscript{509} Gloss runs into margin broken into two lines below. Note space-saving change to abbreviated
Beatus and requiescit in this and subsequent entries.
\textsuperscript{510} Dots under the “u” and “a” and a small “o” added above the “u” to make eropo, as Lind. has it.
\textsuperscript{511} Ending of Philip continued here, with a line marking it off from this line.
\textsuperscript{512} This gloss is to the right in the margin, to avoid the line setting off frigia.
\textsuperscript{513} As with frigia above, this name is below and set off by a line around it. However, the line, brown
ink, jiggles around the gloss of line 21, so he drew it after he glossed. Thus the possible sequence of his work:
He did the Latin in brown, then the gloss in red, then went back with brown and drew the line.
\textsuperscript{514} The abbreviation mark is unclear, occurring over the “vs.” hiervsolima. Presumably this is an abbreviation
for Jerusalem, but the ending with “a” is odd. On line 24 below, although unclear, the city is abbreviated
hiervsolima and at fol. 88r b8 hierv. “The gloss in each case abbreviates to hierv.”
\textsuperscript{515} Abbreviation is a tall “i.” with a macron over it.
gerest’ hierv’ on megde siria
24 requiescit hiervsem in provincia syria\textsuperscript{516}

54. fol. 88va1–24, b1–21

Alphabet of words\textsuperscript{517}
Aldred, minuscule; double column; glossed.\textsuperscript{518}

88va

\textit{se f’ma mon aworht}

1 Adam primus homo factus est
\textit{fro’ drihtne of ðæm f’ma stæfe}

2 a domino de prima litera id est
\textit{of f. .ver\textsuperscript{519} stafv’ of ðæm}

3 de iiii litteris. de quibus
\textit{ad væs noma his}

4 nominatum est nomen eius
\textit{god sunv p’ is abel se þe}

5 .b.\textsuperscript{520} Bonus filius id est abel qui
\textit{arfaestnisse gewvðe\textsuperscript{521} aeldrv’}

6 pietatem prestabat pa
\textit{l acennendvm sinvm}

7 rentibus suis.
\textit{ablendad væs p’ is adam}

8 .c. Cæcatum est id est adam se
\textit{besvicen væs fro’ ewe}

9 ductus est ab eu.
\textit{gehefäid væs p’ is diwl}

10 .d. Dampnatus est id est diabolvs
\textit{in helle væs ðrit’}

11 in infernum. // est .xxx\textsuperscript{522}
\textit{eva wifmon dio gigearvad}

12 .e. Eua mulier quæ induta

\textsuperscript{516} In this last, added, line the Latin is smaller, worn, and hard to read.
\textsuperscript{517} T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 51; Thompson, Rituale, xi, xx.
\textsuperscript{518} Very worn, hard to be sure of line breaks and abbreviations; this transcription relies on Lind. for most of the Latin and all of the gloss.
\textsuperscript{519} Lind. note, more than likely feover.
\textsuperscript{520} The alphabet letters are in the left column, in brown ink and are surrounded by a red box or other shape. The “.a.” is either missing or under the dark stain in the upper left corner.
\textsuperscript{521} Lind. corrects to gevðe.
\textsuperscript{522} End of line 12 added here with two long “s” shaped marks on the left.
gu’ gerv’ 7 æc . . aer . . gecenned

13 annis atque nascetur
vraedde l p’ is divl

14 f. Fremuit id est diabulus iu
ivdisc’ don’ giboren was crist

diaicus quando natus est christus
svide ge . . fade523 p’ is divl dy les

16 .g. Gemuit id est diabulus. ne ra524 nedunca genom crist menn

17 raperit christus homines
of mvde his geladde

18 ex ore suo. / tulit525
Ongel . . crist f’don

19 .h. Hamum id est christus quia
-done fio . . of diss’ middang’
inimicum ex hoc mundo

p’ is.

21 .i.526 Imber id est baptismum
godcund l word . .
diuinum siue scriptura

23 .k. . . u. . n. uer527

24 m. . t. m

25 see below
26 see below

88vb
leht p’ is soð leht l

1 .i. Lumen id est uerum lumen
micil p’ is cneht se heah

2 .m. Magnus id est puer excel

onlesend p’ is crist se hal’

3 sus. .n.528 Nemar529 id est christus iesus

523. Lind. suggests geseafade.
524. Reduplication of “ra-” on next line. Lind. notes sic on raperit.
525. Last word of line 19 added here, with a single long “s” shaped slash mark; appears to be a dash after quia at the end of line 19.
526. Looks like a fancy curving letter, but hard to tell.
527. Lind. has nothing; my guesses at letters from ms.
528. Red line around “n” visible; note midline start of letter, rather than in margin.
529. See Boyd, “AldredianaXXV,” 51–55, who gives Aldred more credit than Lind. on understanding the text.
doere creftig p' is gast se halga
4 .o. Opifex id est spiritus sanctus.
   gēber p' is crist hroda\textsuperscript{530}
5 .p. Portauit id est christus crucem
   his gēber
6 suam portauit.
   acvoect\textsuperscript{531} woerōn p' is iudei
7 .q. Qvassati sunt id est iudei sed
   besvicen woerōn fro' wiðirwordum larwv'
8 ucti sunt ab ereticis.
   noma p' is strong p' is satahel
9 .r. Raguel id est fortis id est satahel\textsuperscript{532}
   hælend p' is crist hæl' se ðe
10 .s. Saluator id est christus iesus. qui
   gehælde middang' ðerh rod
11 saluuit mundum per crvcem
   giheald strengo\textsuperscript{533} micel
12 .t. Tenuit fortitudinem magnam
   crist se ðe gēber middang'
13 christus qui portauit mundum
   ðerh rode gesmirvad
14 per crvcem . . . v. \textsuperscript{534} Unctus id est\textsuperscript{535}
   oeło halgum p' is godcvnd. . . .
15 oleo sancto id est diuina miseri. . . . \textsuperscript{536}
   f'drifeno voerōn p' is heðno fro'
16 .x. Expulsi sunt id est gentiles ab
   ungelaffvlnisse bīora
17 infidelitate sua.
   ende vorvldes p' is degi domes
18 .y. Finis sæculi id est dies iudicii
   hata wynnvng\textsuperscript{537} . . . middv'
19 .z. Zezania in medio tri

\textsuperscript{530} Note spelling of rod here with an “h” and “a” ending; compare to lines 11 (rod) and 14 (rode) below, all glossing crucem; cf. Lindisfarne gloss to Mark 15:30. It could be an aspiration due to the preceding word, Christ; at lines 11 and 14 rod(o) follows ðerh, ending in “h.”
\textsuperscript{531} Lind. notes first two letters indistinct.
\textsuperscript{532} See Boyd, “Aldrediana XXV,” 55–56, who works out the etymological twists that lie behind the idea of strength in Raguel and Satahel.
\textsuperscript{533} Lind. notes beginning of word indistinct.
\textsuperscript{534} Note midline start of next letter, because of line overrun, either because he worried about running out of room or does not like to go to three lines on any entry.
\textsuperscript{535} Lind. does not have id est, but there appears to be an “i” in the margin toward the gutter.
\textsuperscript{536} The “miseri” ends close to the gutter; Lind. thinks there are more words missing here.
\textsuperscript{537} Lind. corrects to wynnvng.
hw. p’is synnfol. . .

20 ticorum id est peccatores

21 in medio iustorum . .

55. fol. 88vb22–26, a25–26

*Testimonia* (Old Testament citations) and *Canones* (Ammonian Sections) in GospeLS

Aldred, minuscule; double column; glossed.

88vb

mathe’ hæfden gecyðnisse

22 Matheu habet testimonia . .

. . . tig 7 drò reglas drò. . . . .

23 . . . iii. canones ccc.v.

marc’ hæfden gecyðnisse drò

24 Marcus habet testi. . . . xxvii

25 . . . . . . . . . xxvii. . . . 541

26 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

88va

25 Lvcas. . . .

26 cano. . . ccc. V. . . Ioh

56. fol. 89 (Binding sheet)

Northumbrian lectionary fragment, 8th century

Half sheet, cut and quarter turned

Later pen trials at top of fol. 89r and 89v (upside down).

---


539. Very worn, so this transcription relied on Lind. for most of the Latin and all of the gloss.

540. Lind. corrects to gecyniso.

541. Lind. does not have, but can see some numbers (presumably for Gospel of John).

542. T. J. Brown, *Durham Ritual*, 36–37; see also Lowe, *CLA* 2, no. 151, who describes the page as “thick and greasy.”
fol. 89r top:
ab ab.
Dns’ sal . . . t hon

fol. 89v top
a tres. specie ðrie megulitas æ abcdefg æ æ

543. Note dot under “t” of sal. . t. Copy of line from fol. 75v bottom (QIX/X.23M1) addition by Scribe M1 honoring Bishop Aldhun (Dns salu& honor& am& aldhunu antistitem) in Caroline script.

544. Dots under “cie” of specie, “e” of ðrie, “as” of megulitas. Ker, Catalogue, 145, suggests a possible date in the tenth century. Note similarity of the “g” to the abcedarial pen trial on fol. 764 bottom, although other letters differ.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

MANUSCRIPTS

CAMBRIDGE

Corpus Christi College 41 (Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History* in Old English), s. xi; marginalia, s. xi–xi med, prob. S. England; provenance Exeter s. xi (Gneuss 39, *ASM* 11.1).

Corpus Christi College 183 (Bede, *Vita S. Cuthberti*, prose and verse), 934x939 S. England; provenance Chester-le-Street s. x (Gneuss 56, Ker 42).

Corpus Christi College 326 (Aldhelm’s prose *De virginitate* and Abbo of Saint-Germain’s *Bella Parisiaca urbis* selections, *De octo*), s. x/xi Canterbury, Christ Church (Gneuss 93).

Corpus Christi College 391 (*The Portiforium of Wulstan*), Worcester, s.xi or s. xi (Gneuss 104).

Corpus Christi College 422, pp. 22–570 (*The Red Book of Darley*), s. xi med. (1060/61?), several prov. Winchester (New Minster?), Sherborne, Derbyshire (Gneuss 111).

University Library MS Ll.1.10, Part 2 (*Book of Cerne*), c. 820x840 Mercia; provenance Worcester? Cerne? (Gneuss 28; *ASM* 7.2).

DURHAM

Cathedral Library A.II.17 (*Durham Gospels*, incomplete); fols. 2–102, with Cambridge, Magdalen Pepys 2981, s. vii ex or viii in, Northumbria; fols. 103–111 (Luke), s. vii/viii Wearmouth-Jarrow; provenance Chester-le-Street s. x; poem on King Athelstan, fol. 31v, s. x/xi; Boge hand, fols. 80, 80v, 106, c. 968 (Gneuss 220–221, Ker 105).

Cathedral Library A.IV.19 (*Durham Ritual or Collectar*), s. ix/x S. England; provenance Chester-le-Street, s. x gloss and additions; flyleaf Northumbria s. viii (Gneuss 223–224, Ker 106, *ASM* 14.3).

Cathedral Library B.III.32 (*Durham Hymnal*), Canterbury, St Augustines; monastic canticles s. xi; Proverbs s. xi med.; Ælfric’s grammar, etc. s. xi med or s. xi (Gneuss 244, *ASM* 14).
LONDON

BL Additional 49598 (Benedictional of Æthelwold), 971x984 Winchester, prob. Old Minster (Gneuss 301). [Ben. Æthel.]
BL Cotton Domitian A. VII (Durham Liber vitae), c. 840 Lindisfarne or Wearmouth-Jarrow; additions s. ix
BL Cotton Nero D.iv (Lindisfarne Gospels), 687x689 or c. 710–25 Lindisfarne; provenance Chester-le-Street and Durham s. x/ex and s. x ex; gloss s. x³ (Gneuss 343).
BL Cotton Otho B.ix (Gospelbook, damaged), s. ix or ix ½ Brittany; provenance English royal court s. x; donated to Chester-le-Street, s. x (Gneuss 354).
BL Cotton Titus D.xxvi+xxvii (Ælfwine Prayerbook), 1023x1031 New Minster, Winchester (Gneuss 380, ASM).
BL Cotton Vespasian D.xii (Exeter Hymnal), s. xi ex, Canterbury, Christ Church (Gneuss 391, ms H in Milfull).
BL Cotton Vitellius A.xv (The Prose Solomon and Saturn); fols. 94–209, s. x/xi (Gneuss 399; Ker 215).
BL Harley 585 (Herbarium, Quadrupedibus, Lacnunga), s. x/xi and s. xi, possibly from a western area (Gneuss 421, ASM 1.5).
BL Harley 2965 (Book of Nunnaminster), s. vii/vi or v/xi Mercia or S England?; additions s. iv/v and s. xi (Gneuss 432; ASM 1.6).
BL Royal 2 A.xx (Royal Prayerbook), s. vii or vii ¼, Mercia (Worcester?); Old English gloss, s. xv; added prayers, s. x med., Worcester (Gneuss 450, ASM 1.9).
BL Royal 7.D.XXIV, fols. 82–168 (Aldhelm), De Virginitate, s. x³–x med; Epistola ad Heahfri
dum, s. xiv, S. England (Wessex, Glastonbury?) (Gneuss 473; Ker 259).

OXFORD

Bodleian Library, Auctarium D.2.19 (MacRegol Gospels), s. vii/v or vii in., Ireland; Old English gloss s. x N or W England (Gneuss 531).
Bodleian Library, Bodley 819 (Bede In Proverbia Salomonis, incomplete), s. vii ex or ex in. (s. vii ii?), Northumbrian (Wearmouth-Jarrow); provenance Chester-le-Street and Durham (Gneuss 604).
Bodleian Library, Digby 63 ("Canterbury Computus," calendar, etc), s. ix ½ (844 or 867x892) Northumbria; provenance Winchester Old Minster by s. x (Gneuss 611).
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INDEX VERBORUM

Latin and Old English words and phrases discussed in the chapters, using the form or endings as they appear in the text.

LATIN (INCLUDING GREEK-AND HEBREW-DERIVED WORDS)

abba, 189
acolitus, 186, 188–89
actio, 176–77
ad complendum, 141
adversae, 158
eternam, 168
affectus, 176
amanitorum, 195
anhela, 178, 180–81
antiqui plebi(u)s, 189
archepiscopus, 186
archus, 189
auctor vitae, 159

beatus, 176
bonae mulieris, 55

capitulum, -a, 120, 125
caro, 180
casaras, 184
chorepiscopus, 186–87

christus benedictus, 61, 80, 144
ciui, civitas, 184, 189, 195
clemens, clementissime, 170
concordiam, 133
cordium, 133
cremencrime, 178
crus, crucem, 197–98
cui, 156
decanus, 184
decurio, 184
deus, 133
diabolus, 160, 176
diaconus, 130, 186, 210
discretio, 153
dominatio, 184
draco, 159
dux, 184
ecclesiae, 56
egressus, 176
eleemosyna, 139
emendatio, 153–55
Emina, 195
enarratio, 153–55
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Word(s)</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>enim, 178</td>
<td>字母, 46, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epiphania, 188–89</td>
<td>lumen, 198, 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>episcopus, 186–88</td>
<td>maeror, 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eructuauit (eructavit), 51</td>
<td>magistratus, 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>est, 178</td>
<td>manifestatio, 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eternus, 168</td>
<td>manu misa, mittit, 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exaudi, 122</td>
<td>martyr, 188–89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exercere, 127</td>
<td>me, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exorcista, 186</td>
<td>meditatio, 154–55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expaues/cit, 158</td>
<td>memoriae, 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extingue, -itur, 158</td>
<td>mens, mentium, 153, 180–81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ferociora, 160</td>
<td>metropolitanus, 188–89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fidelis, 188</td>
<td>miserator, 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flatus, 178, 181</td>
<td>misserrimus, 56, 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>floris, 179–80</td>
<td>mulier. See bonæ mulieris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frigida, 180</td>
<td>nathinnaei, 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fructus, 147</td>
<td>nemar, 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gauisetus (gavisus), 178</td>
<td>neumes, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gratiæ, 180</td>
<td>noxia, noxium, 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gubernatio, 184</td>
<td>nubis, 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>habed (t), 158</td>
<td>ob(y)atio, 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hebraice, 189</td>
<td>oculos. See varietas oculorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hodiernus, 168</td>
<td>omnia, 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hominus, -i, 180</td>
<td>omnipotens, 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hostiarius, 186</td>
<td>oratio, 120, 152–54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ignis, 180</td>
<td>oremeus, 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperator, 183</td>
<td>panis, 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indignus, 56, 58</td>
<td>paraclito, 170, 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspectores. See superinspectores</td>
<td>pater, 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instabilitas, 180–81</td>
<td>patriarch, 188–89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iudicium, 153–55</td>
<td>per, 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lacrima, 180</td>
<td>per quem hæc omnia, 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lames, 180</td>
<td>perduc nos ad regna caelorum, 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lapis, 176</td>
<td>pisteuus, 188–89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lapsus, 176</td>
<td>plebs. See antiqui plebi(u)s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lectio, 152–55, 201</td>
<td>polis, 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lector, 129, 142, 186, 208, 210</td>
<td>portauit, 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limi, 180</td>
<td>potestes, potestas, 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>praeces seruorum tuorum, 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>presta pater piissime, 133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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princeps, 184, 189
prochemio (prooemium), 51
pronuntiatio, 154
provincia, 195

quaesumus, 177–78
quasi, 177–78
qui, 136, 177
qui [uiuis et] regnas, 122, 148
quieta, 161
quinquagenarius, 184

rana, 157, 160–61
redemptor, 159
reduxerit, 169
regnare, 184
repens, repentia, reptio, 160
requiescit/requievit, 195
res, 177
rex, 184
roris, 180
rubeta, 157, 160–61
rubeus sanguis calidus, 180

sacerdos, 188–89
sacerdotalem, 189
saecula saeculorum, 122, 148
salis, 180
saltes, 180
saluator, 198
salus, 176
salutis, 158, 161
sanctus, 158
sanguis. See rubeus sanguis calidus
saracenorum, saracina, 195
Satahel, 197
scripsit, 51
scorpius, 160
secundus, 183
semitarum, 168
semiterne, 168
sensus, 181
seraphim, 182
significat, 181
sol, 169

sor, 169
spes, 176
spiritus, 153, 156
subdiaconus, 186, 188
subiecta, 159
sudor, 180
sunt, 156
superinspectores, 188
tempus, 177
tenet, 198
ternos statores, 183
terra, 195
testis, 189
torpescit, 161
tosca, 160
translatio, 51
trea muta, 202
tristatas, tristitia, 185
tu enim domine, 146
uarietas oculorum, 180
ud (ut), 158
uemento, 180–81
uuenenata, uenenosus, 157, 160
uerbum, 51
uispera, 157, 159
uires, 160
uimenata, uenenosus, 157, 160
uiæ, 147
urbs, 189
uuæ, 147
vere dignum, 141
ypapante, 188–89
zabulus, 176
OLD ENGLISH WORDS AND PHRASES

æht, 177
aldo folcum, 189
aldormon, -menn, 184, 189
andgit. See gastlic andgit
areccan, 153–55
aurát, 51, 58, 68
awritan, 58–59
æces, 168. See also ece
æcre, 168
ættern, attor, 159–61
ætfrvum[m]a, 195

biddas, we, 177
biscop, 188
bloedsvngas, 129
blostmes, 180
blod. See read blod hat
burg, byrig, 189, 196

cald, 180
ceaster, 189
cessares, 184
crecisc, 189
cyning, 184

dawes, 180
ded, 177
digolnes, 51

eard, 195
ebresc, 189
ece, ecvum, 168
efneheortam, 133
eftlesend, 159
egena. See fagvng egena

fæder, 189
fagvng egena, 180
feerræsenda, 160
flæsc, 180
folc. See aldum folcum
forasaga, 51
forelatwa, 183
frofer, 170
frumwyrhta lifes, 159
fyres, 180

gast, 153
gastlic andgit, 154–55
geber, 198
gebed, 153
gecoreno, 184
gefe, 180
g(ei-)resta, 195
geroefa, 184
gescir, 177
gesprintan, 51
getacnað, 181
g(e)þangc, 153
gigladade, 178
gihamadi, gehámettan, 55
giorn la fæder arwyrðesta, 133
giwitnisse, 189
god. See la god

hæman. See gihamadi
hatterne. See ættern.
hæsere, 183
haliwerfolc, 24, 209
healdormenn, 184
hehfæder, 189
hehfæstnung, 189
hehsciromenn, 184
hehsyn, 178
here, 184
heretoga, 184
hergas larwv, 183
hlot, 169
hroda. See rod-
ic, 54–55
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word/Phrase</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>insceawre, -as. See oferinsceawre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rotnisse, 185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rummode, 170, 180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la god, 133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lad-teów, 183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lardom, 185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lareow, larwu, 183–84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lædin, 189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leht, 198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life, 168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lioda, 196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lisau, 159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lond, 195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>londhæbbende, 184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mæsepreôst, 188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>megðe, 196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mon, monnes, 180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nedre, 160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nið æfest, 176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noma, 197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ofergylded, 54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oferglóesade, 54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oferinsceawre, -as, 188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ond, 52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oroð, 180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praefast, 68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raðan, raðincg, rede, 129, 153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ræsan, 160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>read blod hat, 180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ric(sere), 184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rifista, 160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roc(c)ettan, 51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rod-, 197–98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sacerdlichad, 189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saltes, 180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saule, 56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sceilmann, 184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smeagan, 153–55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sunne, 169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svat, 180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swæ, 177–78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sceaomiende, 160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tehero, 180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiid, 177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tilwif, 55–56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ða, ðas, 177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðegnvng menn, 188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðing, 177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðoht, 180–81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðrifalde, 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðrifaldol stondendo, 185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðrow, ðrouere, 189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underbeged, 159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underðiodded, 159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unrotnise, 185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unstadol, 180–81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unstedefull, 180–81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u(o)erc, 177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uord, 51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volcnes, 180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>windes, 180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: letters “u” and “v” Aldred used interchangeably and often used “u” for “w” (win).*
abbreviations, 50, 55, 77, 82, 113, 122, 132, 148, 156, 158, 160, 165, 167, 175–78, 188–90, 195, 205
Achaia Marmorica, 194
Act against Superstitious Books and Images, 93
Acts of the Apostles, 194
Adam, 175, 178–82, 197–98
Adomnán, 192, 212
Advent, 79, 85, 130, 171, 174
Æcerbot Ritual, 211
Ælfric (c. 950–c. 1010), abbot of Eyns-ham, 11–12, 94, 113, 127n, 135, 138, 169, 186
Ælfsige, Bishop of Chester-le-Street (968–90), 1, 4, 10, 12, 18, 23, 60, 69, 81, 120, 127–28, 174, 188, 208, 214
Ælfwine Prayerbook, 117, 136, 138, 141
Æthelfæd, Lady of the Mercians, 20
Æthelwulf, 17
agriculture, 26–28
Alcuin, 17, 36, 48, 87n, 141, 166, 172, 182, 186
Aldhelm, 35–36, 166
Aldhun, Bishop of Durham (990–1018), 87, 90, 119, 142
Alfred, king (871–99), 8–10, 20–21, 199
Alfred Jewel, 188
Alfredi natus est (Lindisfarne Gospels colophon), 55–56
allegorical interpretation, 48, 154, 165, 175, 179, 181–82, 197–98. See also exegesis
almsgiving, 139
alphabet, 37, 63, 65, 77, 90, 173, 192
alphabet poem, 175, 197–98, 215
Amalarius of Metz, 172
amen, 127, 129, 133
Andrew, apostle, 194
angels, 182, 212
Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 17, 20
Antiphoners, 114
antiphons, 120, 123, 129, 130, 137, 138, 142, 143
apocryphal materials, 51, 79, 80, 145, 160, 161, 173, 179, 182, 190, 191, 197, 211, 212
apostles, burial places, 190–97
Armenia, 195
Arundel Psalter, 117
Asmodeus, demon, 146
Athelstan, king (924/5–939), 17, 21–22, 33, 35, 48, 75, 80, 86, 173, 208
Augustine of Hippo, 50
Bamburgh, 6, 7 (image 2), 24, 28
Bangor Antiphoner, 125
Bartholomew, apostle, 194
Bede, 6, 9–10, 17, 21, 165, 171–73, 188, 191, 193; Commentary on Proverbs, 76, 106 (image 20), 165; De locis sanctis, 191; Ecclesiastical History, 6, 14, 24, 59, 161, 192; Expositio actuum apostolorum, 192; Nomina regionum, 192; Vita Sancti Cuthberti, 27, 35
Benedictional, 114
Benedictional of Æthelwold, 58
benedictions (blessings), 78–79, 82, 84–85, 87, 111, 119–20, 123, 129–30, 134, 136, 143–49, 162, 166, 210–11, 214; cross, 146–47; field prayers, 145–46; house, 88, 142, 144–45, 148–49, 211; milk and honey, 146–47; new bread, fruit, apples and nuts, well, 147–48; in original collectar, 143–45; salt and water aspersions, 144, 148–49; vat fouled by rodent, 145, 211
Bernard, Edward, 94
Bernicia, 18, 24, 28
Billfrith (Lindisfarne Gospels), 52, 54, 59
binding strips, 91, 115. See also Durham A.IV.19, binding sheet
Blair, John, 13
blessings. See benedictions
Boge (scribe), 86
Book of Cerne, 76, 117, 156, 157n
Book of Nunnaminster, 117, 156, 157n
Boyd, W. J. P., 176, 197
Bradshaw, Henry, 95, 97
Breviarium apostolorum, 191, 193
breviaries, 95, 114–16, 127–28, 136
Brown, Michelle P., ii, 53, 96
Brown, T. J., vii, xi, 2, 65, 74, 77, 84, 87, 97, 111
Buc, Philippe, vi, 73n
Caedmon, 9, 199
Calamina, 195
calendars, 65, 68, 112, 114–15, 121, 131
calques, 160, 165
canon table, 198–99
Canterbury, 13–14, 72, 131
cantor, 129–30, 142, 208
capitella, 125, 127–28, 132, 136, 138, 208. See also memorials and suffrages
Capitularies. See Collectars capitulum/a, 120, 125
Carolingian reform, 36, 117, 126, 192
Carolingian texts and influences, 134, 182, 186–87
chapter meeting, 121, 139, 192, 206, 208
Chester-le-Street, 15–24, 38, 60, 120, 149, 200, 213; Aldred at, 39–40, 60, 70, 76, 162, 166, 172, 174, 203; church, 29–33, 30
(fig. 1 and image 6), 201, 207–10; cloister, 204, 207–8; estates and property, 12–13, 15, 18, 20, 24, 25 (image 3), 27–28, 31, 111, 128, 201, 210–11; fields, 211–13; gifts to, 31–35, 173; library, 17, 35, 79, 164, 173, 203, 206; location, 2, 10, 24, 27–29; monastic, 10, 18, 90, 128, 208; schoolroom, 152, 206; scriptorium, 38, 72–79, 86, 203, 206; secular clergy, 10, 69, 187; settlement, 8, 20, 27, 31
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Columba, St., 212
Commune Sanctorum, 113, 137, 140
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Irish Liber Hymnorum, 191
James (Jacob), apostle, 194–95
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Skeat, W. W., 95
Snakes, 160–61. See also reptiles
Spain, 194
Stephen, St., 194
Stevenson, Joseph, 95
Stock, Brian, ii, 151
Sudbury, John, dean of Durham Cathedral, 93
Suffrages, 125, 137–38, 143, 210. See also capitella; memorials
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