

# Textual Cultures: Cultural Texts



Edited by ORIETTA DA ROLD  
and ELAINE TREHARNE

---

# Essays and Studies 2010

---

Series Editor: Peter Kitson

# *The English Association*

The objects of the English Association are to promote the knowledge and appreciation of the English language and its literature, and to foster good practice in its teaching and learning at all levels.

The Association pursues these aims by creating opportunities of co-operation among all those interested in English; by furthering the recognition of English as essential in education; by discussing methods of English teaching; by holding lectures, conferences, and other meetings; by publishing journals, books, and leaflets; and by forming local branches.

## *Publications*

*The Year's Work in English Studies*. An annual bibliography. Published by Blackwell.

*The Year's Work in Critical and Cultural Theory*. An annual bibliography. Published by Blackwell.

*Essays and Studies*. An annual volume of essays by various scholars assembled by the collector covering usually a wide range of subjects and authors from the medieval to the modern. Published by D.S. Brewer.

*English*. A journal of the Association, *English* is published three times a year by the Association.

*The Use of English*. A journal of the Association, *The Use of English* is published three times a year by the Association.

*Newsletter*. A *Newsletter* is published three times a year giving information about forthcoming publications, conferences, and other matters of interest.

## *Benefits of Membership*

### *Institutional Membership*

Full members receive copies of *The Year's Work in English Studies*, *Essays and Studies*, *English* (3 issues) and three *Newsletters*.

Ordinary Membership covers *English* (3 issues) and three *Newsletters*.

Schools Membership includes copies of each issue of *English* and *The Use of English*, one copy of *Essays and Studies*, three *Newsletters*, and preferential booking and rates for various conferences held by the Association.

### *Individual Membership*

Individuals take out Basic Membership, which entitles them to buy all regular publications of the English Association at a discounted price, and attend Association gatherings.

For further details write to The Secretary, The English Association, The University of Leicester, University Road, Leicester, LE1 7RH.

---

Essays and Studies 2010

---

# Textual Cultures: Cultural Texts

Edited by  
Orietta Da Rold and Elaine Treharne  
for the English Association

D. S. BREWER

ESSAYS AND STUDIES 2010  
IS VOLUME SIXTY-THREE IN THE NEW SERIES  
OF ESSAYS AND STUDIES COLLECTED ON BEHALF OF  
THE ENGLISH ASSOCIATION  
ISSN 0071-1357

© The English Association 2010

*All Rights Reserved.*

Unauthorised publication contravenes applicable laws

First published 2010  
D. S. Brewer, Cambridge

D. S. Brewer is an imprint of Boydell & Brewer Ltd  
PO Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 3DF, UK  
and of Boydell & Brewer Inc.  
668 Mt Hope Avenue, Rochester, NY 14620, USA  
website: [www.boydellandbrewer.com](http://www.boydellandbrewer.com)

ISBN 978-1-84384-239-2

A CIP catalogue record for this title is available  
from the British Library

This publication is printed on acid-free paper

Printed in Great Britain by  
CPI Antony Rowe, Chippenham and Eastbourne

# Contents

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	vii
ABBREVIATIONS	ix
NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS	x
INTRODUCTION <i>Elaine Treharne</i>	1
THE COMPOSITE NATURE OF ELEVENTH-CENTURY HOMILIARIES: CAMBRIDGE, CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE 421 <i>Erika Corradini</i>	5
THE POWER AND THE GLORY: CONQUEST AND COSMOLOGY IN EDWARDIAN WALES (EXETER, CATHEDRAL LIBRARY 3514) <i>Julia Crick</i>	21
MANUSCRIPT PRODUCTION BEFORE CHAUCER: SOME PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS <i>Orietta Da Rold</i>	43
THE ELLESMERE MANUSCRIPT: CONTROVERSY, CULTURE AND THE CANTERBURY TALES <i>A. S. G. Edwards</i>	59
VANISHING TRANSLITERACIES IN <i>BEOWULF</i> AND SAMUEL PEPYS'S <i>DIARY</i> <i>Martin K. Foys and Whitney Anne Trettien</i>	75
DESCRIPTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ELECTRONIC PUBLICATION <i>David L. Gants</i>	121
OXFORD, BODLEIAN LIBRARY, BODLEY 647 AND ITS USE, c.1410–2010 <i>Ralph Hanna</i>	141
THE IDEA OF THE HEART IN BYZANTIUM AND THE HISTORY OF THE BOOK <i>Robert Romanchuk</i>	163

RED AS A TEXTUAL ELEMENT DURING THE TRANSITION FROM MANUSCRIPT TO PRINT <i>Margaret M. Smith</i>	187
PROBLEMATISING TEXTUAL AUTHORITY IN THE YORK REGISTER <i>Liberty Stanavage</i>	201
INDEX	217

## Illustrations

*The Power and the Glory: Conquest and Cosmology in Edwardian Wales*  
(Exeter, Cathedral Library 3514)

- Fig. 1. Exeter, Cathedral Library, MS 3514, p. 53: the OT map located within Isidore, *Etymologiae*, XIII.XI. 26
- Fig. 2. Exeter, Cathedral Library, MS 3514, p. 159: glosses on the Prophecies of Merlin 27
- Fig. 3. Exeter, Cathedral Library, MS 3514, p. 9: the script of Hand 2 28

*Vanishing Transliterations in Beowulf and Samuel Pepys's Diary*

- Fig. 1. Section of a *runica manuscripta* chart, among other esoteric letter sets, Oxford, St John's College 17, fol. 5v (c.1110) 86
- Fig. 2. Use of the rune  $\mathfrak{X}$  in *Beowulf*; London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius A.xv, fol. 141, line 18 88
- Fig. 3. Detail of a *runica manuscripta*, showing  $\mathfrak{aepel}$  for the rune  $\mathfrak{X}$ , Oxford, St John's College 17, fol. 5v 88
- Fig. 4. Replacement, without editorial formatting, of the rune  $\mathfrak{X}$  as 'epel' (line 520, and note) in Klaeber's edited text 90
- Fig. 5. Entry for 9 February 1668 from Pepys's *Diary*, showing the notorious 'L'escholle des Filles passage' 104
- Fig. 6. Evidence of a plan to publish Pepys's *Diary* that presumably predates the Braybrooke edition found among the papers of William Weller Pepys and printed in A. C. C. Gausson's *A later pepys* (London: John Lane, 1904), p. 52 114

*Descriptive Bibliography and Electronic Publication*

- Fig. 1. The opening screen of the MS-DOS version of *Mindwheel* 132

*Red as a Textual Element during the Transition from Manuscript to Print*  
*Between pages 192 and 193*

- Fig. 1. Johannes Nider, *De morali lepra* (Cologne: Zel, 1470), copy 6 of the study
- Fig. 2. Johannes Nider, *De morali lepra* (Cologne: Zel, 1470), copy 7 of the study





## Abbreviations

BMC	<i>Catalogue of Books Printed in the XVth Century Now in the British Museum, Part I</i> (London: British Museum, 1908)
CCCC	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College
CPG	<i>Clavis Patrum Graecorum</i> , 5 vols. & supplement, ed. M. Geerard, F. Glorie, <i>et al.</i> (Turnhout: Brepols, 1974–98)
EETS	Early English Text Society
ISTC	<i>Incunabula Short-Title Catalogue</i> , online at <a href="http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/istc">http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/istc</a>
LALME	Angus McIntosh, M. L. Samuels, and Michael Benskin, <i>A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English</i> , 4 vols. (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1986)
NIMEV	Julia Boffey and A. S. G. Edwards, <i>A New Index of Middle English Verse</i> (London: British Library, 2005)
PG	<i>Patrologia Graeca</i> , ed. J. P. Migne, 161 vols. (Paris: Migne, 1857–1866)
PL	<i>Patrologia Latina</i> , ed. J. P. Migne, 221 vols. (Paris: Migne, 1844–1903)
STC	<i>Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland, 1475–1640</i> , ed. A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave (London: Bibliographical Society, 1976–1991)

## Notes on Contributors

**Erika Corradini** holds a Ph.D. in late Anglo-Saxon and early medieval culture and manuscript studies (from the University of Leicester). Her research focuses on the collection of books housed at Exeter Cathedral in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries, its formation, development and readers. She has recently been involved in a detailed examination of manuscripts containing homilies written in the English vernacular for the use of a bishop and has been analysing their relevance in the administration of pastoral care.

**Julia Crick** is Associate Professor in History at the University of Exeter. She has published on various aspects of the history and culture of early medieval Britain, including a number of studies of manuscripts, palaeography and textual transmission. Her books include *The Historia Regum Britannie of Geoffrey of Monmouth, III: A Summary Catalogue of the Manuscripts* (1989), *The Historia Regum Britannie of Geoffrey of Monmouth, IV: Dissemination and Reception in the Later Middle Ages* (1991), and, with Alexandra Walsham, ed., *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300–1700* (2004). Her most recent book, *Charters of St Albans*, was published in 2007 in the British Academy series, Anglo-Saxon Charters.

**Orietta Da Rold** is a lecturer in medieval literature at the University of Leicester and is interested in how literature is influenced by questions of materiality, reading-habits and book production. She has published widely on medieval manuscript culture and scribes, focusing chiefly on the period 1100–1500. She is the co-founder (with Elaine Treharne) of the English Association Special Interest Group in the History of Books and Texts.

**A. S. G. Edwards** is Professor of Textual Studies, De Montfort University. He writes mainly on manuscripts and texts between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries, and is currently engaged on an edition of *The History of Griseld the Second*, a poem about Katherine of Aragon by the sixteenth-century poet William Forrest, and (with Julia Boffey) *A Companion to Fifteenth-Century Poetry*.

**Martin K. Foy** is an Associate Professor of English and Communication Arts at Hood College, and currently a visiting professor of English

at Drew University. He is the author of *The Digital Edition of the Bayeux Tapestry* (2003), and *Virtually Anglo-Saxon: Old Media, New Media, and Early Medieval Studies in the Late Age of Print* (2007). Most recently, he has co-edited and contributed to the volume *The Bayeux Tapestry: New Interpretations* (2009); he is also a director of the *Digital Mappaemundi* project.

**David Gants** is Associate Professor in English at Florida State University, and the digital humanities specialist in the History of Text Technologies programme. He publishes on bibliographical, textual, and technological matters, and is the electronic editor of the *Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson*. He is also director of the Early English Booktrade Database project, which seeks to describe, quantify and classify every book published in the STC period. He serves on the council of the Bibliographical Society of America as well as chairing its fellowship committee and is a member of the advisory board for the Oxford Works of Edmund Spenser.

**Ralph Hanna** is Professor of Palaeography at the University of Oxford. He has written widely on later medieval manuscripts and their contexts. His most recent book-length study is *London Literature 1300–1380* (2005).

**Robert Romanchuk** is Associate Professor of Slavic at the Department of Modern Languages and Linguistics, Florida State University. He studies the history of education in the Orthodox Christian Middle Ages. He has published a number of articles in this area, as well as a book, *Byzantine Hermeneutics and Pedagogy in the Russian North: Monks and Masters at the Kirillo-Belozerskii Monastery, 1397–1501* (2007). He is currently working on a new book, *Byzantine Letters and Spiritual Direction at Balkan Courts: Hesychasts and the Language Arts, 1330–1443*.

**Margaret M. Smith** retired recently as Reader in Book Design History from the University of Reading. She is associate editor for printing and reproduction technologies of *The Oxford Companion to the Book* (2010). She is now a free-lance researcher in book design history, and in the history of west Suffolk.

**Liberty Stanavage** is currently finishing her dissertation, 'Domesticating Vengeance: The Female Revenger in Early Modern Drama, 1566–1700', at the University of California, Santa Barbara, where she is a Ph.D. candidate. She specialises in early modern drama, but also works on medieval and Restoration literature. Her current research

interests include female revenge in early modern literature, publics and anti-publics in the broadside ballad and material textuality in manuscript culture.

**Elaine Treharne** is Professor of English at Florida State University and Visiting Professor of Medieval Literature at the University of Leicester. She is the author or editor of some twenty volumes, and has written over thirty articles on Old and Middle English manuscripts and their contents. She is currently completing *The Ideology of English* and working on *The Sensual Book*. She is general editor of *Essays and Studies* (from 2011 onwards) and, with Greg Walker, of the new series, *Oxford Textual Perspectives*.

**Whitney Anne Trettien** has a masters degree in comparative media studies from Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where she produced a born-digital thesis on seventeenth-century experimental poetry. She is currently a researcher at MIT's HyperStudio Digital Humanities Lab and a doctoral student in English at Duke University.

# *Introduction*

ELAINE TREHARNE

IN THE RECENT 2008 Research Assessment Exercise in the United Kingdom – a qualitative audit and analysis of all academics' publications and research – the English Subject Panel made its report on the state of the discipline and potential future directions.<sup>1</sup> In the detailed description, the panel noted the major strengths in scholarship in a number of fields, including manuscript-based studies and 'history of the book and the sociology of texts'. The buoyancy of this area of research is evinced, too, by the creation of new groups, centres, degree programmes and book series all focused on the history of the book in the broadest sense<sup>2</sup> – an area of investigation that properly understood should extend from the emergence of sustained literacy in early cultures to contemporary digital technologies. While this volume cannot claim to have attended to every major facet of textual history along this extensive chronology, the range of material covered here does cover a good deal of ground from the Byzantine period to the Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman periods into the high Middle Ages; and then hurtling through the early modern period, via Pepys, to the publication of electronic forms of bibliographic study.

The aim of this volume was never to be comprehensive in coverage, but rather to publish the work of scholars whose approaches to books, words and texts are engaging, innovative and always rigorous. Readers

<sup>1</sup> This is available as a pdf file from <http://www.rae.ac.uk/pubs/2009/ov/> under Panel M, 'English Language and Literature'. This document in itself, of course, as a product of its specific historical moment, ably illustrates the overarching concept of this book – to demonstrate a range of interpretative approaches centring on the text (manuscript, metaphor, writing, code) in its cultural context.

<sup>2</sup> For example, the English Association Special Interest Group in the History of Books and Texts founded in 2007 (<http://www.le.ac.uk/engassoc/fellows/book.html>); the Centre for Manuscript and Print Studies, founded at the Institute for Advanced Studies in London in 2001 (<http://ies.sas.ac.uk/cmpps/index.htm>); the newly founded History of Text Technologies Program at Florida State University (<http://hott.fsu.edu/>); and the Princeton University Center for the History of the Book and Media, established in 2002 (<http://web.princeton.edu/sites/english/csbm>).

will find the contributors' investigations into the materiality of the book within its varied physical, metaphorical, historical, intellectual and social ambients to be diverse but inspiring, manifesting a concern to exploit the multiple interpretative possibilities yielded by the text in context. This concern is apparent whether the writer is treating one author (like Whitney Trettien's focus on Samuel Pepys); one manuscript (like the Ellesmere Chaucer, scrutinised by A. S. G. Edwards; or Bodley 647, the subject of Ralph Hanna's essay; or Erika Corradini's thorough treatment of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 421; or Exeter Cathedral Library 3514, the focus of Julia Crick's discussion; or Liberty Stanavage's excellent analysis of the *York Register*); a whole group of manuscripts (such as those examined by Orietta Da Rold and Robert Romanchuk); printed incunabula (as in Margaret Smith's nuanced account of red); or virtual materials (considered by David L. Gants and Martin K. Foys). The way that manuscripts are used and interpreted by their multiple readerships forms the focus for some of the essays here, while regarding the textuality of texts and their physical remediation attracts the attention of others.

All the writers here demonstrate convincingly the importance of scholarship on the material text in its context, and how the book is materialised synchronically and diachronically through such sustained attention. All eleven scholars also indicate and exemplify new directions for research, illustrating how the meticulous evaluation of one case study or set of related studies can provide significant evidence to help re-present the larger picture of textual and bibliographic studies in a new light. And this volume shows convincingly that textual culture is not simply about manuscript or print or digital text; it must ultimately include all technologies from the earliest period to the present day. Moreover, each case study here not only focuses on the cultural text to reflect on its moment of production, but also simultaneously provides an insight into the meaning inscribed upon the cultural text by twenty-first century scholarship.

Both editors would like to thank the contributors for their exemplary scholarship and professionalism in working with them to get this volume in and out on time. Orietta Da Rold wishes to thank her co-editor for *bonam viam ostendere*, and Inan and Elif for their patience. All participants in this project owe a large debt of gratitude to the many libraries and librarians involved for their assistance in providing access to manuscripts, incunabula and images. Final thanks go to the English Association for supporting the work of scholars in English across the globe, and special thanks go to Helen Lucas and Peter Kitson. The

editors dedicate this volume to Professor Gordon Campbell: as he approaches his retirement, we wish him many congratulations on his years of work, his complete commitment to the profession at large and his collegiality and good humour in the face of it all.





# *The Composite Nature of Eleventh-Century Homiliaries: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 421*

ERIKA CORRADINI

THE PRODUCTION OF English vernacular homilies in the eleventh century has often been studied with regard to textual transmission and adaptation. Much focus has been placed on the eleventh-century practices of adapting earlier sources to the needs of new users, and to studying the different purposes underlying the original production of, for instance, *Ælfric* and *Wulfstan*.<sup>1</sup> These studies provide invaluable evidence regarding the interests and concerns of those preachers who were interested in using *Ælfric* and *Wulfstan*'s homiletic texts in the eleventh and early twelfth centuries. However, the form in which such adaptations of earlier homilies were collected physically and conceptually has not been easy to comprehend or to describe, because codicological analyses are only just beginning to illuminate eleventh-century homiletic production from a scriptorial perspective. Treharne's studies in the palaeography and codicology of eleventh- and twelfth-century English vernacular manuscripts have uncovered the multilayered structure of homiletic codices as far as the organisation of both the codicology and content are concerned.<sup>2</sup> Many eleventh-century vernacular homiliaries seem indeed to have lacked the liturgical coherence that

<sup>1</sup> Most recently on the subject see H. Magennis and M. Swan, eds., *A Companion to Ælfric* (Leiden: Brill, 2009); M. Swan and E. Treharne, eds., *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); A. Conti, 'Revising Wulfstan's Antichrist in the Twelfth Century: A Study in Medieval Textual Re-appropriation', *Literature Compass* 4/3 (2007), 638–63; J. Wilcox, 'Ælfric in Dorset and the Landscape of Pastoral Care', in F. Tinti, ed., *Pastoral Care in Late Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2005), 52–75.

<sup>2</sup> E. Treharne, 'Producing a Library in Late Anglo-Saxon England: Exeter, 1050–1072', *The Review of English Studies* 54 (2003), 155–71; E. Treharne, 'The Bishop's Book: Leofric's Homiliary and Eleventh-Century Exeter', in S. Baxter, C. Karkov, J. Nelson and D. Pelteret, eds., *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), pp. 521–37. I am indebted to Professor Treharne for giving me the opportunity to read an earlier version

characterised the initial arrangement of Ælfric's two series of *Catholic Homilies* as conceived by the author himself, for example.<sup>3</sup> Seemingly, many eleventh-century collections of homilies show hardly any liturgical rationale in the form in which they currently stand. This liturgical inconsistency may well be due to the fact that the volumes in which they appear have undergone substantial codicological and palaeographical alterations, often carried out in different stages throughout very long periods of time; however, in most cases it is difficult to discern liturgical, and at times thematic, coherence, even after a reliable codicological reconstruction of the volumes in question has been attempted and completed.<sup>4</sup> The complexities of what may be termed an inconsistent nature make the explicit cogency of eleventh-century codices almost unintelligible when one seeks to make sense of their function and cultural value. This is even more the case because these volumes contain homilies whose contents and rigid preaching diction, when studied outside a liturgical context, do not facilitate the modern scholar's comprehension of their cultural significance, or the meanings that they had for eleventh-century audiences – whenever it is possible to identify those audiences, that is. One may observe that the principle underpinning many eleventh-century composite homiliaries seems to rest on the provision of a varied selection of texts, which can often occur independently from any specific religious occasion. Thus, their compilation does not provide readings for a complete liturgical cycle, as one might expect in contemporary English as well as Latin homiliaries, for example.<sup>5</sup> What these codices offer, perhaps, is not readings for the

of her work on manuscripts, which was of enormous benefit to the research underpinning the compilation of this paper.

<sup>3</sup> Examples of manuscripts arranged according to a liturgical rationale beyond Cambridge, University Library, Gg 3.28, the manuscript which is believed to be a remarkably close copy of Ælfric's original production, are Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 198, s. xi<sup>1</sup>, from Worcester; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 340 and 342, s. xi<sup>2</sup>, from Rochester, described in N. R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957). Some examples of eleventh-century composite codices in which Ælfric's homilies are not arranged according to the liturgical year and are interspersed with religious materials other than homilies are Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 115, s. xi<sup>ex</sup>, at Worcester in the thirteenth century; Hatton 113 and 114, s. xi<sup>3/4</sup>, from Worcester; London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius D.xvii (or rather what remains of it), s. xi<sup>med</sup>, of unknown origin.

<sup>4</sup> Treharne, 'The Bishop's Book', pp. 523–6.

<sup>5</sup> H. Gneuss, 'Liturgical Books in Anglo-Saxon England and their Old English Terminology', in H. Gneuss and M. Lapidge, eds., *Learning and Literature in*

liturgical cycle, but rather a flexibility of choice which is reflected in an unprecedented intellectual dynamism, as their composite, versatile nature would suggest.

Thus, I shall seek to demonstrate that the loose structure of some of these codices, those that seem not to have been deliberately planned, was less haphazard than one might expect, and that the ostensibly disorganised make-up of such books is not as incoherent as it looks at first glance. The unsystematic construction of many eleventh-century homiletic codices would actually enhance the potential adaptability of these homiliaries for new uses and audiences.<sup>6</sup> Only volumes with rather fluid formal boundaries could have easily been (re-)adjusted to provide materials to fulfil new preaching necessities and re-purposed – if such a term can be allowed – without losing their religious and cultural significance. A detailed analysis of CCCC 421 will demonstrate that homiliaries in early medieval times had a rather long life. Their longevity is due to a continuous updating of both their physical form and content, which was facilitated by the fluid structural boundaries characterising such manuscripts. The codicological history of CCCC 421 is particularly interesting because it reflects the gradual completion of a process through which the volume was disaggregated and expanded with new materials in subsequent phases; the theoretical and methodological implications of this progression are of critical importance to a fuller understanding of the production of homiliaries in the eleventh and early twelfth centuries and of their use.

### *Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 421*

The volume was produced at the beginning of the eleventh century, considerably revamped in about the 1050s, and was still in use many years later at the end of the century. The history of the codex from the end of the eleventh century until its acquisition by the sixteenth-

*Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 91–142, p. 123. Gneuss implies that eleventh-century religious institutions were likely to have Latin homiliaries to cover the liturgical cycle.

<sup>6</sup> One relevant example of such collections, beside the one here under scrutiny, is Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 943 (Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 364) containing two homilies for the same feast, that is the dedication of a church, now edited in R. Brotanek, *Texte und Untersuchungen zur altenglischen Literatur und Kirchengeschichte* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1913), pp. 3–27.

century antiquarian archbishop Matthew Parker is, unfortunately, unknown.<sup>7</sup> Once in the archbishop's possession, however, the codex became part of his collection of medieval books, which was eventually donated to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, upon the death of the archbishop in 1575, where they remain to this day.<sup>8</sup>

The older nucleus of CCCC 421 – including pages 99–208 and 227–345 – was produced at the beginning of the eleventh century in a centre supposedly affiliated with Canterbury, if not Canterbury itself.<sup>9</sup> Originally, the codex was a companion volume to CCCC 419, with which it shares structure, script, and *mise-en-page*. Together, the two companions provided a fairly extensive collection of homilies, mostly by Ælfric and Wulfstan. Over time, the two volumes received a significant number of spelling updates, some of which are likely to have been executed at subsequent stages. Changes in the orthography of words would suggest that the two manuscripts were in use for a long period of time, long enough for the necessity to revise the spelling to arise. Such alterations do not appear consistently throughout the two volumes, but tend to concentrate within the limits of individual texts. This unsystematic approach to revision was plausibly adopted for homilies being prepared for delivery, thereby suggesting that only some of the texts in these two volumes were used at times after their original production.<sup>10</sup> Although it is difficult to know exactly *when* each of the phases of the spelling revision was carried out in the two companions, let alone

<sup>7</sup> Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 69, pp. 117–18; although Ker's *Catalogue* remains the principal term of reference for CCCC 421, the manuscript has more recently been palaeographically and codicologically described in J. Wilcox, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile*, vol. VIII (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2000), pp. 7–13. The Parker Library on the Web project has the most updated and complete description of the relevant codex at <http://parkerweb.stanford.edu/parker/actions/page.do?forward=home> (last accessed 1.08.2009)

<sup>8</sup> The Latin heading 'Liber Sextus' followed by a summary of the manuscript's contents inclusive of page numbers now on fol. iir was added to the volume in the archbishop's time, as also suggested by the sixteenth-century script. Wilcox, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*, p. 8.

<sup>9</sup> Wilcox, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*, p. 7, indicates that the origin of CCCC 421 is unknown. However, its linguistic and textual features point to Canterbury as far as the physical production of the codex is concerned, contrary to what the contents of the manuscript would indicate.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 8.

by whom,<sup>11</sup> it is plausible to think that part of the changes affecting words would have depended on the scriptorium where the books were modernised and prepared for use, and the conventions adopted by the scribes working for that scriptorium. Interestingly, one recurrent change in CCCC 421 and 419 is the alteration of *i* to *y*. The technique of attaching the longer limb of *y* to the existing *i* and squeezing it between it and the following letter is very much in evidence and particularly frequent in vernacular manuscripts entirely produced at Exeter in the third quarter of the eleventh century. Corrections in Exeter-produced vernacular manuscripts are indeed very few, and even at a glance it may be noted that they mostly consist of *i*-to-*y* changes.<sup>12</sup> Such consistency in revising spelling conventions beyond the limits of one single manuscript would indicate that at a certain point it was decided that the entire corpus of vernacular codices was to be updated and *i* altered to *y* when occurring in certain positions.

It is in itself unsurprising that CCCC 421 and 419 should host corrections added in a style shown in Exeter-produced and corrected manuscripts, since it is accepted by scholars that by the mid-eleventh century the two volumes had been added to the collection of books that belonged to Leofric, who was bishop of Exeter in the years 1050–72. However, the implication of these alterations has a much deeper significance for our knowledge of the history of these codices than one might expect, because they reveal that not only were the manuscripts being repeatedly used before they came to Exeter, but also that, once in Leofric's hands, they were still orthographically updated and harmonised according to the spelling habits used by the bishop's scribes and to which the users of these volumes were accustomed. The language appraisal of the two companions supports the idea that the homiletic texts contained in the two codices needed a linguistic revision when being prepared for delivery. In this regard, spelling alterations, without really changing the meaning of words, would have ensured maximum clarity of the texts, for their delivery to be as smooth and hesitation-free as possible. Bearing this in mind, not only do such corrections offer a snapshot of spelling habits in mid-to-late eleventh-century Exeter, but concurrently underline the utilitarian function of the works that

<sup>11</sup> In most cases it is impossible to distinguish critical differences between the hands that made the alteration. This is because corrections are minimal, though frequent.

<sup>12</sup> CCCC 190, pp. 315–19 and London, British Library, Cleopatra B.xiii are but two examples.

CCCC 421 and its companion contain. The style and nature of the corrections showing in these two codices illustrate that they were intended for reading the texts out in front of an audience.<sup>13</sup> This is indicated by changes being often carried out in a mimetic fashion, in an attempt perhaps to camouflage the alterations and harmonise them with what is written on the page in a non-intrusive manner so that the deliverer could read them easily and without interruption.<sup>14</sup>

### *Homiletic comparanda*

The presence in CCCC 421 and 419 of corrections which are written in typical Exeter hands and of a kind recurring in manuscripts written and used at Exeter in the third quarter of the eleventh century is, however, not the only piece of evidence supporting the idea that the two companion volumes were in use at Exeter and underwent revision there – and radical revision at that.<sup>15</sup> Two sets of eight quires in

<sup>13</sup> See Treharne, 'The Bishop's Book', *passim*, and A. Conti, 'The Taunton Fragment and the Homiliary of Angers: Context for New Old English', *The Review of English Studies* 60 (2009), 1–33, p. 32. Conti suggests that the homiliary of Angers, unlike CCCC 421, was used as a guide for preachers in writing sermons. Clearly, manuscripts for compiling homilies such as those admirably described and analysed by Conti were not unusual, though copies have hardly survived, probably owing to the deterioration inherently caused by their utilitarian nature. Although it is evident that practical functions are generally and justly associated with vernacular homiliaries, the uses for which they were employed varied, as reflected in their diverse physical characteristics. On the latter point see also Wilcox, 'Ælfric in Dorset', p. 61.

<sup>14</sup> Examples of these minutiae are CCCC 421, p. 180, the word 'wyrðe', line 1, was written in the margin; p. 190, line 3, 'godspelle' obtained correcting 'ge<erasure>spelle'; p. 196, line 5, *i* was changed to *y* in the word 'dysiga'; p. 244 a rather lengthy portion of text was orderly written in the footer of the page; p. 334, line 12 *i* was altered to *y* in the word 'cwyde' and line 18 the word 'dufte' was overwritten on erasure (rather than in the interlinear space); to name only a few examples. Similarly, CCCC 419, p. 11, line 4 the word 'þe' was squeezed between two words slightly above the line; p. 13 *i* was changed to *y* in the words 'togetheran', line 12 and 'wyle', line 15. At points when lack of space does not allow for squeezing a letter cluster in the right position, the correction is written above the word and the place where it should be read signalled with a visible comma-like stroke of the pen, see CCCC 419, p. 29, line 5 and again line 13 the words 'mancynne' and 'olehtan' (this is also visible in CCCC 191, fol. 114 another Exeter codex). These are only a few of the many examples of corrections unobtrusively carried out in these volumes.

<sup>15</sup> CCCC 419, p. 55 above lines 4 and 8. The script of this set of corrections

total, produced at Exeter in the third quarter of the eleventh century, were inserted into CCCC 421 at some point during Leofric's episcopacy. The Exeter portions of CCCC 421, now covering pp. 3–98 and 209–24, were originally part of another collection of homilies entirely compiled by Exeter scribes, perhaps before the arrival of CCCC 421 and its companion at Exeter. This collection of homilies is now extant as London, British Library, Cotton Cleopatra B. xiii and London, Lambeth Palace, 489.<sup>16</sup> The Exeter sections of CCCC 421 share script and page layout with these two codices and it is such palaeographical grounds that suggest they were originally intended to be part of the same collection of homilies, including texts now appearing in three different volumes. Although it is possible that the texts contained in Lambeth 489 and Cleopatra B.xiii were bound in the two volumes in which they now appear in the sixteenth century, the acquisition of CCCC 421 and CCCC 419 by Leofric may have reasonably instigated re-organisation and revision of the entire homiletic collection already in place at Exeter. This explains the similar spelling updates found throughout the four volumes, and the insertion into CCCC 421 of units belonging to the collection originally copied and assembled at Exeter, now represented by Lambeth 489 and Cleopatra B.xiii.

If this was the case, as seems plausible, the texts now contained in the four volumes together would have formed the homiletic collection which Bishop Leofric used to fulfil his preaching duties.<sup>17</sup> Although there is no apparent episcopal flavour to CCCC 421 and CCCC 419, contrary to what has been noted with regard to Cleopatra B.xiii and Lambeth 489,<sup>18</sup> the simple fact that CCCC 421 shows codicological connections with them is sufficient grounds to place it in a context which is likely to be different from that at the beginning of the century, when the manuscript was made. In these circumstances it would appear that CCCC 421, and by implication its companion volume, were reshaped as a collection and placed in a context where they would

is clearly of the Exeter type as reflected in the distinctive features of insular **g**, **a** and **d** and in the angular shape of minims.

<sup>16</sup> The connections between these four volumes have been evidenced in T. A. M. Bishop, 'Notes on Cambridge Manuscripts. Part II', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 2 (1954–8), 185–99, p. 198, and more forcefully supported in Treharne, 'The Bishop's Book', pp. 524–8, where a detailed codicological analysis of the three volumes is presented.

<sup>17</sup> Treharne, 'The Bishop's Book', pp. 524–8.

<sup>18</sup> P. Clemoes, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies. First Series*, EETS, ss 17 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 22.