University of Groningen

Encyclopaedic Notes as Micro-Texts

Dekker, Kees

Published in:
Anglo-Saxon Micro-Texts

DOI:
[10.1515/9783110630961-011](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110630961-011)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2019

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Dekker, K. (2019). Encyclopaedic Notes as Micro-Texts: Contextual Variation and Communicative Function. In U. Lenker, & L. Kornexl (Eds.), *Anglo-Saxon Micro-Texts: Buchreihe der Anglia / Anglia Book Series* (Vol. 67, pp. 203-224). (Buchreihe der Anglia / Anglia Book Series; Vol. 67). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110630961-011>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Kees Dekker

Encyclopaedic Notes as Micro-Texts: Contextual Variation and Communicative Function

Abstract: Encyclopaedic notes occur in some 45 manuscripts from Helmut Gneuss and Michael Lapidge's *Bibliographical Handlist* (2014), either as individual micro-texts or in groups. They are either single statements conveying factual information, or lists itemising simple knowledge. The manuscript context of encyclopaedic notes is, as yet, unexplored: they may occur in the periphery, in the margins or centrally in manuscripts, but are never part of the larger texts in these codices. In this article, I review a group of encyclopaedic notes which recurs, in various forms, in six manuscripts. By considering codicological as well as textual features and by assessing the interplay between the intentions of authors or compilers *vis-à-vis* reader- or user-response, it becomes clear that the insertion of encyclopaedic notes was motivated by various types of associations made by scribes and compilers. These associations are the key to establishing their communicative functions.

1 Introduction

Out of 1291 manuscripts and manuscript fragments listed in Helmut Gneuss and Michael Lapidge's *Bibliographical Handlist* (2014), some 45 contain texts that may be classified as encyclopaedic notes – for example:

Ossa hominis sunt numero .cc.xviii. Numerus uenarum .ccclxv. Dentium numerus in perfecta aetate .xxxii.

'The number of bones in a man is 219. The number of veins, 365. The number of teeth in the perfect age, 32'.

(Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 183, fol. 68v; see Dekker 2007: 283)

or

Kees Dekker, University of Groningen

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110630961-011>

Sapientia grecorum. Inuidia iudeorum. Superbia. romanorum. Largitas. Langobardorum. Sobrietas. gothorum. Eleuatio francorum. Gula gallorum. Ira brittonum. Stultitia saxonum. Libido Scottorum Crudelitas. pictorum.

‘The Greeks, wisdom; the Jews, jealousy; the Romans, pride; the Longobards, generosity; the Goths, temperance; the Franks, arrogance; the Gauls, gluttony; the Britons, anger; the Saxons, simplicity; the Scoti, passion; the Picts, harshness’.

(London, British Library, Cotton Caligula A.xv, fol. 126v)

An encyclopaedic note can be defined as “a brief written observation, record, or abstract of facts, *esp.* one intended to aid the memory, or to serve as a basis for a more complete statement or for future action” (*OED* s.v. *note* n.² 15.a.), and, as such, it may be classified as a micro-text. In line with other micro-texts, all encyclopaedic notes are independent verbal records of communicative acts (Brown and Yule 1983: 6), and are therefore never part of other, larger texts in the manuscripts, for which I will use the term ‘macrotexts’.¹ Encyclopaedic notes are either single statements consisting of “primarily transactional language” (*ibid.*) conveying factual information, or lists itemising simple knowledge, for example the six ages of man, or the seven days of Creation, or the three Incarnations of Christ.² They often resemble answers to questions such as: how many books are there in the Bible; how many seasons are there in the year and what are the names of the seasons?

Although they are independent entities, encyclopaedic notes do not occur in isolation. On the one hand they display, in the words of Norman Fairclough, “manifest intertextuality”, by sharing phrases or source material with related texts (1992: 104, 117–130). For example notes on the bones, veins and teeth in the human body are found five times in Latin and once in Old English, but a similar text also occurs in the Old English prose *Solomon and Saturn* 59 (Cross and Hill 1982: 34), as well as in the Hiberno-Latin *Liber de Numeris* (PL 83, col. 1295C) and in the *Vocabularius Sancti Galli* (St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, 913, p. 127–128; Baesecke 1933: 6). On the other hand, one finds “constitutive intertextuality”: the interrelationship of discursive features or discourse conventions in texts such as form, style, text typology and structure. Thus, short factual texts in question-and-answer format, in an itemising, paratactic style occur not only as encyclopaedic

¹ A term not included in the *OED*, ‘macrotext’ is used in literary studies as well as applied linguistics (Nicholas and Starks 2014: 57–59).

² Elsewhere I have discussed formal characteristics such as their itemising structure, parataxis and the use of *pa* and *ponne* as discourse markers (Dekker 2013: 109–112). For my classification of encyclopaedic notes, I have been using the method for determining ‘text types’ by Manfred Görlach, who distinguishes between text types on the basis of parameters, which may be structural, functional, textual and contextual. Classification involves a “correlation between types of situation, textual functions and conventionalised linguistic features” (Görlach 2001: 50).

notes, but also in wisdom dialogues (e.g. the Old English prose *Solomon and Saturn* and *Adrian and Ritheus*), florilegia (e.g. *Collectanea pseudo-Bedae*) and glosses (e.g. the *Biblical Commentaries of the Canterbury School*).³ Between these texts, encyclopaedic knowledge was recontextualised, reformatted, translated and dynamically transferred from one scholarly context to another.

The manuscript context of these encyclopaedic notes is, as yet, unexplored. Some notes occur in only one manuscript, others in more than one, often showing remarkable variation as a result of omissions, additions, re-orderings or mistakes. This suggests that, instead of being copied in writing, some may well have been reproduced from memory and reformatted in the process (Dekker 2012). Encyclopaedic notes occur either as individual texts or in groups. Some are written in the same hand as the surrounding texts, while others are in a different hand, sometimes, but not always, by a later scribe. Finally, notes occur in various places in manuscripts. It is possible, therefore, to distinguish between notes that are ‘integral’, written among the main collection of texts; ‘peripheral’, added to the initial or final folios of a manuscript or codicological unit; or ‘marginal’, written in marginal space on a full page. This variety in manuscript context raises the question of whether we can assign any purpose to such notes. Are they just ‘there’, stored for their own sake, or were they added to the manuscripts by scribes and compilers who planned their insertion for a specific reason? If so, what do encyclopaedic notes communicate, and what was the role of scribes and compilers in their distribution? And how do they relate to other micro-texts?

2 Manuscript Context

Micro-texts and other minor texts in the context of manuscript compilation and reader response have not generated much scholarly attention. In a recent article on “Manuscript Catalogues and Book History”, Ralph Hanna (2017: 50–51) discusses the lack of attention on the part of manuscript cataloguers to marginalia:

³ A central position in the history of wisdom texts is taken up by the *Collectanea pseudo-Bedae* (Bayless and Lapidge 1998), which contain many items that are structurally similar to encyclopaedic notes (Dekker 2013: 112–115). Mary Garrison (1998) and Charles Wright (1993: 54–58) have shown the relation between the *Collectanea* and further analogues, not just in terms of topics and contents, but also with respect to the enumerative style associated with Irish exegesis. For the connections between wisdom texts and the *Biblical Commentaries of the Canterbury School*, see Bischoff and Lapidge (1994: 205, 291).

[C]ataloguers, committed to the originally provided, in-column texts, are notoriously loath to note (even the presence of) marginalia, primary data in any reader-response study, and frequently even ignore the presence of added texts, typically on flyleaves (and, where they do appear in descriptions, appear subordinated to original in-column materials).

Moreover, as Hanna states, even though such texts are “exciting as evidence of ‘reader response’”, “the ideal presentation of such materials remains completely unexplored territory” (*ibid.*). More than any other category, micro-texts fit this description of a neglected group when it comes to their presentation in book-historical studies and their role in reader-response theory. The distinction is, however, not just between texts and items placed inside or outside of the conventional written space. Instead, a considerable number of manuscripts contain collections consisting of

- (a) ‘macrotext’, an overarching theme or collection such as homilies or prayers, or
- (b) ‘macrotexts’, longer, primary texts in the manuscript, in combination with
- (c) ‘paratext’, such as glosses, scholia or marginal commentaries,⁴ or
- (d) ‘micro-texts’, in the form of brief texts, often secondary to the collection.

All of these categories are involved in the interplay between the intentions of authors or compilers *vis-à-vis* reader- or user-response, where it should be noted that the distinction between authors, scribes and compilers versus users and readers is blurred: a scribe can be an author, compiler and user at the same time. The function of micro-texts such as encyclopaedic notes within a compilation can therefore only be assessed through a detailed study of the manuscript as a continuing process of interaction between macrotext, paratext, micro-text and audience. Interesting in this respect is Hanna’s assertion that

in England until very nearly the coming of print, excepting certain standardized texts for ‘institutionalized’ use (bibles, [para-]liturgical books, school texts), no manuscript was ever produced for an anonymous, unknown audience. They were most generally either for personal use or the product of a ‘bespoke trade’, specializing in what we would call ‘special orders’, implicitly some variety of negotiation among parties. (Hanna 2017: 53)

Although Hanna used later medieval manuscripts as his examples, several manuscripts from Anglo-Saxon England are likewise known to be products of ‘bespoke trade’ for a designated audience, while the production history of many other manuscripts is unclear.

In the study of multi-text manuscripts (which often include micro-texts such as encyclopaedic notes), the interplay between codicological and textual aspects

⁴ Cf. Genette (1997: xviii–xix, 1–2) for a general definition of paratextuality. Genette’s chapter on notes (319–343) does not include the concept of encyclopaedic notes as discussed here.

of compilation is an important, yet complicating factor, which requires a careful consideration of terms and definitions. As Peter Gumbert explained in his seminal study on the “Stratigraphy of the Non-Homogeneous Codex”, such manuscripts consist of ‘codicological units’, i.e. “a discrete number of quires, worked in a single operation and containing a complete set of texts”, which can be changed over time, and joined with other codicological units (2004: 23). Gumbert distinguishes three types of relation between codicological units in non-homogeneous manuscripts: such units can be ‘monogenetic’, written by the same scribe; ‘homogenetic’, originating in the same circle at the same time; or ‘allogenic’, not originating from the same circle and time (2004: 29). Using Gumbert’s system as a starting point, Erik Kwakkel distinguishes between ‘production units’, explained as “groups of quires that formed a material unity at the time of production”, and ‘usage units’, i.e. “the manner in which a production unit was used: separately or bound together with other production units” (2002: 14–15). Because usage could change over time due to redistribution of production units, Kwakkel also coined the term ‘usage phase’ to indicate the time frame in which a particular usage unit functioned.

Whereas Gumbert and Kwakkel concentrated on the physical composition of manuscripts, Karen Pratt, Bart Besamusca, Matthias Meyer and Ad Putter outline the connection between manuscripts and texts in their “Introduction” to *The Dynamics of the Medieval Manuscript*, where they explain that ‘guest texts’ (texts added to an existing manuscript) can also be homogenetic or allogenic, and add that “the diversity of a multi-text collection is therefore not simply a matter of its content but also of its strata” (2017: 17). Indeed, the production, (re)distribution and usage of texts, including micro-texts, depends not just on the vicissitudes of the manuscript, but can, and should, also be regarded independently. As Pratt, Besamusca, Meyer and Putter state with respect to multi-item manuscripts: “the text collections they preserve consist, in whole or part, of texts which were composed earlier and circulated independently (sometimes in booklets) before they were copied into multi-text codices” (2017: 25). In addition, they point to “the arrangement of texts in a compilation and accompanying paratexts” as “further evidence for the manner in which they were received by the compiler, revealing the way(s) in which he appreciated, classified, and interpreted the individual works” (*ibid.*). For an investigation of micro-texts in multi-text codices, the interplay between codicology and text compilation, as well as the stratigraphy of production and usage, are indispensable parameters for our understanding of the meaning of such texts in manuscripts. In more concrete terms, within a codicological unit, micro-texts can be monogenetic, homogenetic or allogenic, and are in an abstract sense text production units which may exercise a particular function in a usage unit during a usage phase. As micro-texts migrate from one manuscript to another, they move from one usage

unit to another, and enter another usage phase in which they may adopt a different communicative function.

In what follows I review a group of some fourteen encyclopaedic notes in six manuscripts in which this group occurs, either completely or in part. It will appear from the manuscript contexts that the communicative functions of these notes change as they move between production units and usage units.

3 The Latin Collection

The earliest example of encyclopaedic notes in a ‘bespoke’ manuscript is a collection of fourteen Latin notes in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 183, fols. 67r–69v. Written by one scribe and compiled as a single volume between 934 and 940, the manuscript was, in all likelihood, commissioned by King Athelstan possibly in Winchester, but, more likely, Glastonbury or Wells, and may have been a gift to the abbey of Chester-le-Street.⁵ CCCC 183 is a Cuthbert collection, containing Bede’s *Prose Vita*, the miracles of St Cuthbert from Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica* (IV 31–32), Bede’s *Metrical Vita*, preceded by a glossary of difficult words from this text, as well as a mass and office for St Cuthbert (Gretsch 1999: 352–353). In the middle, there is a section (fols. 59r–70v) containing lists of popes, the seventy-two disciples of Christ, Anglo-Saxon kings and bishops,⁶ followed by fourteen encyclopaedic notes in Latin, on

- (1) Christ’s three Incarnations,
- (2) the number of Christ’s years on earth,
- (3) the six ages of the world,
- (4) the six ages of man,
- (5) the number of bones, teeth and veins in the human body,
- (6) the measurements of the world,
- (7) the measurements of Solomon’s temple,
- (8) the measurements of Moses’s tabernacle,
- (9) the measurements of St Peter’s basilica in Rome,
- (10) the measurements of Noah’s ark,

⁵ Gneuss and Lapidge (2014: no. 56). The origin of CCCC 183 and its commission and donation by King Athelstan is discussed by Keynes (1985: 180–184) and Gretsch (1999: 352–359). Rollason (1989) confirms its commission by King Athelstan, but claims that it was used in Wessex rather than given to Chester-le-Street.

⁶ Editions by James (1912: I, 428–438); Page (1966: 8–12 [episcopal lists]); Dumville (1976: 32–34 [regnal lists]).

- (11) the number of books of the Old and New Testament,
 - (12) the number of verses in the Psalms,
 - (13a) and (13b) units of measures,
 - (14) God's works on the seven days of Creation.
- (James 1912: I, 439–440; Dekker 2007: 281–284)

This middle section does not form a separate codicological unit: it is integrated in the quire structure of the manuscript, written in the same hand as the other texts and in a similar spacious layout.⁷ Concentrating mostly on the regnal and episcopal lists, Mechthild Gretsch (1999: 356–357) suggested that the presence of this material may indicate that the Prose and Metrical *Vitae* hailed from different exemplars. Although this may well be true, there is no evidence of filling empty space in CCCC 183; instead, the compilers deliberately planned and carefully inserted all of this material: the texts are monogenetic as are the quires, and the whole manuscript makes up a single production unit. Potential reasons for incorporating the lists and notes have been suggested by Simon Keynes (1985: 181), who notes that the purpose of the lists and notes was “mainly educational and emphasised the unity of the Anglo-Saxon Church and kingdoms”. While the lists of bishops and kings have generated substantial scholarly attention, the presence of the encyclopaedic notes – arguably the most enigmatic material – has not.⁸

However, the relevance of these notes appears very clearly from another manuscript of Bede's Metrical *Vita* of St Cuthbert: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 2825, fols. 57–81, written around 900, either in Northern France or in England.⁹ On the basis of Old English glosses and rubrics it is believed that this manuscript was in England by the middle of the tenth century, possibly at King Athelstan's court, the same court that commissioned CCCC 183 (Gretsch 1999: 357). Bede's Metrical *Vita* is followed, on fols. 78bis to 81, by the same collection of encyclopaedic notes as occurs in CCCC 183.¹⁰ Pen trials on fol. 81r–v suggest that this leaf was once the last one in a separate codicological unit, while the imperfect beginning of the Metrical *Vita* leaves open the possibility that more material – for example Bede's Prose *Vita* – was once part of the manuscript. A closer look at the manuscript reveals that the notes are on two additional bifolia forming a separate quire,

⁷ James (1912: I, 426) provides a collation; the middle section covers part of quire H (57–64) and I (65–71).

⁸ In Rollason's discussion of the manuscript (1989), the notes remain unmentioned.

⁹ Lapidge (1995: 156) classifies the main script as Continental Caroline, whereas Ebersperger (1999: 57) denotes it as English Caroline with insular letter forms.

¹⁰ Fol. 78bis has been cut away, but with the help of the writing on the remaining stub, it is possible to see that the two missing notes were once there (Dekker 2007: 305–306).

written in a hand that differs from the one of the Metrical *Vita* in being less consistent and showing features such as open **g** and **r** with a slightly longer descender that make it definitely English Caroline rather than continental.¹¹ Deriving from a separate production unit, the encyclopaedic notes were codicologically and textually allo-genetic, but were deliberately added to the Metrical *Vita*, perhaps after the Metrical *Vita* arrived in England.¹² In the new usage phase – in England – the now enlarged codicological unit consisting of *Vita* and notes formed a new usage unit, both codicologically and textually, in which the notes were meant to be significant, especially since not one but two manuscripts of Bede's Metrical *Vita*, which were presumably together at the court of King Athelstan in the tenth century, contain the same sequence of encyclopaedic notes.

If these notes have a communicative function beyond being a string of fourteen individual micro-texts functioning as a micropaedia of wholesome learning (Dekker 2007: 313), I suggest that they were intended to represent Bede, the author of the macrotext, in that they provide micro-textual examples of Bede's Bible exegesis, in the shape of a list of basic itemised lessons. Together the notes constitute a statement of Bede's authority as a Bible exegete and historian. The explicit attribution of such a collection to Bede or an implicit association with Bede would not be an uncommon phenomenon; instead, among the many texts erroneously attributed to Bede at one time or another there are florilegia and wisdom dialogues, including, of course, part I of the *Collectanea pseudo-Bedae*, but also *De sex dierum generatione* and the *quaestionum super Genesin dialogus*, both of which were known in England in the tenth century (Gneuss and Lapidge 2014: 576).¹³ That such micro-texts could attribute 'dignity' to surrounding material was rightly suggested by Keynes in his investigation of London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian B.vi, fols. 104–109, an early ninth-century quire containing a similar collection of encyclopaedic notes and other micro-texts,¹⁴ as well as lists

11 Collation on the basis of *Gallica*: the manuscript fragment containing Bede's Metrical *Vita* consists of three quires: I⁶ (fols. 57–62); II¹⁰–1 (fols. 63–71); III⁶+1 (fols. 72–78); the quire with the additional material is IV⁴ (fols. 78bis–81); <<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b105420770.r=Beda%20cuthberti?rk=85837;2>>.

12 At the beginning of fol. 78bis–r, ten capital letters followed by blank spaces indicate that there were ten lines of Latin verse. They are not mentioned in any catalogue and have not been identified.

13 No. 808.0. Brussels, Bibliothèque royale, 8654–8672 (s. ix^{1/3}, prob. NE France [Channel coast]). Jones's catalogue of *Didascalica dubia et spuria* (1939: 48–91) includes titles such as *De ratione unciarum libellus*, *De signis Horis XII Mensium*, *Similitudo Arcae Noe*, which are reminiscent of the material found in encyclopaedic notes.

14 The quire is generally thought to be Mercian on historical and palaeographical grounds, but Keynes (2005: I, 48–51) suggests Canterbury as a possible place of origin.

of the 72 disciples of Christ, popes, Anglo-Saxon bishops and Anglo-Saxon kings, in addition to the *Metrical Calendar of York* and texts on world chronology and tables of numerals (Keynes 2005: I, 51–59).¹⁵ In an article entitled, significantly, “Between Bede and the Chronicle”, Keynes states with respect to the notes in *Vespasian B.vi* that they “provide a background or context to what was to follow [i.e. the lists of bishops and kings], and thereby lend dignity of some kind to the new order” (2005: I, 55). The presence of these notes in *CCCC 183* and *BnF lat. 2825* suggests that the kind of dignity they provided was Bede’s *auctoritas* in the form of a synopsis of his learning that put a meta-textual stamp of authority on the books containing Bede’s *Vitae* of St Cuthbert.¹⁶

The two remaining manuscripts in which this collection of encyclopaedic notes occurs do not contain Bede’s *Vitae* of St Cuthbert, nor any other Bede text. Instead, in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 320, fols. 117–170, the entire collection of notes (fols. 166v–169v) occurs at the end of the manuscript, following the penitential of Archbishop Theodore (the macrotext in this book), Pope Gregory’s *Libellus responsionum*, Theodore’s poem addressed to bishop Hæddi, an Order of Confession and the *Poenitentiale Sangermanense*.¹⁷ The notes begin mid-page, and are in the same hand as the previous texts, with similar paratextual features. As in *CCCC 183*, the quire structure as well as the notes are monogenetic, and the manuscript appears to be a single production unit.

At the end of the collection of encyclopaedic notes we find an additional note, on the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, entitled “De hierosolima et rebus in ea gestis”:

In monte excelso hierusalem posita est. et in media illa ciuitate habetur basilica in honore s<an>c<ti> constantini. et in illa basilica fuit thesaurus salomonis regis. et ibi est altare de auro factum et illud altare sustentant columpnę nouem deauratę et in dextera parte in illa basilica est quasi cubiculus factus. et in illo cubiculo fuit crux chr<isti> abscondita in qua d<omi>n<u>s passus fuit & suspensus pro salute mundi. & ibi s<un>t clauī unde iudaei fixerunt manus d<omi>ni. & ibi est illa lancea unde longinus transforauit latus d<omi>ni; Illa crux et illa lancea sic fulgent in illo loco in nocte quasi sol in die et deinde venis ad illum cancellum ubi d<omi>n<u>s in cruce stetit & ille cancellus est de auro & de argento factus & sub illo cancello corpus adam sepultum est. et ipsa crux stetit sup<er> pectus adam & de illa gutta quę de latere d<omi>ni fluxit & de illo sanguine fuit terra purgata & s<an>c<ti>ficata. & adam redempt<us> de inferno;

¹⁵ On the relation between *Vespasian B.vi* and *CCCC 183*, see Dekker (2007: 303–305), where I suggest that, in all probability, the two go back to a shared source or tradition.

¹⁶ See Nicholas and Starks (2014: 132–142) on ‘meta awareness’ and its manifestations in education.

¹⁷ The notes are followed on the last folio by a fragment of the “Scriftboc”. See Gneuss and Lapidge (2014: 103–104, no. 90), for texts and editions.

‘About Jerusalem and what it contains. Jerusalem is situated on a high mountain, and in the middle of the town we find the basilica in honour of Saint Constantine. And in this basilica was King Solomon’s treasure, and here is the altar made of gold, and nine gilded columns support this altar. And in the right part of the basilica a room is made like a sleeping chamber, and in that sleeping chamber Christ’s cross was hidden, on which the Lord suffered and was hanged for the salvation of mankind. And here are the nails with which the Jews fastened the hands of the Lord. And here is the spear with which Longinus pierced the side of the Lord. In this place, at night, this cross and this lance light up in such a way that they seem like the sun at daytime. And subsequently you reach the enclosure where the Lord’s cross stood, and the screen is made of gold and silver, and under this enclosure Adam’s body is buried. And this cross stands over Adam’s body, and by this fluid which flowed from the Lord’s side and by this blood the earth was purged and blessed, and Adam was redeemed from Hell’. [translation mine]

This additional note resembles a text known as the *Breuiarius*, a brief description of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre followed by other Jerusalem landmarks which has been dated to the beginning of the sixth century and which survives in three continental manuscripts (Weber 1965: 107).¹⁸ The note, however, includes several items not found in the *Breuiarius*: it mentions King Solomon’s treasure in the basilica¹⁹ and refers to the presence in the basilica of the nails used by ‘the Jews’ for fixing Christ’s hands.²⁰ The lance used by Longinus to pierce the Lord’s side is there *together with* a cross, and not *made into* a cross, as in other sources.²¹ Unique to this note is also the mention of Adam’s burial underneath the cross and of the fluids from Christ’s body cleansing and sanctifying the earth and redeeming Adam from Hell.²² There is no single exemplar for these variations; instead, the compiler of the note seems to have drawn up a list of primary and secondary

18 Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, M. 79 sup. (c. 1080, ?Piacenza); St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, 732 (s. viii^{1/4}, Bavaria); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud misc. 263 (s. ix in., Mainz, written in Anglo-Saxon minuscule; text partly erased); Walbers (2012: 218–223).

19 King Solomon’s treasure may refer to Solomon’s ring, which was shown together with the horn from which kings were anointed on Good Friday, as mentioned in Egeria’s Pilgrimage XXXVII.3 (Franceschini and Weber 1965: 81) and Peter the Deacon’s *De locis sanctis* C.2. (Weber 1965: 95).

20 No source mentions that the nails remained in Jerusalem to be venerated by pilgrims, as this note suggests (Borgehammar 1991: 48–49).

21 The discovery of the nails is occasioned by prayer followed by the miraculous appearance of a great light described as brighter than the sun at day time (Borgehammar 1991: 270, 287). In the note this phenomenon of relics emitting light that is brighter than the sun is associated with *illa crux et illa lancea* ‘this cross and this lance’, which suggests some confusion. All sources claim that only a part of the Cross was left in Jerusalem by St Helena (Borgehammar 1991: 49–50), while the lance, as Adomnán states, is “in the porch of the basilica of Constantine, inserted in a wooden cross” (Meehan 1958: 50–53), which Bede copied almost verbatim (Fraipont 1965: 257).

22 Adam’s baptism after death is discussed at length by Cross and Hill (1982: 77–79), who show that it is a wide-spread motif found in Insular, Continental, Coptic and Syrian texts. Created out

Christ relics, culminating in the world's most powerful instrument of redemption: Christ's blood which redeemed Adam from Hell.

The question arises of whether the note on Jerusalem is not only an interesting accretion but also a purposeful one. With its separate rubric it is articulated differently from the preceding fourteen notes, which are marked mostly by coloured initials and must have been copied from a single source. There is, however, no blank line separating the note on Jerusalem from the previous ones, which contrasts strongly with the three blank lines following this note and providing a clear break between the notes and the subsequent "Scriftboc" fragment on fol. 170r. Moreover, the encyclopaedic note on Jerusalem resembles the earlier notes in terms of handwriting, itemising style, brevity and encyclopaedic import, which suggests a conscious choice on the part of the compiler, not just to conclude the manuscript with the collection of fourteen notes but also to add a final one with an emphasis on Christ's holy relics and Adam's redemption. If so, the adaptation may well have been inspired by the penitential contents of the manuscript, with its pervasive theme of sin, penitence and potential of redemption to which the Jerusalem relics provide a fitting conclusion. Furthermore, the notes may also allude to the authorship and authority of Archbishop Theodore, whose scholarly reputation, like Bede's, was highly regarded. The monogenetic origin of the notes in CCCC 320 imply a single production unit and a single usage unit and thereby increase the likelihood of a communicative function of the notes that is not detached from the macrotext.

In London, British Library, Royal 2.B.v, fols. 187r–190r, the encyclopaedic notes once again occur at the end of the macrotext, this time the Psalter, but here the complicated stratigraphy of the manuscript suggests a different communicative function. Opinions vary on where this psalter with its interlinear and marginal glosses was written: the earlier consensus was Winchester (Pulsiano 1994: 57; Stokes 2014: 67), whereas Gretsche (1999: 264–267) endorsed by Scragg (2008: 382) opts for either Glastonbury or Abingdon. The subsequent development of the manuscript displays an intricate interplay of codicological and textual enrichment, as well as change of location. First, the notes plus a prognostic in Latin were added at the end of the manuscript, followed by two confessional prayers in Old English, a Latin encyclopaedic note on the Fridays for fasting, two more confessional prayers in Old English, as well as an additional quire of six folios at the beginning of the manuscript with the Office of the Virgin Mary and the Preface to the Psalms. The incorporation of this material is supposed to have coincided with

of earth, Adam is buried in mother earth, ends up at the foot of the Cross and is baptised by the blood and water oozing from Christ's body.

the presence of the manuscript in Winchester and its subsequent move to Christ Church, Canterbury. When the Royal Psalter moved to Christ Church, and where the various additions were inserted, remain points of discussion.

The question of where, when and why the encyclopaedic notes were added to the Royal Psalter has not featured in the discussions about this manuscript. The notes begin in the middle of what was originally the penultimate quire in the manuscript, immediately after the end of the canticles, i.e. the end of the macrotext.²³ They are written in a robust English Caroline hand, which is unlike any of the other hands in the manuscript. Compared to the parallel collections in CCCC 183, BnF lat. 2825 and CCCC 320, the individual notes in Royal 2.B.v are more explicitly articulated by means of capitalised titles; they contain a high number of omissions and errors; between notes 2 and 3 there is a computus citation on the termini of Easter, while the last note, on the seven days of Creation, is omitted. A brontology (thunder prognostic) written by the same scribe follows the notes (Chardonens 2007: 43–44). In all likelihood, the notes were the first additions to the Royal Psalter, and, in theory, they could have been written at any of the places where the manuscript was used. A possible clue on the origin of the notes may be found in the inserted computus citation on the Easter dates, which consists of a warning that Easter must be celebrated or take place between 22 March and 25 April, and that Easter should by no means be celebrated outside of this period, regardless of the date of the fourteenth moon.

De pascha christiānorum que ante uel post. Christianorum uero pascha ab xi kalendas apredis usque in vii kalendas maias quacuque domini ca die regulari uidelicet luna occurrerit xiiii. semper pascha mōdis omnibus celebrabitur quam si ante xi kalendas apredis uel post .vii. kalendas maias. etiam si luna xiiii. occurrerit pascha nullatenus celebrabitur.

‘About the termini of Christian Easter. Christian Easter [occurs] from 22 March to 25 April. Easter will namely always be celebrated by all means on whichever regular Sunday the fourteenth moon occurs. However, if, indeed, the fourteenth moon occurs before the 22 March or after the 25 April, Easter will by no means be celebrated’. [translation mine]

This particular text fragment occurs in only three other manuscripts, all of which are – albeit not conclusively – associated with Christ Church, Canterbury (Henel

²³ Since all folios of quires II to XXV were ruled similarly for nineteen lines with margins wide enough to add comments, it has been assumed that the final quire was there from the start (Ker 1957: 320; Scragg 2008: 381). This implies that upon completion the manuscript included eleven blank folios, including an empty quire.

1934: 46).²⁴ Although there is no firm proof, this increases the possibility that the notes, including the computus citation and the brontology, were entered in Canterbury, where these notes were circulating. A Canterbury origin of the notes also ties in with the argument put forward by Scragg (2008: 392) “that the psalter reached Canterbury before the end of the tenth century”, and that all additional material hails from there.²⁵

Both the Canterbury origin and the different hand in which the notes are written indicate that the notes in Royal 2.B.v are allogenic, and therefore not part of the original compilation. It is, moreover, unlikely that these encyclopaedic notes fulfilled a communicative function similar to that in CCCC 183, BnF lat. 2825 or CCCC 320: no metatextual relation can be construed between the notes and the psalter: the notes do not allude to the contents of the psalter nor to learned authors, as in the earlier examples. Moreover, there are no other psalter manuscripts to which these notes were added. The addition of the computus citation suggests, however, an engagement on the part of the Canterbury scribe with note 1, on the three Incarnations of Christ. In this note, which starts the collection, the third Incarnation of Christ takes place *quando excitatus catulus surrexit .vi. kl aprilis die dominico. lun<a> ipso temp<o>r<e> .xvi. secundum legem moysi .xiii. die lunę passus* ‘when the awakened whelp rose up, on 27 March, a Sunday, the moon at this time being sixteen [days old] – according to Moses’s law the fourteenth day of the moon’. The reason for the Canterbury scribe to insert a text on the termini of Easter may have been that note 1 seemed to consider the quartodeciman practice of keeping Easter either on the 14 of Nisan, the same date as when the Jews celebrate Passover, or on the Sunday after Jewish Passover (Huber 1969: 1–84). The computus citation constitutes a refutation of quartodeciman practices. This type of intellectual engagement with text is precisely what characterises the Royal Psalter as a production unit in its initial usage phase. Kenneth Sisam typified the Royal Psalter as “a book for study, not a service book”, while Gretsches found confirmation of Sisam’s classification in “the layout of the manuscript and [...] the interactions between the Latin text, marginal commentary and Old English gloss” (Sisam and Sisam 1959: 52; Gretsches 1999: 32). The scribe who added the

²⁴ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 579, fol. 55v (‘The Leofric-Tiberius computus’; s. ix/x, prob. Canterbury CC [or Arras, Saint Vaast]); London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B.v, fol. 18r (s. xi², Canterbury CC? Winchester?. [prov. Battle]); Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, 274 (Y. 6), fol. 22r, ‘the sacramentary of Robert of Jumièges’ (1014×1023, prov. [and origin?] Christ Church, Canterbury, prov. Jumièges s. xi med.) (Gneuss and Lapidge 2014: no. 585, 373, 921).

²⁵ Cf. Stokes (2014: 89–91), who claims on palaeographical grounds that the Old English prayers on fols. 190–196v were written in Winchester, which would imply that the notes were also added in Winchester.

notes shows awareness of the Royal Psalter as a book for study, and while his insertion initiated a second usage phase of the manuscript, its function remained the same.²⁶

4 Old English Derivations

That encyclopaedic notes circulated as micro-texts in Christ Church, Canterbury is also suggested by London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A.iii. Classified as “a type of reference book preserving texts of interest to the community” and dating from the middle of the eleventh century (Gneuss 1997: 15), the manuscript offers a wealth of texts, as well as many questions about its unity and compilation.²⁷ On fol. 73r–v there are four encyclopaedic notes in Old English, dealing, respectively, with the dimensions of Solomon’s Temple, the two thieves crucified with Christ, the dimensions of Noah’s Ark and the dimensions of St Peter’s basilica in Rome (Ker 1957: art. 186.14; Napier 1889: 4; Estes 2012: 646). Except for the note on the two thieves, they are Old English renderings of Latin notes found in CCCC 183, CCCC 320, BnF lat. 2825 and Royal 2.B.v. Differences in detail, however, show that they are not just translations from these manuscripts (Dekker 2007: 291–293; 2012: 79): the note on the measurements of Solomon’s temple adds the number of workmen and overseers, while in the note on St Peter’s basilica, the height of the tower is replaced by the mention of 12,500 lanterns in the building.

The position of these notes in Tiberius A.iii illustrates how scribes and compilers appraised such texts. The four notes occur at the end of Section I of Ælfric’s *De temporibus anni* without any sign of a break; in fact, someone inserted a pencil line into the manuscript to indicate the transition from *De temporibus anni*. The notes are also situated at the end of *De temporibus anni* as a whole, because what is Section I in modern editions of Ælfric’s *De temporibus anni* is actually the last section in Tiberius A.iii., in all likelihood because this particular section first circulated as an independent tract before it became attached to the rest of the text.²⁸ Left unmentioned by Blake’s edition, the notes support the case for Section I to have been an independent production unit before it was joined with other

²⁶ The addition of confessional prayers at the end and the office of the Blessed Virgin Mary at the beginning may well have introduced new usage phases which brought the Royal Psalter more in line with other psalter manuscripts.

²⁷ Gneuss (1997: 15–17) discusses the various arguments regarding the unity of Tiberius A.iii. See Gneuss and Lapidge (2014: no. 363).

²⁸ Both Godden (1983: 60–61) and Blake (2009: 28–30) have suggested that Section I (l. 1–75 in Blake’s edition) circulated independently.

translated excerpts from Bede's work. The *raison d'être* for this unit becomes clear if we take a closer look at it. Remaining untitled in Tiberius A.iii,²⁹ Section I begins with an explicit reference to Bede's learning:

Ic wolde eac gif ic dorste gadrian sum gehwæde andgit of ðære bec þe Beda se snotera
lareow gesette 7 gegaderode of manegra wisra lareowa bocum be ðæs geares ymbrenum
fram anginne middangeardes.

'I would also like, if I may be so bold, to gather some small meaning from the book which
Bede the learned teacher compiled and gathered together from the books of many wise
teachers about the progression of time from the beginning of the world'.

(Blake 2009: 76–77)

Subsequently, Ælfric discusses the seven days of Creation in simple terms by explaining the phenomena created on each day. In doing so he introduces Bede's scholarship to his readers by providing a framework in the form of a list of the days of Creation, to which he anchors the rest of his argument on the allegorical meaning of the sun and the universe.³⁰ Section I of Ælfric's *De temporibus anni* is thereby only one step removed from encyclopaedic notes on the seven days of Creation as we find them in CCCC 183, CCCC 320 and BnF lat. 2825.

It is impossible to reconstruct precisely how the four encyclopaedic notes came to be added to Section I of *De temporibus anni*. Either it was done on purpose by a scribe collecting this kind of learning, or it was done by a copyist who misinterpreted in his exemplar a version of Section I with these notes immediately following. Whatever the cause, it seems clear that the Tiberius scribe, as well as, probably, the scribe of his exemplar, associated the kind of learning offered by encyclopaedic notes with Section I of Ælfric's *De temporibus anni*. These texts were closely related in terms of production and even more in terms of usage, and what we are seeing is a scribe adding text by thematic association, similar to the additional note on Jerusalem in CCCC 320, and similar to what we will find in the final example.

The four Old English notes which form the end of Section I of Ælfric's *De temporibus anni* in Tiberius A.iii also occur in London, British Library, Cotton Julius A.ii, fragment 3, a ten-folio fragment dating from the middle of the twelfth century.³¹ The fragment contains on the first six folios a prayer followed by the Old

²⁹ The title *De temporibus anni* occurs only in Blake's MS D, London, British Library, Cotton Titus D.xxvii.

³⁰ The itemising style of this passage was reinforced in London, British Library, Cotton Titus D.xxvii, fols. 50v–52r, by a scribe numbering the days of Creation I–VII (Blake 2009: 30).

³¹ For a description of the fragment, see Ker (1957: no. 159); Doane (2007: 13–14, 18); Da Rold et al. (2010–2013): "London, British Library, Cotton Julius A.ii".

English dialogue of *Adrian and Ritheus*, plus the page of notes (= 140v). The last four folios contain the Old English translation of the *Distycha Catonis*. The first four notes in Julius A.ii are the same as the ones in Tiberius A.iii, except that 1 and 2 are in a different order. These four are followed by a note on the measurements of the world according to “Istoriuss” (Cosmas Indicopleustes) and one on the number of bones and veins in the human body (Napier 1889: 5–6; Dekker 2012: 76–80; Estes 2012: 646).

The collections in Tiberius A.iii and Julius A.ii display remarkable similarities: they share four notes, three of which show no major differences.³² All except one are Old English renderings – some freer than others – of Latin notes found in CCC 183, CCC 320, BnF lat. 2825 and Royal 2.B.v. Moreover, both collections contain the only examples of encyclopaedic notes on the thieves crucified with Christ in a multilingual format, i.e. with the names of these thieves in the three *linguae sacrae*, Hebrew, Greek and Latin:

London, BL, Cotton Tiberius A.iii, fol. 73r	London, BL, Cotton Julius A.ii, fol. 140v
Her secgþ þæra tweigra sceapena naman þe mid criste hangodon. on ebreisc hig hatton .acharica. 7 macres 7 on grecisc .macha. 7 iacha 7 on romanisc ismus. 7 dismus. ismus gelyfde 7 dysmus ne gelyfde.	Her sagað embe þa twegen sceðan. þe mid criste hangedon. Hy wære on ebreisc genem-nede Achasachat. 7 Macros. 7 on Greckisc Malica. 7 Ioca. 7 on romanisc Cism«us» 7 Dism«us». Cismus gelifde. 7 dism«us» ne gelifde.
‘Here we are told of the names of the two thieves who were hanged with Christ. In Hebrew they were called Acharica and Macres, in Greek Macha and Iacha and in Latin Ismus and Dismus. Ismus believed and Dismus did not believe’.	‘Here we are told about the two thieves who were hanged with Christ. In Hebrew they were called Achasachat and Macros, in Greek Malica and Ioca and in Latin Cismus and Dismus. Cismus believed and Dismus did not believe’.

A comparison of the two versions suggests that both notes were either translated differently from a similar Latin exemplar or result from individual memorisations. This appears first of all from the varying grammatical constructions used in the two notes: Tiberius A.iii has the class 3 weak verb form *secgþ*, followed by a genitive construction and uses the synthetic passive *hatan* for ‘to be called’, while in Julius A.ii *sagað* is a class 2 form, followed by a prepositional phrase in the accusative, while *wære genemmede* is a periphrastic passive. The names of

³² These are the notes on Solomon’s Temple, Noah’s Ark and St Peter’s basilica. Only the latter has 42 steps in Tiberius A.iii and 62 in Julius A.ii (Dekker 2012: 79). Other differences concern only spelling and morphology.

the thieves, however, are indicative of a shared origin. With the help of Francis Junius's seventeenth-century transcript of Julius A.ii, it is possible to discern that in both versions the 'Hebrew' name of the 'right' thief begins with Hebrew אַח [Ach-] ('brother') followed by the unidentified forms *-arica* or *-sachat*.³³ The other names, too, bear a resemblance to each other.³⁴ The presence in these two manuscripts of such rare information in the form of micro-texts increases the possibility of a Canterbury origin of fragment 3 in Julius A.ii (Treharne 2003: 482), and provides further reasons to assume that this kind of learning was current in Canterbury in the tenth to twelfth centuries.

The function of the notes on fol. 140v in Julius A.ii has been a moot point. Max Förster (1897: 434) considered them to be part of the Old English *Dialogue of Adrian and Ritheus* because questions on the measurements of Noah's Ark and on the number of bones and veins in the human body occur in the Old English prose *Solomon and Saturn*, the only parallel Old English wisdom dialogue, whereas they are lacking in *Adrian and Ritheus*. Cross and Hill (1982: 16) dispute Förster's claim that the notes belonged to *Adrian and Ritheus*, pointing to the blank space at the bottom of fol. 140r, indicating the end of *Adrian and Ritheus*, which the scribe did not use for the notes. Moreover, Cross and Hill refer to the rigid question-and-answer structure of *Adrian and Ritheus* which the notes do not

33 I am grateful to Wout van Bekkum for suggesting the Hebrew form. The 'Hebrew' name of the thief on the left, *Macres* or *Macros*, might correspond to the name *Maggetra*, derived by Metzger (1970: I, 89) from the Codex Rehdigeranus (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Depos. Breslau 5 [Rehd. 169], p. 507), a Gospel book written in Northern Italy in the first half of the eighth century. In this text the names *ioathas* (Right) and *maggetra* (Left) occur in Luke 22:23. In all likelihood the form *Maggatras* is itself a corruption, through a metathesis of *ch* and *m*, of *Chammatra* (found in Metzger's list also as *Gamatras*, *Gomatras*, *Capnatas*, *Chamma*). **34** The 'Greek' names, *Macha* / *Malica* (with *li* miscopied for *h* in Julius A.ii) (R[ight]) and *iacha* / *ioca* (L[eft]), form a close parallel to *Collectanea pseudo-Bedae* 71, unnoticed by the editors (Bayless and Lapidge 1998: 217). It is possible that *Macha* (R) and *Io[a]c[h]a* (L), as well as *Matha* (R) and *Ioca* (L) in *Collectanea pseudo-Bedae* 71, derive from a corrupt reversal in position of *Joathas* and *Maggatras* as found in the Codex Rehdigerianus. Whereas the above names have been associated with the Western Churches in Metzger's list, for the 'Latin' *Ismus*/*Cismus* and *Dismus* we have to turn to the list from the Eastern Churches (Metzger 1970: I, 93). The form *Dismus* (R) corresponds to Δυσμᾶς, with an *s* in the middle, which is found only in the apocryphal *Acts of Pilate* (James 1924: 104; Hall 1996: 41); all variants of the same name lack the middle *s* (*Demas*, *Dimas*, *Damas*, Δημᾶς). *Cismus* (L) seems to be a contamination of *Dismus* and **Cestas*, a form that corresponds to Γέστας found in the *Acts of Pilate*, while *Ismus* disturbs the picture even further. The last line, specifying that '[C]Ismus believed whereas *Dismus* did not believe', runs counter to nearly all versions of the *Acts of Pilate* X.2, which specifies that *Dysmas* was repentant. In his English translation of the *Acts of Pilate*, James (1924: 104 n. 1) states that "MS J. has, 'Gestas on the right and Dysmas on the left', and makes *Gestas* the penitent thief". James's information is taken over by Metzger (1970: I, 90, n. 62), although neither James nor Metzger identify 'MS J'.

show. Notwithstanding the fact that Cross and Hill are essentially right in stating that the notes do not belong to *Adrian and Ritheus*, they are not “an unconnected addition”. Written in the same hand, the encyclopaedic notes and *Adrian and Ritheus* are monogenetic, and therefore part of the same compilation.³⁵ The scribe or compiler will have recognised the constitutive intertextuality between the wisdom dialogue and the notes, which was emphasised by the beginning of the first note as “Her **sagað** embe þa twegen sceðan [...]”. This is a verbal echo of the “**saga** me [...] ic þe **secge**” pattern of all questions and answers in *Adrian and Ritheus*. From a compiler’s point of view, the encyclopaedic notes in Julius A.ii expand on the usage unit constituted by *Adrian and Ritheus* and, just like the notes at the end of Section I of Ælfric’s *De temporibus anni*, could be seen to function as a natural sequel to the seven days of Creation, implicitly reflecting on this kind of learning. The encyclopaedic notes were a deliberate addition because of their association with a larger text in the manuscript, without being part of that larger text.

5 Concluding Remarks

The examples discussed here are only a selection from a much larger number of highly diverse micro-texts which I have classified as encyclopaedic notes. Many of them occur only once, while others are found in multiple manuscripts and in clusters. Questions about the functionality of such texts within manuscripts are problematic for a variety of reasons. First of all, scribal choices may well have been motivated by external factors of which modern scholars are unaware. This argues for a very cautious approach to establishing functionality. Secondly, the manuscripts in which micro-texts are found are not static codicological units, but should rather be regarded as dynamic media that develop throughout place and time and are re-organised, re-used and re-appraised in the process. Thirdly, our vocabulary and terminology concerning compilation and scribal activity does not yet match the complication and sophistication of the production, movement and usage of texts. And fourthly, the frequent position of encyclopaedic notes in peripheral or marginal positions in manuscripts makes them extra vulnerable to attrition through rebinding manuscripts or cutting them to size. Their survival rate is, therefore, low. The collections of encyclopaedic notes in CCCC 183, BnF lat. 2825, CCCC 320, Royal 2.B.v, Tiberius A.iii and Julius A.ii show

³⁵ The collation of the fragment is unclear because the folios were mounted. Doane (2007: 13–16) reconstructs a regular HF quire of 8 (136–143) plus 1 (144).

that our understanding of the relations between micro-texts and macrotext(s) requires a close look at a combination of codicological factors and textual activities, including copying, pasting, memorising and translating. However, such an understanding also requires an analysis of literary and cultural associations made by scribes, compilers and users. Only an analysis of all of these factors in terms of the genesis, production and usage of micro-texts such as encyclopaedic notes within the context of codicological units can teach us more about the functionality of micro-texts and thereby increase our understanding of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. With respect to the encyclopaedic notes discussed above, a claim can certainly be made that what at first sight seemed to be arbitrary additions to texts and codicological units are, in fact, purposeful additions in the form of micro-texts that were inspired by associations made by producers, scribes and users.

Works Cited

- Baesecke, Georg. 1933. *Der Vocabularius Sti. Galli in der angelsächsischen Mission*. Halle a. d. S.: Niemeyer.
- Bayless, Martha and Michael Lapidge. 1998. *Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Bischoff, Bernhard and Michael Lapidge (eds.). 1994. *Biblical Commentaries from the Canterbury School of Theodore and Hadrian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blake, Martin (ed.). 2009. *Ælfric's De temporibus anni*. Cambridge: Brewer.
- Borgehammar, Stephan. 1991. *How the Holy Cross was Found: From Event to Medieval Legend*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Brown, Gillian and George Yule. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chardonnens, László S. 2007. *Anglo-Saxon Prognostics, 900–1100: Study and Texts*. Leiden: Brill.
- Cross, James E. and Thomas D. Hill (eds.). 1982. *The Prose Solomon and Saturn and Adrian and Ritheus*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Da Rold, Orietta, Takako Kato, Mary Swan and Elaine Treharne. 2010–2013. *The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220*. <<https://www.le.ac.uk/english/em1060to1220/index.html>> [last accessed April 2018].
- Dekker, Kees. 2007. "Anglo-Saxon Encyclopaedic Notes: Tradition and Function". In: Rolf H. Bremmer Jr. and Kees Dekker (eds.). *Foundations of Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*. Leuven: Peeters. 279–315.
- Dekker, Kees. 2012. "The Vernacularization of Encyclopaedic Notes in Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts". In: László S. Chardonnens and Bryan Carella (eds.). *Secular Learning in Anglo-Saxon England: Exploring the Vernacular*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. 65–95.
- Dekker, Kees. 2013. "The Organisation and Structure of Old English Encyclopaedic Notes". *Filologia Germanica/Germanic Philology* 5: 95–130.

- Doane, Alger N. 2007. *Grammars: Handlist of Manuscripts*. ASMMF 15. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies.
- Dumville, David N. 1976. "The Anglian Collection of Royal Genealogies and Regnal Lists". *Anglo-Saxon England* 5: 23–50.
- Ebersperger, Birgit. 1999. *Die angelsächsischen Handschriften in den Pariser Bibliotheken: Mit einer Edition von Ælfrics Kirchweihhomilie aus der Handschrift Paris, BN, lat. 943*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Estes, Heide. 2012. "Anglo-Saxon Biblical Lore: An Edition". *English Studies* 93: 623–651.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Förster, Max. 1897. "Zu Adrian und Ritheus". *Englische Studien* 23: 431–436.
- Fraipont, Johannes. 1965. "Beda Venerabilis de locis sanctis". In: Geyer et al. 1965, 245–280.
- Franceschini, Ezio and Robert Weber. 1965. "Itinerarium Egeriae". In: Geyer et al. 1965, 27–106.
- Fulk, Robert D. and Stefan Jurasinski. 2012. *The Old English Canons of Theodore*. EETS SS 25. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Garrison, Mary. 1998. "The Collectanea and Medieval Florilegia". In: Martha Bayless and Michael Lapidge (eds.). *Collectanea Pseudo-Beda*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies. 42–83.
- Genette, Gérard. 1997. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Intr. Richard Macksey. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Geyer, Paul et al. (eds.). 1965. *Itineraria et alia geographica*. CCSL 175. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Gneuss, Helmut. 1997. "Origin and Provenance of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: The Case of Cotton Tiberius A.III". In: Pamela R. Robinson and Rivkah Zim (eds.). *Of the Making of Books: Medieval Manuscripts, their Scribes and Readers: Essays Presented to M. B. Parkes*. Aldershot: Scolar Press. 13–48.
- Gneuss, Helmut and Michael Lapidge. 2014. *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A Bibliographical Handlist of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Godden, Malcolm. 1983. "Ælfric's *De temporibus anni*". In: Patrick MacGurk et al. (eds.). *An Eleventh-Century Anglo-Saxon Illustrated Miscellany, British Library Cotton Tiberius B.V, Part 1. Together with Leaves from British Library Cotton Nero D.II*. EEMF 21. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde & Bagger. 59–64.
- Görlach, Manfred. 2001. "A History of Text Types: A Componential Analysis". In: Hans-Jürgen Diller and Manfred Görlach (eds.). *Towards a History of English as a History of Genres*. Heidelberg: Winter. 47–88.
- Gretsch, Mechthild. 1999. *The Intellectual Foundations of the English Benedictine Reform*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumbert, Johan Peter. 2004. "Codicological Units: Towards a Terminology for the Stratigraphy of the Non-Homogenous Codex". *Segno e Testo* 2: 17–42.
- Hall, Thomas N. 1996. "The *Euangelium Nicodemi* and *Vindicta Saluatoris* in Anglo-Saxon England". In: James E. Cross (ed.). *Two Old English Apocrypha and their Manuscript Source: 'The Gospel of Nichodemus' and 'The Avenging of the Saviour'*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 36–81.
- Hanna, Ralph. 2017. "Manuscript Catalogues and Book History". *The Library* 18: 45–61.
- Henel, Heinrich. 1934. *Studien zum altenglischen Computus*. Leipzig: Tauchnitz.
- Huber, Wolfgang. 1969. *Passa und Ostern: Untersuchungen zur Osterfeier der alten Kirche*. Berlin: Töpelman.

- James, Montague R. 1912. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- James, Montague R. 1924. *The Apocryphal New Testament: Being the Apocryphal Gospels, Acts, Epistles and Apocalypses, with Other Narratives and Fragments*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Jones, Charles W. 1939. *Beda Pseudepigrapha: Scientific Writings Falsely Attributed to Bede*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Ker, Neil R. 1957. *A Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Keynes, Simon. 1985. "King Athelstan's Books". In: Michael Lapidge and Helmut Gneuss (eds.). *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England: Studies Presented to Peter Clemoes on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 143–201.
- Keynes, Simon. 2005. "Between Bede and the *Chronicle*: London, BL, Cotton Vespasian B.vi, Fols. 104–9". In: Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe and Andy Orchard (eds.). *Latin Learning and English Lore: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Literature for Michael Lapidge*. 2 vols. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. I, 47–67.
- Kwakkel, Erik. 2002. "Towards a Terminology for the Analysis of Composite Manuscripts". *Gazette du livre médiéval* 41: 12–19.
- Lapidge, Michael. 1995. *Archbishop Theodore: Commemorative Studies on his Life and Influence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meehan, Denis. 1958. *Adamnan's De locis sanctis*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Metzger, Bruce M. 1970. "Names for the Nameless in the New Testament: A Study in the Growth of Christian Tradition". In: Patrick Granfield and Josef A. Jungmann (eds.). *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten*. 2 vols. Münster: Aschendorff. I, 79–99.
- Napier, Arthur S. 1889. "Altenglische Kleinigkeiten". *Anglia* 11: 1–10.
- Nicholas, Howard and Donna Starks. 2014. *Language Education and Applied Linguistics: Bridging the Two Fields*. London/New York: Routledge.
- OED = *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2000–. 3rd ed. online. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <<https://www.oed.com/>> [last accessed April 2018].
- Page, Raymond I. 1966. "Anglo-Saxon Episcopal Lists, Part III". *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 10: 2–24.
- Pratt, Karen, Bart Besamusca, Matthias Meyer and Ad Putter. 2017. "Introduction". In: Karen Pratt, Bart Besamusca, Matthias Meyer and Ad Putter (eds.). *The Dynamics of the Medieval Manuscript: Text Collections from a European Perspective*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Academic. 11–40.
- Pulsiano, Phillip. 1994. *Psalters 1*. ASMMF 2. Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies.
- Rollason, David. 1989. "St Cuthbert and Wessex: The Evidence of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 183". In: Gerald Bonner, David Rollason and Clare Stancliffe (eds.). *St Cuthbert, his Cult and his Community to A.D. 1200*. Woodbridge: Boydell. 413–424.
- Scragg, Donald. 2008. "London, British Library, Royal 2 B. V, Christ Church, Canterbury, and the English Language in the Eleventh Century". In: Patrizia Lendinara (ed.). ... *Un tuo serto di fiori in man recando: Scritti in onore di Maria Amalia d'Aronco*. Udine: Forum. 381–393.
- Sisam, Celia and Kenneth Sisam. 1959. *The Salisbury Psalter: Edited from Salisbury Cathedral MS. 150*. EETS OS 242. London: Oxford University Press.
- Stokes, Peter. 2014. *English Vernacular Minuscule from Æthelred to Cnut, c. 990–c. 1035*. Cambridge: Brewer.

- Treharne, Elaine. 2003. "The Form and Function of the Twelfth-Century Old English 'Dicts of Cato'". *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 102: 465–485.
- Walbers, Birte. 2012. "Number and Measurements in Anglo-Saxon Christian Culture: Editions and Studies of Numerical Notes in Eight Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts, c. 800–c. 1150". Unpubl. PhD dissertation, University of York.
- Weber, Robert. 1965. "Breviarius de Hierosolyma". In: Geyer et al. 1965, 105–112.
- Wright, Charles D. 1993. *The Irish Tradition in Anglo-Saxon England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.