

## DOCUMENTS

## ITER DUNELMENSE: DURHAM BIBLE MSS, WITH THE TEXT OF A LEAF LATELY IN THE POSSESSION OF CANON GREENWELL OF DURHAM, NOW IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

IN September 1908 I was able to carry out a long projected visit to Durham with a view of examining such MSS of the Vulgate Gospels as still remained in the Cathedral Library. At Durham only was it possible to view on the spot some remains of what had been in its time a unique output of English scholarship and calligraphy. In the Northumbrian Church met and mingled the two streams of Christian tradition most fertilizing for the cause of sacred learning. Ireland, though cut off since the fifth century, by the heathen invasion of England, from direct contact with the Christianity of Europe, displayed in her monasteries an ardent zeal for theological knowledge and an unrivalled skill and patience in the production of calligraphic manuscripts. And if missionaries came from Rome to wrestle with the paganism of the southern English, a line of Irish missionaries were simultaneously carrying the Gospel both to the north of England and also along the edge of Frankish territory as far as the Alps and the Apennines. At Péronne on the Somme, at Luxeuil in the Vosges, at St Gall by the Lake of Constance, at Bobbio on the northern slopes of the Apennines, Irish monasteries arose to be at once homes of learning and centres of evangelization: and what Gall and Columban had done abroad, that Aidan and his followers began for Northumbria at Lindisfarne. Meanwhile the greater mission from the south reached York in 625, in the person of Paulinus, some ten years before the consecration of Aidan. For a generation the two missions, one owing allegiance to Rome, the other looking to Iona and Ireland as the source of its inspiration, worked in presence of one another, till a definite solution of their rival claims was reached at the synod of Whitby in 664. The nominal dispute in the council raged over the shape of the tonsure and over the right method of calculating Easter. But the defeat of the Irish party, and the withdrawal of the irreconcilable element among them from English ground, meant much more than the adoption of two foreign customs: it meant that the English Church, instead of accentuating its insularity by turning its back on Europe, preferred to bind its fortunes with those of continental Christianity, and became of all Western Churches the most docile and devoted pupil of the successors of the great pope whom it rightly named 'apostle of the English'.

It is to this peculiar combination of Irish and Roman elements that

the Northumbrian Church owed the qualities and opportunities which, in the century that followed the synod of Whitby, earned it its undying fame. From its Irish ancestry it inherited all the learning and love of books which it was able to satisfy to the full in its intercourse with Italy, the paradise of the bibliophile. Two great twin monasteries between the Tyne and the Wear—St Peter of Wearmouth, founded in 674, and St Paul of Jarrow, founded in 681—became the hearth of the new renaissance and the depository of the treasures which the two indefatigable travellers, the abbots Benedict Biscop and Ceolfrid, collected on their numerous journeys to Rome. Naples and Capua were ransacked: books that had come from Sardinia, books that had come from Vivarium, Cassiodorus's school of learning in southernmost Italy, found their way to Northumbria. With the manuscripts came calligraphers to reproduce them in the best handwriting of the day: and Italian Bibles were being copied by Italian scribes, not only in Jarrow and Wearmouth, but, as it would seem, in northern Lindisfarne as well.

These books—the old exemplars brought from Italy, and the new and magnificent copies made from them—were the most priceless possession of the great Northumbrian religious houses: and it was with gifts of their best that they endowed their mother church of Rome and their daughter missions to Germany. What they had with infinite pains collected or reproduced, that with superb prodigality they distributed. The most splendid Bible that Northumbria could reproduce was sent as a tribute of devotion to the pope: ancient and modern treasures alike were lavished upon the English missionaries, Willibrord and Boniface and Burchard, and formed the glory of the mediaeval libraries of Würzburg and Fulda and Echternach.

By the kindness of Canon Greenwell, librarian of the Chapter Library, I was not only able to examine the two important MSS of the Gospels, A II 16 and A II 17, at leisure, but also had my attention called to two not less early fragments, the one a guard-leaf belonging to a MS in the Library, the other at that time in the private possession of Canon Greenwell himself and since presented by him to the British Museum.

1. A II 16, of perhaps the first half of the eighth century, contains the four Gospels on 134 leaves. But the MS should probably be reckoned as made up out of two (contemporary) MSS, the first containing the Synoptic Gospels, the second St John.

(a) Foll. 1-102 are for the most part in a hand of the Italian school, of the same general style as codex Amiatinus or the Greenwell leaf to be presently described: but the fourth gathering—foll. 24-33—and all the remaining leaves after the tenth gathering—that is to say, foll. 87-101—

are in 'Irish' semi-uncial. And the two scribes are further distinguished by the fact that the 'Italian' scribe signs his sheets at the top of the first page, whereas the 'Irish' scribe has left no signatures at all. The MS is mutilated as we have it: the first leaf of the first gathering has gone, so that the MS begins at Matt. ii 13 (the conjugate leaf was of course loose also, and instead of following fol. 6 is now at the end of the MS as fol. 102, Matt. vii 25<sup>1</sup>—viii 29 'clamaverunt dicentes'): the leaf now numbered 11\* is both mutilated and disarranged—it ought to precede, instead of following, fol. 11: the two conjugate leaves which formed the outer wrapper of the fifth gathering, foll. 24–33, have both disappeared, the former leaf covering Matt. xxii 15–xxiii 3, the latter Matt. xxviii 14–end. The MS was also copied from a mutilated exemplar: for whereas St Mark ends on the first column of fol. 60 *b* (the last leaf of the seventh gathering), the rest of the page being left blank, fol. 61 *a* begins at Luc. i 57, although our MS appears to have suffered no loss at this place. The confused condition of the exemplar was perhaps also the reason why the whole of the fifth gathering has been rewritten, foll. 34–43: I detected part of Marc. v as the under writing of fol. 37 *b* which in the rewritten form of the sheet now appears on fol. 41 *b*.

The detailed description of the gatherings is then as follows:—

- fol. 1–6, a quaternion, of which the first leaf is lost and the last is now fol. 102.
- fol. 7–15 (with a leaf omitted in the numbering after fol. 11), a quinion, in which fol. 11 and fol. 11\* should be transposed: signed II on fol. 7 *a*.
- fol. 16–23, a quinion, of which two leaves were cut out before writing signed III on fol. 16 *a*.
- [fol. 24–33, a senion, of which the two outer leaves have disappeared: in Irish semi-uncial.]
- fol. 34–43, a quinion, signed V on fol. 34 *a*.
- fol. 44–51, a quaternion, signed VI on fol. 44 *a*.
- fol. 52–60, a quinion, of which the fourth leaf was apparently cut out before writing: signed VII on fol. 52 *a*.
- fol. 61–70, a quinion: no signature visible.
- fol. 71–78, a quaternion, signed VIII on fol. 71 *a*.
- fol. 79–86, a quaternion, signed X on fol. 79 *a*.
- [fol. 87–96, a quinion: in Irish semi-uncial, and not signed.]
- [fol. 97–100, a binion: in the same Irish hand.]
- [fol. 101, a single extra leaf, in the same hand. St Luke's Gospel ends on fol. 101 *a* with the colophon (there is no colophon at all to St Mark) 'explicit liber'.]

<sup>1</sup> Or vii 27: the words 'et flaverunt venti | et inruerunt' occur twice.

It is noticeable that of the eleven full-sized gatherings no less than six were quinions, and one a senion.

The Eusebian sections seem to be supplied in the margin by the same hand in both the Italian and the Irish parts of the MS. I have no doubt that an Irish-writing scribe was put on to assist the Italian-writing scribe in the work of copying, or possibly to complete work which the Italian scribe had, for whatever reason, to leave unfinished. This connexion of Italian and Irish hands is quite enough to prove that the MS was actually written where we now find it preserved, in North-umbria, where about the year 700 A.D. the Amiatinus was being produced in the one script, the Lindisfarne Gospels in the other.

St Mark's Gospel is the only one for which our MS has preserved any prologue or list of *capitula*. The text of the prologue is midway between the text of the Book of Armagh and the text of the Echternach Gospels of St Willibrord. The *capitula* are those of the Amiatine and Lindisfarne MSS (in cap. xxvi our MS reads 'interroganti' not 'interrogantibus', and is surely right): but the title to the *capitula* 'incipiunt breves causae' and the subscription 'expliciunt breves causae evangelii Marci' rather imply that the scribe had before him an exemplar on the Armagh and Echternach type, for which he deliberately substituted the text of the fuller and better *capitula* of the other family. For the other two Synoptic Gospels the *capitula*, if ever written out, are no longer extant: but the numbers corresponding to the *capitula* in the margin of the texts themselves are in St Matthew of an Amiatine-Lindisfarne type, in St Luke (or at any rate in that part of St Luke which is by the semi-uncial hand) they agree with the Armagh-Echternach family.

The Gospel text is mixed: but, so far as I could tell on brief inspection, the two characteristics which emerge are (i) a general likeness to the D P L R group (I use Wordsworth's symbols for the Vulgate MSS), (ii) remarkable agreements in unique readings with P, the Echternach MS. Thus in Matt. vi 15 our MS and P are alone in the transposition 'hominibus non dimiseritis', and in Matt. xxviii 7 they are alone again in omitting the words 'ecce praedixi vobis', as also in the reading 'in profetis' in Marc. i 2. In Matt. xi 1 the addition of 'verba haec' found in the Irish MSS L Q R is made by the corrector of our MS and in the margin of the Echternach MS. On the other hand I could trace no special resemblance between the two MSS at the end of St Mark.

The series of the New Palaeographical Society represents on Plates 54 and 55 the uncial and the minuscule or semi-uncial hand: plate 54 = fol. 12 = Matt. xiii 5-21, plate 55 = fol. 28 = Matt. xxv 33-xxvi 1.

(b) A third plate of the same series gives a page of the Gospel of

St John : plate 56 = fol. 121 = Jo. xi 4-17. But I prefer to treat this as really a distinct MS for the following reasons :—

i. The four gatherings which contain St John's Gospel (fol. 103-109, 110-118, 119-125, 126-134) are in a different hand, and the sheets have, as far as I could see, no numbering.

ii. The character of the text is absolutely different : for, whereas the Synoptic Gospels (apart from the Summaries) find allies in the texts of D and still more of  $\mathfrak{P}$ , St John's Gospel, though the hand that wrote it is English, agrees closely with the Italian text of Amiatinus. It is even closer to A than is either the Lindisfarne Gospels or the Stonyhurst St John : the four together—our MS being cited as  $\Delta$ —form together the family on which in this Gospel the edition of Wordsworth and White mainly rests.

iii. As with the text, so with the capitula marked in the margin. The insular hand in St Luke (fol. 87-101) marks the chapters from xvi 19 to the end of the Gospel with numbers that agree with the D  $\mathfrak{P}$  series : conversely the (different) insular hand in St John (fol. 103-134) marks the Gospel throughout with the numbers of the Amiatine chapters.

Yet I am not indisposed to think that the two MSS were joined together almost from the beginning of their history : for the hand that inserted in the margin of St Matthew the Eusebian sections, and also within dots the Amiatine chapters as far as viii 19 cap. xxviii, does not seem to be the same with the uncial hand of the text and may be identical with the hand that wrote St John.

Of other additions to the MS the following are noticeable :—

*Lection notes.* Throughout St Matthew's Gospel an early hand has added marginal notes of Gospel lections : iv 1 in capite xl, iv 12 de cotidiano, iv 18 in n̄ sc̄i andreae, v 17 de cotidiana, viii 28 de passione, x 16 de sc̄orum, xiii 24 in xl, xiii 36 in nat̄ michaeli archangelis, xiv 1 passio sc̄i iohān̄ bab̄t, xv 1 in feria in ieiunio septimi mensis, xv 21 in xii lectio in xl, xv 32 in sab̄ in xii lēc̄ mensis sept̄i, xvii 1 in xl,<sup>1</sup> xx 1 in ordinatione aepiscopi,<sup>1</sup> xxiv 44 or 46 in ordin episco, xxv 1 de martyris, xxvi 1 de cena dn̄i.

*Musical notes?* Throughout the Passion in St Luke a nearly contemporary hand has inserted at intervals the marks C and L, the former apparently for the narrative, the latter for the words of Christ. Do they stand for cantor and lector respectively?

*Blank pages filled up.* Advantage was taken of the blank spaces at the end of St Mark (fol. 60 b) and of St Luke (fol. 101 b) to transcribe later mediaeval documents, all of them relating to the church of Durham,

<sup>1</sup> In these two cases my notes have suffered damage : and though I am certain of the chapters I am not certain of the verses.

and their presence proves conclusively, if proof were wanted, that our MS already belonged to the monks of St Cuthbert. The earliest of them, that on fol. 101 *b*, is a bull of pope Gregory to Bishop William of Durham—that is to say, from Gregory VII to William of St Carilef: the date of the original must be between 1081 and 1085. The other insertions, on fol. 60 *b*, are twofold: a document which mentions Robert of St Andrews (1124?–1158), Turstin of York (1114–1140), Rannulf of Durham (1099–1128), John of Glasgow (1115–1147), and Gaufrid abbot of St Albans (1119–1146)—and which must therefore fall between 1124 and 1128—is followed by an account of the miraculous cure of Thomas archbishop of York at the tomb of St Cuthbert. I had not time to copy out these documents, and indeed supposed they were probably already in print.

2. Durham A II 17, foll. 1–102.

This second MS of the Vulgate Gospels falls, like the other, but much more clearly and certainly, into two parts. The first 102 leaves are the disordered débris of what was once no doubt a complete MS of the Gospels; the last nine leaves are a fragment of an older Gospel book, written in uncial not in cursive, in two columns not in one, in the seventh century not in the eighth.

The first part of the MS, when in its original state, was a superb Gospels in the most beautiful style of the insular minuscule or semi-uncial hand of the eighth century. I should judge it to belong perhaps to the middle of the century, and to be somewhat later than the MS or MSS described under A II 16, which I would place in the first half of the eighth century. Parts of all four Gospels survive (not of John Luke and Mark only, as the account which accompanies the reproduction in the New Palaeographical Society's series, plate 30, would appear to indicate); and, though many of the leaves have been shorn of their lower margins, enough signatures survive to shew that the four were arranged in the usual order: fol. 10 *b* R at Jo. v 18, fol. 28 *b* T at Jo. xiii 31, fol. 38 *b* F at the capitula of Mark, fol. 75 *b* L at Luc. iv 32. The headline for St Luke is regularly 'secundum lukanum': 'cata' is employed in the two pages of St Matthew that have survived (Matt. xxv 35 *sitivi*—xxvi 34 *illi ih̄s*; xxviii 17–end): both forms, 'cata' and 'lukanum', are Old Latin survivals. The manuscript appears to have been copied page by page from its exemplar: for at the end of the page the scribe seems to have had more before him, as a rule, than he could conveniently get into the last line of his normal handwriting. In the earlier half of his work the device he employed was to change for the last line from his stately semi-uncial calligraphy into a more compressed and more minuscule hand (e.g. the letter *n* no longer retains its uncial

form) : though sometimes, as in the page of the Palaeographical Society's reproduction, Marc. vii 3-11, even this device proved insufficient and a word remained over to be written below.<sup>1</sup> In the Gospels of SS. Luke and John the change of hand at the last line is dropped and the full complement of lines is written in the regular semi-uncial characters, the remaining words of the page of the exemplar being written below the last line without any attempt at concealment.

Between St Matthew's Gospel and St Mark's, on fol. 37 *b*, is a picture of the Crucifixion, the art of which is described in detail in the letterpress accompanying the plate of the Palaeographical Society. No attempt is however there made to decipher the inscriptions round the picture : and it may be worth while to point out that the inscription at the top of the page has been unintelligently copied from an earlier original.

scito quis et qualis est qui talia cuius titulus cui  
 nulla est inventa passus pro nobis pp hoc culpa  
 hic est  
 ihs rex  
 iudae  
 orum

It is clear that the exemplar must have been meant to run somewhat as follows :—'scito quis et qualis est qui talia passus est pro nobis, cui nulla est inventa culpa, cuius titulus Hic est ihs rex iudaeorum.'

<sup>1</sup> Both the splendid insular semi-uncial, and the device of passing for the last line or two of the page into a closer minuscule hand, reappear in another MS of the eighth century, a book of Canons in the Cathedral library of Cologne (Colon. ccxiii : Y in my edition of the Canons). The resemblance is so marked that it is natural to conjecture that both MSS are products of the same scriptorium : and as there can be no doubt of the insular origin of the Gospel book, one is tempted to postulate an insular origin for the book of Canons. And such an origin would square with another indication of English connexions which I lit upon not long ago : in Theodore's *Penitential*, or rather the early edition of it made by an anonymous 'Discipulus Umbrensius', occurs the following citation 'De hoc in canone dicitur : Qui auguria auspicia sive somnia vel divinationes quaslibet secundum mores gentilium observant aut in domos suas huiusmodi homines introducunt in exquirendis aliquam artem maleficiorum, penitentes isti, si de clero sunt abiciantur, si vero seculares quinquennio peniteant' (I xv 4 : Haddan and Stubbs, iii 190). The canon referred to is the penultimate canon of Ancyra according to the version called Isidorian vulgate : but the Cologne MS has reproduced from Theodore (not always in quite the right place) the most characteristic of Theodore's (or the disciple's) variations from the original, notably the insertion 'si de clero sunt abiciantur, si vero saeculares'. At the same time it is fair to say on the other side that the MS Y (i) represents a collection that originated in Italy and passed to the Rhineland (Reichenau, Trèves, Cologne?) : (ii) gives a text of that collection that has been modified by the influence of the Quessel collection (Gaul and Rhineland), or of the Würzburg MS, or both. Or are we to look for the ancestry of the Würzburg MS in England also?

St Mark's Gospel is preceded by capitula, by a brief 'interpretatio nominum' and by the prologue.

'Incipiunt tituli secundum marcum . . . finiunt breves causae evangē mā̄': the heading is the same as in the Bodleian Gospel book known as O, once supposed to be one of the Canterbury Gospels of St Augustine; the text is closely similar, but without the blunders of O; the colophon appears to shew relationship with the heading of D 'Inciḡ breves causae secundum marcum'.

'Incipit interpraetatio nominum]. Abba syrum pater idumea rosa sive terrena solome sive pacifica tyro angustiae thabitha cumi puella surge traconitis (-tidis *corr.*) negotiatio tristitiae setha aperi paulus mirabilis sive electus pacificis. Finit inter nominum<sup>1</sup> ebreorum.' The Echternach Gospels have in the same way, after the capitula of St Luke, an 'an interpraetatio nomī eiusdem'.

'Incipit argumentum<sup>1</sup> . . .' The prologue is given in a text which again bears a close resemblance to O: while a strictly contemporary hand has corrected it to a D text.

The only other prefatory matter that has survived in the MS is part of the prologue to St Luke, beginning with the words 'obiit in' (Wordsworth, p. 269 l. 4): the relationship of the text to O is maintained, but the D corrector has not been at work. Half of a leaf containing part of the prologue—'nativitate . . . indis[partibilis]', Wordsworth, p. 270 ll. 3-9, is one side of it—has been torn away from the MS, and is now in the Pepysian Library at Magdalene College, Cambridge: but the responsibility for the theft lies rather on the Dean and Chapter, who sanctioned this and other mutilations of the treasures in their charge, than on Samuel Pepys, in whose interest the deed was done.

The Gospel text is definitely not of the Italo-Northumbrian type, though I was not sure whether a corrector—as in the Canterbury Gospels at Cambridge—was not introducing readings of that description in the few verses of St Mark which I examined. I have little doubt that the relationship with O would be found to extend throughout the MS.

In the margin the original hand has noted chapter numbers, in general accordance with the capitula system of O, throughout the MS. A different hand (very similar to that which did the same work in A II 16) has added Eusebian sections and lection headings. Of the latter I have noted: Marc. x 2 de cotidie, xvi 5 in dominico paschae: Luc. i 39 de adventu, ii 1 \* \* atale dñi, ii 21 de octabas dñi, iv 16 post natale dñi, vi 31 or 32 de cotidiana, vi 37 cotidiana, vii 19 de adventu [the MS is defective from Luc. viii 37 to xii 42], xiii 6 cotidiana, xiv 25 in scōrum, xv 1 cotidiana, xvi 19 cotidiana, xviii 9 cotidiana; Jo. iii 16 cotidiana,

<sup>1</sup> The abbreviation for -um in both these cases is something like this 3



iv 7 *b* de XL ma, v 19 *b* cotidiana, v 24 ad defunctos, vi 37 de mortuorum, vi 51 cotidiana, viii 45 de cotidie, x 11 de cotidie, x 22 de dedicatione, xiii 1 in cena dñi, xiv 1 cotidiana, [xiv 15 sab̄ in penti : a different hand from the other lection notes, and perhaps by the original scribe], xv 1 or 2 cotidiana.

At the foot of fol. 31 *b* are the following remarkable verses :—

+Quarta dine gressus per maria navigans stellarumque spacium ad regem spalacium

Regem primum salutem regem non aditu n ē clerum quoque conditum armites milierum

Illic Sitric defuncto armatura prelio sex annū excersitum uiuit rex Adelstanum

Costantine.

As I cannot profess to translate these metrical attempts, I may have deciphered them wrongly or divided words wrongly. But the names Sitric Athelstan and Constantine fix the date clearly enough to the earlier half of the tenth century. Sitric or Sihtric, a great Norse chief and leader of expeditions, settled in northern England as ruler of Danes and Northumbrians and married the sister of Athelstan king of Wessex, dying soon afterwards in 927. His death is clearly alluded to in the third line, and no less clearly a period of six years, or an event at the end of six years, after it. This brings us to the battle of Brunanburh in 934, in which Athelstan defeated Constantine king of Scotland and became undisputed ruler of Northumbria. It was this same Athelstan who offered gifts at the tomb of St Cuthbert, some of which are still to be seen in the Chapter library at Durham.

It is possible that our MS was one of the gifts made on that occasion, and that the puzzle of its relationship with a south English book, the Bodleian Gospels (O), is to be solved by supposing that our book too was written in southern England and only brought later by Athelstan to the North. Yet it is difficult not to connect our MS with the great days of Jarrow, Wearmouth and Lindisfarne : and in those great days we cannot doubt that there must have been some literary traffic between north and south, between Benedict Biscop's first abbacy at Canterbury and his new foundations between the Wear and the Tyne. The Cambridge Gospels of St Augustine (X), certainly a Canterbury book, have in this way been corrected in the margin from an exemplar of the Amiatine type.

### 3. Durham A II 17, foll. 103-111.

This fragment now consists of nine leaves, Luc. xxi 33 caelum et terra—xxiii 44 in nonam hora: but half a leaf has been cut away here, as in the earlier part of the book, so that the right-hand column of fol. 105 *a* and left-hand column of fol. 105 *b* (Luc. xxii 26-33 ministrator

. . . tecum) have been lost. I had confidently hoped that this fragment also would turn up in the Pepysian library, but the librarian tells me it is not to be found there, and Mr Pepys's own example has perhaps been imitated by another collector. The size of the pages is at present not more than 30 centimetres by 23: but the lower margin, below the last line of writing, has in every case been cut away, and though the leaves were when written probably rather larger than those of foll. 1-102, they are now distinctly smaller. It is possible that damp or other injury had affected the margins, and that they were trimmed and made neat when they were bound up with the rest of the existing MS. The headlines are written, as in the early Vulgate Gospel fragments of St Gall, only on alternate pairs of pages:  $\zeta$  SEC  $\zeta$  on the *verso*,  $\zeta$  LUCAN  $\zeta$  on the *recto* (in one case 'lucan' is written, not 'lucan'): I am inclined to think that this device must have been a characteristic of Vulgate MSS. The Eusebian sections are very elegantly marked  $\text{Ϡ}$   $\text{Ϡ}$   $\text{Ϡ}$  (for mt. mr. io.) by, as I suppose, the original scribe. At Luc. xxii 24 the chapter number LXXXVIII is also given in the margin. There are no lectionary notes. I think that a fresh gathering began at fol. 109, and on the top left-hand corner of fol. 109 *a* is a small +.

The leaves may have been brought into their present position in order to complete the Gospel of St Luke. Fol. 102, the last of the main MS as it is at present arranged, ends at Luc. xxii 2: the fragment begins only eight verses earlier, at xxi 33, and may have extended to the end of the Gospel. That the juncture had taken place by the middle of the tenth century, and that the joint MS was then already in possession of St Cuthbert's monks, is more than probable: for 'Boge the mass priest' has scrawled his name both on our fragment and on fol. 80 *a* of the main MS, and on one of the two occasions he has added to his unknown name the known name of 'Aldred God's bishop'. Aldred was bishop of Chester le Street from 957 to 968, and the body of St Cuthbert rested at Chester le Street for about a century before its final translation to Durham in 995.

A very slight inspection of the text is sufficient to shew that here, as in the St John of A II 16, we have a specimen of the purest Italo-Northumbrian type. But no one has yet noticed—and of course before the appearance of Bishop Wordsworth's Vulgate Gospels the identification of relationships was no such easy matter as it is now—that besides the general agreement with the Amiatine family we have in the fragment an indisputable and special likeness to the Lindisfarne Gospels. I have compared the Amiatine and Lindisfarne MSS as represented by Wordsworth: Dr Kenyon has kindly supplied me with the readings of another member of the family, Reg. I B vii of the British Museum. In the following instances our fragment and the Lindisfarne MS stand alone

against the consensus of all other MSS, A and Reg. included: Luc. xxi 38 manicavat, xxii 34 petrae, xxiii 19 facta (for factam). We may note also the spelling athuc Luc. xxii 37 (with FMY only), xxii 47 (with MX<sup>e</sup>Y Reg.: this suggests that the corrector of X drew not upon A but upon one of the other Northumbrian MSS), xxii 60 (with MY Reg. only), xxii 71 (with MY Reg. only). In the perhaps still more significant test of the arrangement of the *cola*, our fragment is again closer to Y than to A: and its few differences from Y seem to me mostly pure slips on the part of the scribe of the latter MS.

I hope some day to publish a complete transcript of the fragment as an appendix to an edition which I have in preparation of the early Vulgate Gospel fragments of St Gall. Meanwhile the New Palaeographical Society are issuing a specimen page of it in their publication for 1909.

The handwriting is a large fine but somewhat stiff uncial in two columns, with twenty-two lines to the column—exactly half the lines of Amiatinus. It has no suggestion of the Anglo-Irish School about it: on the other hand its resemblance to the Amiatinus struck Mr White many years ago,<sup>1</sup> and Dr Lehmann of Munich whom I consulted has independently noticed the same thing. I do not doubt therefore that the MS of which the fragment formed part, was written either in Italy or by the Italian school of scribes in Northumbria. To me, I own, while I quite admit the general resemblance, it seems a somewhat firmer and more natural hand than the Amiatinus: and the traits of the handwriting—the top stroke of T shorter, the bar of E sometimes above the middle of the letter, the elegance of the headline SEC LUCAM—also suggest to me a rather earlier date. I should date it myself in the second half of the seventh century: in any case I believe it was not improbably the exemplar from which the Lindisfarne Gospels were copied.

#### 4. Guard-leaf at the end of B IV 6.

On a solitary guard-leaf written on one side only is another uncial fragment, now 21 centimetres broad by 13 high, containing in the first column 1 Maccabees vi 59–62 *a*, in the second 1 Macc. vi 63 *b*–vii 2. The text is printed below, p. 541. The words missing between the end of the first and beginning of the second column might have covered about fifteen lines, which with the fifteen preserved in whole or in part (the top line and bottom line are both cut) makes a total of thirty lines to the column.

The writing is less thick, and the letters tend to be broader, than in the fragment last described. The tags which descend from the cross-stroke of F, from the vertical stroke of R, and from the horizontal stroke of L, are much more pronounced than in the other MSS. But for all

<sup>1</sup> *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica* ii (Oxford 1890) 287.

that, the MS belongs, I think, to the same Italo-Northumbrian School, and may be dated to the end of the seventh or beginning of the eighth century. It has the same abbreviation for final m at the end of the line as the other MSS of the group, namely  $\overline{m}$ . In the first line of the fragment -us is in ligature. No other abbreviations occur. The MS is written *per cola et commata*, and a point is added in punctuation at the end of every *colon*. A chapter is marked at 1 Macc. vii 1 with the numbers XIX in a sort of rustic capitals.

5. The last fragment which I have to describe is also perhaps the most interesting and important of all. Canon Greenwell called my attention to a splendid single leaf containing on the *recto* 1 (3) Kings xi 29-xii 2, on the *verso* xii 2-18, which hung, framed and mounted, in the hall of his house: and I was struck at once with the resemblance of the handwriting and of the dimensions to that of the codex Amiatinus, and hazarded the guess that it must be a missing leaf of that great MS, which for its date—somewhat before A.D. 716—is quite unique in size. But there is no lacuna at that point in Amiatinus: and it was Canon Greenwell himself who suggested the true solution. We know from the anonymous life of Ceolfrid (accessible in Plummer's *Baedae Opera Historica* i 388-404), that that abbot caused three great Vulgate Bibles to be copied, one of which was placed, for convenience of consultation by the monks, in the church of the monastery of Wearmouth, a second similarly in the church of the monastery of Jarrow, while the third was the manuscript which he was taking to Rome as a gift to St Peter's when he died at Langres in 716, and which is now definitely identified with the codex Amiatinus. The Wearmouth and Jarrow Bibles were supposed to be hopelessly lost: but when Canon Greenwell, some twenty years ago, picked up in a bookseller's shop at Newcastle a solitary vellum leaf which had been folded in two to form a cover for an account book (of date about 1780), chance had thrown into his hands a fragmentary relic of one of the two lost Bibles. Size, number of lines, handwriting, text, all conspire to make the relationship to the Amiatine Bible a matter not of conjecture but of certainty. The size of the Greenwell leaf is 48 by 34 centimetres, that of Amiatinus is given as 50 by 34 centimetres: the number of lines is 44 in both: the handwriting is not that of the same scribe—it is obvious that one scribe could not have copied the whole of the three enormous folios: Amiatinus consists of over 2000 pages, with two columns each, and 44 lines to a

(*Letterpress continued on p. 544.*)

## I

## I MACCABEES

vi 59-62 a

quae despeximus  
 irati sunt et fe-  
 cerunt omnia  
 haec.  
 et placuit sermo  
 in conspectu re-  
 gis et principum.  
 et misit ad eos pa-  
 cem facere et  
 receperunt illa-  
 et iuravit illis rex  
 et principes et  
 exierunt de mu-  
 nitione.  
 et intrauit rex

vi 63 b-vii 2

sus eum et occu-  
 pavit ciuitatem.  
 XIX. Anno centensimo  
 quinquagensi  
 mo et primo. 5  
 exiit demetrius  
 seleucii filius  
 ab urbe roma-  
 et ascendit cum  
 paucis uiris in ci- 10  
 uitatem marima-  
 et regnauit illic-  
 et factum est ut  
 ingressus est  
 in domum regni 15

l. 1. In the first line in both columns the lower half of the letters is alone preserved.

despeximus: -us in ligature.

l. 15. Between the end of col. a and the beginning of col. b about sixteen lines are lost: but it is impossible to fix how many of the lost lines belong to the end of col. a, how many to the beginning of col. b.

l. 2. I am not quite sure about the stop after ciuitatem: it is certainly fainter than the others, and possibly the stop was omitted at the end of a capitulum.

l. 7. eleucii (with the second i dotted) m. 1: seleucii m. 2, the s being added outside the line.

l. 11. marimam for maritimam.

## II

## I (3) KINGS xi 29-xii 18

The leaf printed on the next two pages contains on the *recto*, col. a xi 29-36, col. b xi 37-xii 2, on the *verso*, col. a xii 2-10, col. b xii 10-18. The *recto* has the headline MALACHIM, which is, as usual, in a different style of writing from the body of the MS: in this case the scribe employs for his headlines a script that reminds one of rustic capitals. The *verso* has nothing: compare what was said above, p. 538, of the employment of headlines only on alternate pairs of pages in the best Vulgate MSS. The *recto* has further the letters a b in minuscule at the bottom of the page: if this were in the original hand, it might conceivably be the signature to the gathering, but it rather appears to be early mediaeval.

## MALACHIM

- et inueniret eum ahias silonites  
 profeta in uia opertus  
 pallio nouo  
 erant autem duo tantum in agro  
 5 adpraehendensq; ahia pallium  
 suum nouum quo coopertus  
 erat scidit in duodecim partes  
 et ait ad hieroboam tolle tibi  
 decem scissuras
- 10 Haec enim dicit dñs dñs israhel  
 ecce ego scindam regnum  
 de manu salomonis  
 et dabo tibi decem tribus  
 porro una tribus remanebit ei  
 15 propter seruum meum dauid  
 et hierusalem ciuitatem  
 quam elegi ex omnibus tribubus israhel  
 eo quod dereliquerint me  
 et adorauerint astharoth
- 20 deam sidoniorum  
 et chamos deum moab  
 et melchom deum filiorum ammon  
 et non ambulauerint in uisibus meis  
 ut facerent iustitiam coram
- 25 me et praecepta mea et iudicia  
 sicut dauid pater eius  
 nec auferam omne regnum  
 de manu eius  
 sed duce[m] ponam eum cunctis  
 30 diebus uitae suae  
 propter dauid seruum meum  
 quem elegi  
 qui custodiuit mandata mea  
 et praecepta mea
- 35 auferam autem regnum  
 de manu filii eius  
 et dabo tibi decem tribus  
 filio autem eius dabo tribum unam XXIII **Venit autem roboam in sychem**  
 ut remaneat lucerna dauid
- 40 seruo meo cunctis diebus  
 coram me  
 in hierusalem ciuitate quam  
 elegi ut esset nomen  
 meum ibi
- te autem adsumam  
 et regnabis super omnia quae  
 desiderat anima tua  
 erisq; rex super israhel  
 si igitur audieris omnia quae  
 praecepero tibi  
 et ambulaueris in uisibus meis  
 et feceris quod rectum est coram  
 custodiens mandata mea  
 et praecepta mea  
 sicut fecit dauid seruus meus  
 ero tecum et aedificabo tibi  
 domum fidelem  
 quomodo aedificaui dauid  
 et tradam tibi israhel  
 et adfligam semen dauid super hoc  
 uerum tamen non cunctis diebus  
**Voluit ergo salomon interficere**  
 hieroboam  
 qui surrexit et aufugit in aegyptum  
 ad susac regem aegypti  
 et fuit in aegypto usque ad mortem  
 salomonis  
 Reliquum autem uerborum  
 salomonis  
 et omnia quae fecit et sapientia eius  
 ecce uniuersa scripta sunt  
 in libro uerborum salomonis  
 dies autem quos regnauit  
 salomon in hierusalem super  
 omnem israhel  
 quadraginta anni sunt  
 dormiuitq; salomon cum patribus suis  
 et sepultus est in ciuitate  
 dauid patris sui  
 regnauitq; roboam filius eius  
 pro eo  
**Illuc enim congregatus erat**  
 omnis israhel ad constituendum eum regem  
 at hieroboam filius nabat cum  
 adhuc esset in aegypto pro  
 fugus a facie regis salomonis

audita morte eius reuersus est  
 de aegypto  
 miseruntq; et uocauerunt eum  
 uenit ergo hieroboam et omnis  
 multitudo israhel  
 et locuti sunt ad roboam dicentes  
 pater tuus durissimum iugum  
 inposuit nobis  
 tu itaq; nunc inminue paululū  
 de imperio patris tui durissimo  
 et de iugo grauissimo quod in  
 posuit nobis et seruiemus tibi  
 qui ait eis  
 ite usq; ad tertium diem  
 et reuertimini ad me  
 cumq; abisset populus iniit  
 consilium rex roboam  
 cum senibus  
 qui adsistebant coram salomone  
 patre eius dum aduiueret  
 et ait quod mihi datis consilium  
 ut respondeam populo  
 qui dixerunt ei  
 si hodie oboedieris populo huic  
 et seruieris  
 et petitioni eorum cesseris  
 locutusq; fueris ad eos uerba lenia  
 erunt tibi serui cunctis diebus  
 qui dereliquit consilium senum  
 quod dederant ei  
 et adhibuit adulescentes qui  
 nutriti fuerant cum eo  
 et adsistebant illi  
 dixitq; ad eos quod mihi datis  
 consilium ut respondeam  
 populo huic  
 qui dixerunt mihi leuius fac  
 iugum quod inposuit pater  
 tuus super nos  
 et dixerunt ei iuuenes qui  
 nutriti fuerant cum eo  
 sic loqueris populo huic qui  
 locuti sunt ad te dicentes  
 pater tuus adgrauauit iugum  
 nostrum tu releua nos  
 sic loqueris ad eos  
 minimus digitus meus grossior  
 est dorso patris mei  
 et nunc pater meus posuit  
 super uos iugum graue  
 ego autem addam super iugum  
 uestrum  
 pater meus caecidit uos flagellis  
 ego autem caedam uos  
 scorpionibus  
 Venit ergo hieroboam et omnis  
 populus ad roboam die tertia  
 sicut locutus fuerat rex dicens  
 reuertimini ad me die tertia  
 responditq; rex populo dura  
 derelicto consilio seniorum  
 quod ei dederant  
 et locutus est eis secundum  
 consilium iuuenum dicens  
 pater meus adgrauauit  
 iugum uestrum  
 ego autem addam iugo uestro  
 pater meus caecidit uos flagellis  
 et ego caedam scorpionibus  
 et non adquebit rex populo  
 quoniam auersatus eum  
 fuerat dñs  
 ut suscicaret uerbum suum  
 quod locutus fuerat in manu  
 ahiae silonitae ad hieroboam  
 filium nabat  
 Videns itaq; populus quod nolu  
 isset eos audire rex  
 respondit ei dicens  
 quae nobis pars in dauid  
 uel quae hereditas in filio isai  
 in tabernacula tua israhel  
 nunc uide domum tuam dauid  
 et abiit israhel in tabernacula sua  
 super filios autem israhel  
 quicumq; habitabant in ciui  
 tatibus iuda regnauit roboam  
**Misit igitur rex roboam**

column—yet so like that it must belong to the same school: the text is identical but for the most minute divergences.<sup>1</sup>

Canon Greenwell has since last autumn presented the leaf to the British Museum: and both pages of it will be reproduced in this year's publication of the Palaeographical Society.

A late hand of fourteenth (possibly thirteenth) century has substituted for the marginal chapter number XXIII, opposite 1 K. xii 1, the number XII. This may perhaps suggest that the MS was at that time still in use.

It is impossible not to hope that yet other leaves may have survived. The church of Durham is the lineal descendant of the church of Lindisfarne, and it is a legitimate conjecture that the three (or four) MSS first described above which together form the existing MSS A II 16 and A II 17 were carried about by the monks of Lindisfarne, together with the body of St Cuthbert, through the peregrinations that ended at Durham. On the other hand the monasteries of Jarrow and Wearmouth, before the time when their history was finally closed and the monks incorporated in the new foundation of Durham in 1083, had suffered many vicissitudes, and it is hardly likely that the two great 'Pandects' of the whole Bible still remained in their churches. At any rate if any volumes so unusual had ever been moved to Durham, we should expect to have heard something of them in their new quarters: we need not therefore assume any Durham epoch in their history. It is more likely that they were left to suffer a gradual disintegration—books of that size are neither lost nor destroyed quite easily—and there is no reason in the nature of things why, if one leaf has survived to our own day, others may not still be lurking in the libraries or lumber rooms of country houses in Durham and Northumberland.

C. H. TURNER.

<sup>1</sup> I owe to the kindness of Dr Kenyon the loan of a collation made with the Amiatinus: the only difference of text is on p. 1, col. b, l. 22 where Am. originally wrote fugit for fuit: the only differences of spelling are p. 1, col. b, l. 27 Am. scripta for scribta, and p. 2, col. b, l. 43 Am. regnabit for regnaut: the only difference of palaeography appears to be that, while both MSS ordinarily use an uncial s, they differ somewhat in the form which they substitute for the uncial s when space has to be saved at the end of a long line. On the other hand, in arrangement the two MSS do not tally either page for page or line for line: the *cola* and *commata* are absolutely identical in the two, but within these the scribe of either MS has subdivided at his pleasure: and as the scribe of Amiatinus wrote a somewhat larger hand, and is perhaps rather less fond of abbreviating -que and -bus and the final -m at the end of a line, he has often got rather fewer words into a line—one of his columns of 44 lines is only equivalent to from 38 to 42 lines of our leaf. Also the first line of each *capitulum* (cap. xxii at xi 40: cap. xxiii at xii 1: cap. xxiiii at xii 18) is in red in our leaf, but not in Am.: conversely Am. has marked the numbers in the margin more carefully than our leaf has done.