The *West Saxon Gospels* and the gospel-lectionary in Anglo-Saxon England: manuscript evidence and liturgical practice

URSULA LENKER

Farað witodlice and lærað ealle þeoda and fulligeaþ hig on naman fæder and suna and þæs halgan gastes. and lærað þæt hig healdon ealle þa ðing þe ic eow bebead (Matt. XXVIII.19–20).

With these words at the end of the gospel according to Matthew, Jesus sends out his disciples to spread the words and deeds of the Lord to all peoples. With respect to the Anglo-Saxons, this order was impressively executed by the earliest translation of the Vulgate gospels into a vernacular, the *West Saxon Gospels* (*WSG*).[1] This text, from the late tenth or early eleventh century, survives in four complete manuscripts (A, B, C, Cp) and two fragments (F, L)[2] from the Old English period and two complete manuscripts from the late twelfth century (R and its copy H).

In Cambridge, University Library, Ii. 2. 11 (A; s. xi^med, from Bishop Leofric's scriptorium at Exeter)[3] and the fragments in New Haven, Beinecke Library, Beinecke 578 (F; s. xi^in, from south-eastern England)[4] rubrics are inserted which show on which day of the liturgical year a certain part of the gospels was read in the liturgy of the mass. Thus in A, the following rubric is found before Matt. XXVIII.16:

> Ðis sceal on frigedæg innan þære easterwucan.
> Undecim discipuli habierunt in galileam.

---

[1] The major editions of the *WSG* are *The Holy Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian and Old Mercian Versions, Synoptically Arranged, with Collations Exhibiting all the Readings of all MSS.*, ed. W. Skeat, 4 vols. (Cambridge, 1871–1900) and now *The Old English Version of the Gospels*, ed. R. M. Liuzza, EETS os 304 (Oxford, 1994).

[2] For the sigla, see the Appendix, below, pp. 175–8. The sigla for the manuscripts of the *WSG* correspond to those chosen by Skeat and Liuzza, with the exception of F for the 'Yale Fragments' ('Y' in Liuzza's edition).

[3] For detailed descriptions, see N. R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957; reissued with addenda 1991), no. 20, Liuzza, *The Old English Version*, pp. xvii–xx, and *The West-Saxon Gospels. A Study of the Gospel of Saint Matthew with Text of the Four Gospels*, ed. M. Grünberg (Amsterdam, 1967), pp. 19–28. For the rubrics, see also pl. III.

[4] For detailed descriptions of the fragments, see Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 1, Liuzza, *The Old English Version*, pp. xli–xlii and in particular R. M. Liuzza, 'The Yale Fragments of the West Saxon Gospels', *ASE* 17 (1988), 67–82.

Accordingly, the pericope,[5] whose beginning is quoted in Latin, is to be read on the Friday of Easter Week. Altogether, 199 such rubrics are found throughout the text of the four gospels in A. In F, a single rubric which corresponds to that in A marks the text beginning with Mark I.40 to be read in the fifteenth week after Pentecost.

These rubrics connect the Old English gospel text to the eucharistic liturgy and have therefore raised the question whether the gospel of the day was read in the vernacular in Anglo-Saxon times. Madeleine Grünberg, the only editor of the *WSG* who chose A as the basis for her edition, is convinced that the *WSG* were employed in the liturgy of the mass:[6] 'The A-text of the four West-Saxon gospels served the purpose of liturgical reading . . . for this reading special texts, the so-called lectionaries, were in use. The A-text of the West-Saxon gospels, then, served as such a lectionary, but with the unique distinction of being in the vernacular.' Such liturgical use of the Old English gospel text in the Middle Ages would, however, have been revolutionary in the context of the western churches – it was exactly the employment of the vernacular in the liturgy which became one of the main objectives of future church reformers.[7]

Therefore, apart from the origin and organization of the rubrics in A and F,[8] their purpose must first be studied more closely in the light of other Anglo-Saxon witnesses. Such an investigation must be grounded on an inventory of different kinds of documents which inform us about the biblical lections employed in Anglo-Saxon times and, secondly, the evaluation of their functions. Thirdly, the liturgical readings selected in these sources have to be investigated, so that correspondences to and deviations from the tradition recorded in the rubrics may become evident and provide evidence for their purpose.

---

[5] Pericope (from Greek περικόπτειν 'to cut around') is the technical term for a liturgical reading of set length. It was only introduced by Protestant theologians of the sixteenth century. In the Middle Ages, the Latin terms were *capitula euangelii* or *sequentia euangelii* and metonymical *euangelium* (cf. ModE *Gospel (of the day)* and German *Evangelium*). See U. Lenker, *Die westsächsische Evangelienversion und die Perikopenordnungen im angelsächsischen England*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Englischen Philologie 20 (Munich, 1997), 85–93.

[6] Grünberg, *The West-Saxon Gospels*, p. 369.

[7] In his Preface to the edition of 1571, which was prepared under the supervision of Archbishop Parker (by John Joscelyn?), John Foxe explicitly links the Old English translation with the aims of the Reformation; see also Liuzza, *The Old English Version*, pp. xiii–xv.

[8] The rubrics to the *WSG* have attracted very little scholarly attention; the most important investigations are F. Tupper, 'Anglo-Saxon Dæg-mæl', *PMLA* 10 (1895), 111–241, the notes to J. Bright's edition of the Gospel according to John (*Euangelium Secundum Iohannem. The Gospel of Saint John in West–Saxon* (Boston, 1904), pp. 115–82) and W. H. Frere, *Studies in Early Roman Liturgy: 2. The Roman Gospel-Lectionary*, Alcuin Club Collection 30 (Oxford, 1934), 221.

THE LITURGICAL RUBRICS IN A AND F

The insertion of the liturgical rubrics in manuscripts A and F of the *WSG* was definitely not part of the original translation project.[9] The extant manuscripts can be divided into three broad groups – CpBC, AF and the post-Anglo-Saxon group RH. Compared to the older manuscripts CpBC, A contains a number of apparently deliberate variants in text and layout,[10] such as alteration of prefixes and word order, expansion and shortening of the text, fuller paragraphing and – for that matter – the insertion of liturgical rubrics. Liuzza even refers to A as 'virtually a second edition of the OE version of the gospels'.[11] Unfortunately F defies easy classification, as its text is only preserved in small fragments (Matt. XXVIII.17–19 and Mark I.24–31, 35–42) which do not contain major variants. There are only a few textual agreements which align the fragments with A rather than Cp, suggesting that F represents an earlier version of the text found in A.[12] Apparently the common exemplar of F and A had a slightly altered design in that it also contained the Latin headings, which are found in the margins in other manuscripts, on separate lines (for F, cf. the headings at Mark I.29 and 40).

The Old English rubric in F at Mark I.40 is a later addition, which was squeezed in between the lines by a scribe of unknown date and origin. While palaeographical and dialectal analysis[13] places the origin of F in the Kentish area at the beginning of the eleventh century, the next certain evidence – its provenance at Tewkesbury in the fourteenth century – allows no conclusion as to when it wandered from the eastern to the western part of the country. Hence we do not know where and when the Old English part of the rubric was added.

In A, on the other hand, the insertion of the rubrics is integral to the general design of the whole manuscript. The incipits in the Latin text were written together with the main text in the same ink. This method can be discerned from the fact that the Latin fills two lines where the space was needed, as in the case of the rubrics before Matt. XVII.10 and XVII.14:[14]

---

[9] For the relationship of the manuscripts, see Liuzza, 'The Yale Fragments', pp. 75–80, Liuzza, *The Old English Version*, pp. xliii–lxxiii, and Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, pp. 23–7.

[10] Liuzza, *The Old English Version*, pp. lvi–lvii.

[11] The relationship of R and H to the other copies is fairly clear – R is a copy of H, H itself a copy of B.   [12] Liuzza, *The Old English Version*, p. lviii.

[13] The Kentish origin is obvious, for example from the spellings <yo> instead of West Saxon <eo> for /e:o/ (e.g. *dyofel, syocnessa* (Mark I.39)) and forms in *-an, -ade* and *-ad* (*geclænsad* Mark I.42) instead of West Saxon *-on, -ode* and *-od* (see A. Campbell, *Old English Grammar* (Oxford, 1959), §§ 297 and 757). *Anwald* without breaking is attested in Mark I.27. See also Liuzza, 'The Yale Fragments', p. 75.   [14] Cf. pl. III.

143

geþys ne secgon ær mannes sunu of deaðe aryse
Ðys sceal on frigedæg on þære fiftan wucan pent*ecosten*.
Interrogauit [*sic*] ies*u*m discipuli dicentes . Quid ergo
scribe dicunt. Quid elia*m* oporteat primu*m* uenire.
And þa acsedon hys leorning cnyhtas hyne hwat

tas þæt he hyt sæde be Iohannes þa*m* fulluhtere. Ðys sceal
on wodnesdæg to þa*m* fæstene ær hærfestes emnyhte.
Et cu*m* uenisset ad turba*s* accessit ad eu*m* homo genib*us*
prouolutus.
And þa he co*m* to þære mænigu hym to genealæhte su*m*

Before the Latin incipit a line was left blank for the insertion of the Old English part of the rubric, which was added later by the same scribe in red ink.[15] When this blank line did not provide enough space, the Old English text was squeezed into the blank spaces after the preceding or following Old English gospel text (Matt. XVII.14 above) or the Latin incipit. Rubrics such as the one before Luke XVI.19 prove that the Old English part was added after the completion of both the Old English gospel text and the Latin incipit:

[. . . unrihthæmð] Ðis godspel
gebyrað on þone oðerne sunnandæg ofer pen
Homo quidam erat diues. tecosten.
[Sum welig man wæs . . .]

In all instances, the first word of the Old English pericope is highlighted by an initial.

This procedure of the scribe is important because it informs us that the book(s) he used as (an) exemplar(s) must have contained **not** only the Old English translation but also the Latin incipits. Textually, these incipits belong to the tradition of lectionaries.[16] Hence the scribe must have used a Latin lectionary in addition to a manuscript of the *WSG* or an exemplar in which these two elements had already been joined.[17] This means that he also had the information about the liturgical day at hand, though probably not in the form of rubrics, but perhaps as marginal notes. This would account for the unsystematic layout by an otherwise extremely careful and competent scribe. The fact that two lines were

---

[15] The later addition of liturgical rubrics in lines left blank for this purpose is not unique to A but is also found in a manuscript of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*. 'At the beginning of each homily the scribes left a space for a large initial capital and also one or two blank lines into which the heading and pericope incipit were later inserted' (P. Clemoes, 'Description of the Manuscript', *Ælfric's First Series of Catholic Homilies. British Museum, Royal 7. C. XII, Fols. 4–218*, ed. N. E. Eliason and P. Clemoes, EEMF 13 (Copenhagen, 1966), 22).

[16] See below, pp. 147–9.

[17] Without any obvious reason the scribe changed his method for the last four rubrics (John XX.19, XXI.1, XXI.15 and XXI.19), where the Latin follows the Old English.

left blank for a pericope which is read on two liturgical days further supports this argument (Luke IV.38):[18]

Ðis sceal on þone ðryddan ðunresdæg innan lenctene
7 to pentecosten on sæternesdæg.
Surgens iesus de sinagoga introiuit in domum simonis.

The Old English text of the rubrics

The Old English part of the rubric is extremely formulaic: only four different phrases are used randomly in the four gospels. The choice is restricted to constructions with *gebyrian* 'it pertains to, it is lawful' and *sceal* 'shall, ought to [be read]', both of which indicate a certain degree of obligation:[19]

+ 'Ðis godspel sceal' (Matt. II.13; Mark VI.17; Luke VII.36; John II.1 etc.)
+ 'Ðis sceal' (Matt. II.1; Mark I.40; Luke I.26; John I.35 etc.)
+ 'Ðis godspel gebyrað' (Matt. I.18; Mark VIII.1; Luke I.1; John II.13 etc.)
+ 'Ðis gebyrað' (Matt. VIII.14; Mark X.46; Luke I.39; John I.19 etc.)

These fixed phrases are not unique to the rubrics of the *WSG* but are also found as rubrics and headings in homiliaries. Consider, for example, two instances from a manuscript of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* (London, BL, Cotton Vitellius C. v: s. x/xi), which are identical to the rubrics not only in phrasing but also in contents and design:[20]

FERIA VI IN PRIMA EBDOMADA QUADRAGESIMÆ.
ðis spel gebyrað on Frige-dæg on þære forman Lenctenwucan.
EVVANGELIUM. Erat dies festus Iudæorum, et reliqua.

FERIA VI IN EBDOMADA III:
Ðis spel sceal on frige-dæg on þære þriddan lencten-wucan.
EVVANGELIUM: Venit IHs in ciuitatem samariæ quæ dicitur sichar.

The analysis of the Old English text of the rubrics according to Old English dialect features shows them to be typically late West Saxon.[21] Some of the late features, moreover, attest to a date at the end of the Old English

---

[18] Similarly, two lines are left blank before Matt. XX.29, where the Saturday in the summer Embertide is described in a long phrase: 'þys sceal on sæternesdæg on þære pentecostenes/ wucan to þam ymbrene'.

[19] Only the first instances in each gospel are cited. The Old English term for the pericope is *god-spell*, except for the four cases when *passio* refers to the Passion (Matt. XXVI.2, Mark XIV.1, Luke XXII.1 and John XVIII.1).

[20] *Homilies of Ælfric. A Supplementary Collection*, ed. J. C. Pope, 2 vols., EETS os 259–60 (London, 1967) I, 230 and 288.

[21] For a detailed analysis of the different characteristics such as breaking, palatal diphthongization etc., see Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, pp. 216–19.

period,[22] in particular syncope in *þuresdæg* (John VII.40) and the already Middle English form *þursdæg* (John V.30) instead of regular *þunresdæg* 'Thursday'.[23]

In addition, two forms (*ucan* and *þæge*) which are not found in the gospel text of A and are thus exclusive to the rubrics, suggest that they originated in the south-western region of England. The form *ucan* with loss of initial /w/ (cf. *wicu/wucu*),[24] also occurs in a manuscript of the *Theodulfi Capitula* (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 865: s. xi¹)[25] which was presumably written at Exeter. In Old English times, *ucan* is only recorded in manuscripts from the south-western area.[26]

Similarly, the attestations of the pronoun *þæge*[27] (used instead of *þa* in Luke XI.15) are concentrated in the south-west of England, in particular Bath and Exeter.[28] The four instances of *þæge* found in the gospel text of the three south-western manuscripts of the *WSG* (Cp, B and C) are in all cases replaced by *þa* in A (John IV.40, X.16, XIV.12; incorrect *þe* at John XII.20), so that *þæge*-forms in A are only found in the rubrics.

Ucan and *þæge* thus serve as evidence for the origin of the rubrics, which were

---

[22] Other late features are dative plural forms in *-on* instead of *-um*, e.g. *wucon* (Mark XI.1, Luke XIX.29 and John I.15) and *dagon* (Luke XI.5, John XV.12 and XV.17). Cf. also the spelling <mænies> (Matt. XXIV.42) instead of <mæniges> (Luke XII.35) which points towards a vocalization of /j/.

[23] Other instances of syncope of the genitive ending are *sæterndæg* in Mark IX.2 and Luke III.1.

[24] The form *ucan* is attested five times (Luke XVI.10, XXI.20, John XVI.5, XX.11 and XXI.1). For a similar phenomenon of loss of initial *w* before *u*, see the forms *uton* for *wuton* (Campbell, *Old English Grammar*, § 471). The change is probably triggered by *w* being a half-vowel, i.e. an unsyllabic *u*, which was lost before the vowel /u/.

[25] Cf. *Theodulfi Capitula in England. Die altenglischen Übersetzungen zusammen mit dem lateinischen Text*, ed. H. Sauer, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Englischen Philologie 8 (Munich, 1978), 190–1, 377 and 393.

[26] The form *ucan* is found in Luke XVIII.12 ('Ic fæste tuwa on ucan') in the three south-western manuscripts of the *WSG*, Cp (Bath), C (Malmesbury?) and B (unknown origin); in A, however, the form appears as *wucan*. Another instance of *ucan* is recorded in the poem *Seasons of Fasting* (*c.* 1000). Sisam attributes this form to the 'South Midlands' and comments on its use in Old English: 'The sound-change is concealed by the conventional spelling which spread with the Late West Saxon Literary dialect. It appears commonly in the Domesday record of 1086 where the traditional spelling is no longer followed' (K. Sisam, *Studies in the History of Old English Literature* (Oxford, 1953), p. 52).

[27] For a detailed summary of the attestations of *þæge* and their critical assessment, see M. Förster, 'Die spätae. deiktische Pronominalform *þæge* und ne. *they*', *Anglia Beiblatt* 52 (1941), 274–80 and 'Nochmals: ae. *þæge*', *ibid.* 53 (1942), 86–7, and in particular W. Hofstetter, *Winchester und der spätaltenglische Sprachgebrauch. Untersuchungen zur geographischen und zeitlichen Verbreitung altenglischer Synonyme*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Englischen Philologie 14 (München, 1987), 563–7.

[28] See instances 5, 6, 7 and 8 in Förster, 'Die spätae. deiktische Pronominalform *þæge*' and examples 2, 3 and 4 in Hofstetter, *Winchester und der spätaltenglische Sprachgebrauch*, p. 563.

probably compiled at the end of the Old English period in the south-west of England. Since A itself was certainly written at Exeter in the time of Bishop Leofric,[29] Exeter in the middle of the eleventh century seems a very likely place for the origin of the rubrics themselves, a conclusion which the linguistic evidence would seem to support.

The Latin text of the rubrics

There are two different Latin textual elements in A which have to be separated from one another: first, the Latin incipits of the pericopes and, secondly, the Latin headings which are similarly found in other manuscripts of the *WSG* (Cp, B, R, H).[30] These two elements follow a completely different textual tradition and have furthermore to be distinguished from the Latin exemplar of the translation text itself, as the following examples show:[31]

Luke I.26

Vul:	**In mense** *autem* **sexto**	missus est angelus gabriel
WSG:	*Soþlice* **on þam syxtan monðe**	wæs asend gabriel se engel
A:		Missus est angelus gabrihel
Qe, Sa:		Missus est gabrihel angelus

Luke XXIV.36

Vul:	*ipse* stetit	in medio **eorum**
WSG:	*se hælend* stod	on **hyra** midlene
A:	Stetit *iesus*	in medio **discipulorum suorum**
Qe, Sa:	Stetit *iesus*	in medio **discipulorum suorum**

---

[29] The origin and provenance of the manuscript in Exeter is apparent from both palaeographical evidence and the inventory of books procured by Bishop Leofric for the church of Exeter. One copy of this inventory was originally part of A and is now found in a quire prefixed to the Exeter Book (Exeter, Cathedral Library, 3501, fols. 0, 1–7). The manuscript itself can be identified as 'þeos englisce cristes boc' in this list; in another copy (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. D. 2. 16, fols. iv, 1–6) it is called 'englisc Cristes boc'. See M. Lapidge, 'Surviving Booklists from Anglo-Saxon England', *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England. Studies presented to Peter Clemoes*, ed. M. Lapidge and H. Gneuss (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 33–89, at 64–9. Leofric's donation is also documented in an entry on 1r: 'Hunc textum euangeliorum dedit leofricus episcopus ecclesiae sancti petre apostoli in exonia ad utilitatem successorum suorum. Ðas boc leofric biscop gef sancto petro and eallum his æftergengum into exancestre gode mid to ðenienne.'

[30] For detailed descriptions of the manuscripts, see Liuzza, *The Old English Version*, pp. xvii–xlii.

[31] Abbreviations: 'Vul' refers to the text of the Vulgate (*Nestle-Aland. Novum Testamentum Latine*, ed. K. and B. Aland (Stuttgart, 1982)), '*WSG*' to the Old English translation (ed. Liuzza) and 'A' to the text of the rubrics in the manuscript A. For the text of Latin lectionaries, the incipits cited in the gospel-lists Qe and Sa were chosen (see the Appendix, below, pp. 175–8).

While the first example merely shows a shortening in the text of the lectionary incipits by the deletion of adverbials, the second example documents one of the specific characteristics of lectionary texts, namely the substitution of proper names or nouns for pronouns.[32] In general, all anaphoric items have to be replaced, since the extracts chosen as lessons lack the context of the gospel text, but still have to be fully understandable, coherent stories. In the following example (John XXI.19), the pericope would not be comprehensible without these changes:

Vul:	Et hoc cum dixis**set,**	dic**it** *ei*:	sequere me
WSG:	And þa **he** þæt sæde	þa cwæð **he** *to him*:	fylig me
A:		Dixit **iesus** *petro*:	sequere me
Qe, Sa:		Dixit **iesus** *petro*:	sequere me

The text of the Latin incipits in A clearly derives from the textual tradition of Latin lectionaries.[33]

The second Latin element in the text of A are twenty-five chapter-headings.[34] A mistake of the scribe who could have forgotten to add the Old English part of the rubric is unlikely: apart from four instances there is no line left blank for its insertion. Furthermore, the textual tradition of these chapter-headings does not belong to that of lectionaries but corresponds to the Vulgate text proper. Thus in the chapter-heading for Mark I.29, the Latin text in A and F represents the Vulgate version and is not altered according to the lectionary tradition: 'Et protinus egredientes de sinagoga uenerunt in domum symonis et andree.'[35] The fact that the chapter-headings are mainly found in the beginning chapters of the gospels according to Matthew and Mark suggests that a recension had been started in which all the gospels were to be augmented with chapter-headings.[36] This plan was, however, abandoned after the first chapters of each gospel.

[32] The relevant phrases are marked by italics or bold letters.

[33] The exemplar of the Latin incipits in A, however, is as yet unknown. Their comparison with both the incipits attested in extant Anglo-Saxon witnesses and the textual varieties documented in the critical edition of Latin gospelbooks by Fischer (which includes the texts of Roman and Milanese lectionaries) showed too many discrepancies. Their closest textual relative is Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, 612 (Rheims, *c.* 850). See B. Fischer, *Die lateinischen Evangelien bis zum 10. Jahrhundert*, 4 vols. (Freiburg, 1988–91).

[34] Cf. the chapter-headings before Matt. V.13, V.27, VI.1, VI.7, VI.22, VII.6, VII.13, VII.22, VIII.5, VIII.28, IX.23, IX.35, X.7, X.11, X.22, Mark I.9, I.14, I.16, I.22, I.29, XII.41 and John III.22, V.24, VI.5 (for VI.1) and VI.37. For chapter-headings in general, see P. Meyvaert, 'Bede's *Capitula Lectionum* for the Old and New Testament', *RB* 105 (1995), 348–80, at 349–52.

[35] Cf. the lack of a proper name or noun as the subject of the sentence ('egredientes, uenerunt'); the adverb 'protinus' is not deleted.

[36] These chapter-headings were a very useful tool in a time when there was no chapter and verse division of the gospels. In the gospels according to Luke and John, major parts of the beginning chapters are used as liturgical readings so that the original chapter-headings were replaced by the rubrics.

148

This or a similar project also accounts for the lines which were left blank in A.[37] For these, both Grünberg and Liuzza have suggested[38] a liturgical function, such as the later insertion of rubrics. Yet the verses following the blank lines were not selected for liturgical use in the Roman rite, as a comparison with the incipits of Roman pericopes[39] shows. They agree, however, with the paragraphing and chapter-headings in other manuscripts. The blank lines are therefore due to the altered layout of A and its ancestor, in particular the introduction of new paragraphs for the easier use of the manuscript.

The rubrics in A and F are undoubtedly an addition in one branch of manuscript transmission of the *WSG*. Their common ancestor was a version, revised in text and design, to which the liturgical information was added, presumably in the margins. The combination of the Old English text with the Roman pericope system most probably originated in a centre in the south-western area in the late Old English period, presumably Exeter at the time of Bishop Leofric, according to linguistic and manuscript evidence.

BIBLICAL LECTIONS IN THE LITURGY OF THE EUCHARIST

The reading of the gospel of the day is one of the oldest elements of Christian worship. With regard to the eucharistic liturgy,[40] we have firm evidence for two or three biblical lections from the second century onwards. In the Roman rite,[41] a two-lesson system had gained acceptance by the seventh or eighth century when Roman books entered Gaul. The first text, read by the subdeacon, was taken from the New Testament epistles (hence the term 'epistle'), the Acts of the Apostles, the Apocalypse (Revelation) or the Old Testament.[42] The source

---

[37] For the blank lines, see pl. III (before Matt. XVII.22 'Ða hig wunedon . . .'). There are twenty blank lines in Mark, twenty-one in Luke, eight in Matthew and only two in John. Only four of them are found in the neighbourhood of chapter-headings.

[38] See Grünberg, *The West-Saxon Gospels*, p. 21 and Liuzza, *The Old English Version*, p. xx.

[39] See the index of biblical lessons in Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, pp. 529–35.

[40] For general surveys of the subject, see J. Jungmann, *Missarum Sollemnia. Eine genetische Erklärung der römischen Messe*, 5th ed., 2 vols. (Freiburg, 1962) I, 501–83; C. Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy. An Introduction to the Sources*, trans. and rev. W. Storey and N. Rasmussen; and A.-G. Martimort, *Les Lectures liturgiques et leurs livres*, Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental 64 (Turnhout, 1992), 15–20.

[41] For the development of the elements which surround the readings of the gospel of the day, i.e. the chants, collects, the homily and the *Credo*, see Jungmann, *Missarum Sollemnia*, I; K. Young, *The Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2 vols. (London, 1933; corr. repr. 1962) I, 21–9; and J. Harper, *The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy from the Tenth to the Eighteenth Century. A Historical Introduction and Guide for Students and Musicians* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 109–26.

[42] Evidence for the first reading in the Anglo-Saxon eucharistic service is provided by the Old English gloss *pistelrædere* for Latin *subdiaconus* in the *Regularis Concordia* (see *Die Regularis Concordia und ihre altenglische Interlinearversion*, ed. L. Kornexl, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Englischen Philologie 17 (Munich, 1993), lines 798, 801, 1011 etc., cf. p. ccxxxix). For the documents for the first reading, see W. H. Frere, *Studies in Early Roman Liturgy: 3. The Roman Epistle Lectionary*,

for the second lection, read by the deacon,[43] has always been one of the four gospels.

The reading of the gospel of the day was, and still is, the central and most important part of the liturgy of the Word. For Christian believers, God is present in the word that is announced and proclaimed, so that Word and Sacrament are inseparable. Accordingly, Latin and vernacular witnesses for the various traditions of biblical lections in the mass[44] have survived in comparatively great numbers from Anglo-Saxon times,[45] in altogether more than sixty different Latin and Old English sources. Before the emergence of the *missale plenum* in the late tenth or eleventh century, the elements that made up the eucharistic liturgy were contained in three separate books: the prayers to be said by the celebrant were found in the 'sacramentary',[46] the chants in the 'gradual'[47] and the readings in various kinds of books, in particular gospelbooks and, later, books written exclusively for liturgical use. Basically, five major groups of witnesses can be distinguished:

Alcuin Club Collection 32 (Oxford, 1935) and for the lack of witnesses from Anglo-Saxon England, see H. Gneuss, 'Liturgical Books in Anglo-Saxon England and their Old English Terminology', *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Lapidge and Gneuss, pp. 91–141, at 110.

[43] See Jungmann, *Missarum Sollemnia* I, 566–7. For Anglo-Saxon England, the reading of the gospel by the deacon is attested in a number of sources, e.g. the *Regularis Concordia*: 'Diaconus uero, antequam ad euuangelium legendum accedat' glossed by 'se diacon ær þam to godspelle to rædenne toga' (*Regularis Concordia*, ed. Kornexl, line 803) and Ælfric's pastoral letters:'Diaconus is gecweden <þegn> se þenað þæm mæssepreoste oþþe þam bisceope æt þære mæssan and godspel ræt' (*Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics in altenglischer und lateinischer Fassung*, ed. B. Fehr, Bibliothek der angelsächsichen Prosa 9 (Hamburg, 1914; repr. with a Supplement to the Introduction by P. Clemoes, Darmstadt, 1966), 108). Cf. also the sign for the deacon in the *Monasterialia Indicia* 'Ðonne þu diacon abban wille þonne stric þu ealgelice mid þinum scyte fingre and wyrc cristes mæl on þin heafod foran on þæs halgan godspelles getacnunge' (*Monasteriales [sic] Indicia. The Anglo-Saxon Monastic Sign Language*, ed. D. Banham (Pinner, 1991), p. 48 (no. 124)).

[44] The present study is restricted to the reading of the gospel of the day as it appears in the context of the eucharistic liturgy. The epistle readings and the lessons included in the daily Office and the occasional offices demand special treatment as they developed independently; for the books for the daily Office, see Gneuss, 'Liturgical Books', pp. 110–35; for their readings, see Martimort, *Les Lectures liturgiques*, pp. 71–103.

[45] See the inventory of manuscripts in the Appendix, which is based on H. Gneuss, 'A Preliminary List of Manuscripts Written or Owned in England up to 1100', *ASE* 9 (1981), 1–60 and in particular Gneuss, 'Liturgical Books', pp. 91–141. See now also R. W. Pfaff, 'Massbooks: Sacramentaries and Missals', *The Liturgical Books of Anglo-Saxon England, OEN* Subsidia 23 (1995), 7–34.

[46] Unfortunately, sacramentaries and missals are neither distinguished in Latin, nor in OE or ModE: the terms *missale*, *mæsseboc* and *missal* can denote both books. Cf., for example, the codex known as the 'Missal of Robert of Jumièges' (Rouen, BM, 274 (Y.6)) which is actually a sacramentary. Cf. Gneuss, 'Liturgical Books', pp. 99–100 and Pfaff, 'Massbooks', pp. 7–8.

[47] See Gneuss, 'Liturgical Books', pp. 104–6 and K. D. Hartzell, 'Graduals' in *The Liturgical Books of Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Pfaff, pp. 35–8.

(i) marginal notes in gospelbooks[48] (siglum 'M'[49] for the non-Roman tradition, 'N' for the Roman tradition),

(ii) capitularies[50] or gospel-lists, included in gospelbooks ('O', 'P', 'Q', 'S'),

(iii) full lectionaries ('T') and gospel-lectionaries ('V'),

(iv) missals ('W'), and

(v) Latin ('X', 'Y') and vernacular ('Z') homilies and homiliaries.

Bible manuscripts have no importance in this investigation, since evidence from them is restricted to the 'Codex Amiatinus' (Mc) which contains only a single marginal note for a gospel lection.[51]

Systems

In the course of the Middle Ages, several different systems were developed to help the lectors find the proper readings for the recurring feasts. The first documents with information on the nature and arrangement of the readings in the eucharistic liturgy to survive are from the sixth century.[52] With regard to the Roman rite, Anglo-Saxon witnesses employing highly innovative and idiosyncratic methods such as notes to *capitula*-tables (Ma, Mb, Mc)[53] and the so-called

---

[48] See Gneuss, 'Liturgical Books', p. 108 and, in addition, eight notes in Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 1. 24 (Nc) and four in the *Stonyhurst Gospel* (Nk).

[49] The sigla are chosen according to a system in which the first letter of each siglum shows what kind of source the document is.

[50] See Gneuss, 'Liturgical Books', p. 109 and, in addition, the capitularies in Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, 45–1980 (Pc), Hanover, Kestner-Museum, WM XXIa. 36 (Sx), London, BL, Loan 11 (Sc), New York, Public Library, 115 (Qc) and the fragment of a capitulary in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 381, fols. i-ii (Px). Another extremely important old witness, the epistle- and gospel-list in Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, M. p. th. f. 62 (Oa), is included, although its Anglo-Saxon origin is not certain (see below, n. 79). Two lists in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts mentioned by Gneuss (Besançon, BM, 14; no. D. 21) and Klauser (Antwerp, Plantin-Moretus Museum, lat. 194) are post-Anglo-Saxon and were added to these gospelbooks in the twelfth or thirteenth century (for the latter, see T. Klauser, *Das römische Capitulare Evangeliorum. Texte und Untersuchungen zu seiner ältesten Geschichte. 1. Typen*, Liturgiegeschichtliche Quellen und Forschungen 28 (Münster, 1935), p. xxxviii (no. 11)).

[51] For the transmission of the Old Testament in general and for liturgical notes in Old Testament manuscripts, see R. Marsden, *The Text of the Old Testament in Anglo-Saxon England*, CSASE 15 (Cambridge, 1995), 40–1.

[52] For the general development, see Frere, *The Roman Gospel-Lectionary*, pp. iii-iv and 59–61; Klauser, *Capitulare Evangeliorum*, pp. x–xxii; Martimort, *Les Lectures liturgiques*, pp. 15–58; Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 293–304 and 315–20, and Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, pp. 94–132.

[53] The notes to the *capitula*-tables in the 'Lindisfarne Gospels' are ed. Skeat, *The Holy Gospels*, pp. 16–22 (Matt.), 2–5 (Mark), 3–11 (Luke) and 3–8 (John). They are described and analysed by T. J. Brown, 'The Latin Text', *Euangeliorum quattuor codex Lindisfarnensis Musei Britannici codex Cottonianus Nero D.IV permissione Musei Britannici totius codicis similitudo expressa. Book I. Part II: The Latin Text*, ed. T. D. Kendrick, T. J. Brown *et al.* (Olten, 1960), pp. 35–6 and his edition of *The Stonyhurst Gospel of Saint John*, Roxburghe Club (Oxford, 1969), pp. 25–7.

151

'quasi-capitularies' in the 'Lindisfarne Gospels' (Mx) and London, BL, Royal 1. B. VII (My)[54] are among the oldest extant sources.

Marginal Notes

In the oldest manuscripts, marginal notes to gospelbooks appear as the most basic method of marking a gospel text as a liturgical reading (as in M and N),[55] since only the name of the feast is placed in the margin of a codex at the beginning of the pericope.[56] In several of the Northumbrian manuscripts (Md, Me, Mf, Mv/Nd, Nk), crosses mark the beginning of the lection in the gospel text itself. Its conclusion is not similarly indicated: among the Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, London, BL, Add. 40000 (Na) is unique in marking the end of the pericope with *F:n:t.* Since the gospel and the relevant chapter have to be known beforehand, marginal notes represent a somewhat unsystematic and highly provisional means, made for liturgical experts at a time when relatively few readings were fixed. Hence the number of notes scattered over the gospel text is normally small – in seven of the fourteen extant manuscripts[57] from Anglo-Saxon times there are fewer than twenty such notes. Only the notes in the 'Burchard Gospels' (Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, M. p. th. f. 68; Mv/Nd) and London, BL, Add. 40000 (Na) cover the major parts of the liturgical year.

Furthermore, both the exact date and place of origin of the notes are often hard to determine. The notes may have been copied together with the gospel text, but they may also have been added to the margins of the texts centuries later. Thus in the 'Burchard Gospels' two sets of notes appear, a non-Roman (Mv) and a Roman system (Nd). In Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. D. 2. 14, three different sets of Roman systems are recorded, two from seventh-century Italy (Ng; Nh) and one added in England in the tenth century (Ni). More important than the dating of the manuscripts is therefore that of the notes, which can be summarized as follows:

---

54 These 'quasi-capitularies' are merely tables of names of church festivals. They are not arranged in the liturgical order and do not indicate which pericopes they refer to. They are thus useless as a means of finding the gospel of the day. Only comparison with the marginal notes to 'Burchard Gospels' allows their allocation to certain liturgical texts. For more detailed descriptions, see Brown, 'The Latin Text', pp. 35–8, J. Chapman, *Notes on the Early History of the Vulgate Gospels* (Oxford, 1908), pp. 52–63 and Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, pp. 136–40 and 387–96.

55 For details, see Klauser, *Capitulare Evangeliorum*, pp. xiii–xiv and xxx–xxxvi, Martimort, *Les Lectures liturgiques*, pp. 22–6, Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 315–16 and Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, pp. 102–6 and 387–412.

56 An exception to this rule are the notes in the 'Burchard Gospels', which are found at the upper margin of the page. The beginning of the pericope in the text is indicated by a cross.

57 In some manuscripts this is due to later bookbinders who, when rebinding the books and trimming the margins, cut off some of the marginal notes; cf. the seventh-century notes in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. D. 2. 14 (Ng/Nh) and those in Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 1. 24 (Nc) or London, BL, Add. 40000 (Na).

s. vii   Ng, Nh
s. viii   Ma, Mb, Mc, Md, Me, Mf, Mg, Mv, Nd, Nk
s. x   Na, Nc, Ni

Capitularies

The use of marginal notes predominated as long as readings were relatively few. When their number increased, other means became necessary. Thus the most important documents for gospel lections in the early medieval period are gospel-lists (also called 'lists of pericopes' or 'capitularies'). From Anglo-Saxon England, seventeen capitularies have survived (sigla O, P, Q, S).[58] These lists may be placed at the beginning (Pa, Pc, Ph), but are more often found as an appendix at the end of a manuscript. Capitularies provide very precise and detailed information about the date of a feast and in particular the exact beginning and end of the pericope by referring to its Eusebian section and by quoting its opening and closing words. Compare the following examples from the eleventh-century capitulary in Sa (Cambridge, Trinity College B. 10. 4, 164v):[59]

Dom*in*ica v p*os*t theophania. Eu*angelium* Secu*n*du*m* matheum. Cap*itulum* lxviiii. Ascendente Ie*su* in nauicula Usq*ue* quia uenti et mare oboediunt ei.
In nat*ale* s*an*c*t*ae agnae. Eu*angelium* Secu*n*du*m* matheum. Cap*itulum* cclxvii. In illo *tempore*. Dix*it* ie*su*s discipulis suis. Simile e*st* regnum caelo*rum* decem uirginib*us* Usq*ue* quia nescitis diem neq*ue* horam.

Since the entries are arranged in liturgical order, the lists can be grouped on purely formal grounds, such as the beginning of the list with the first mass of Christmas (Pa, Pb, Pc, Pg) or the vigil mass at None of Christmas Eve (Pc, Ph, Qa, Qb, Qc, Qe, Sa, Sb, Sc, Sd, Se, Sx).[60] Other basically formal criteria provided the basis for the allocation of different sigla: 'Q' indicates that the days of the Sanctorale and Temporale are not combined in one list, but are grouped together (Qa, Qb, Qc) or completely separated (Qe) from one another. While

---

[58] For details, see Frere, *The Roman Gospel-Lectionary*, pp. 59–214, Klauser, *Capitulare Evangeliorum*, pp. xiv–xviii and xxxvii–lxx, Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 316–18 and Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, pp. 107–14 and 413–56.   [59] Cf. pl. IV.

[60] The beginning of a list with the first mass of Christmas or the vigil mass at None of Christmas Eve is one of the characteristics which distinguishes the Roman types 2 and 3 (see below, pp. 160–3). In all strictly Anglo-Saxon witnesses investigated here, one of the Christmas masses is chosen as the beginning of the liturgical year, although the shift to the first Sunday in Advent is commonly dated between the eighth and the tenth century (see e.g. Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, p. 312 and Ælfric's statement in his homily on the Circumcision: 'Sume ure þeningbec ongin-nað on aduentum domini' (*Ælfric's Catholic Homilies. The First Series. Text*, ed. P. Clemoes, EETS ss 17 (London, 1997), 228)).

153

'P'-lists count the Sundays after Pentecost according to the Gregorian sections,[61] 'S'-lists name them continuously as 'post pentecosten'.

Most of the surviving capitularies are from the ninth and eleventh centuries:

s. ix   Pa, Pb, Pc, Px, Qc, Qe
s. x   Ph, Qa
s. xi   Pg, Qb, Sa, Sb, Sc, Sd, Se, Sx

For an evaluation of their actual use in the Anglo-Saxon liturgy it has to be remembered, however, that several of these manuscripts were written on the Continent (Pa, Pc, Px, Qa, Qc, Qe; Oa?, Pb?) and only came to England with monks taking refuge from Viking raids or in the wake of the Benedictine reform.

Lectionaries

Unlike gospelbooks with marginal notes and capitularies, lectionaries commonly served liturgical purposes only, because they contain only a selection of biblical texts, namely the readings for the liturgical services. A so-called full lectionary gives the texts for both the first and the second reading. However, the three extant fragments, which consist only of one or two folios, do not provide much evidence for the lection system in Anglo-Saxon England (Ta, Tb, Tc).[62]

Gospel-lectionaries (V)[63] are arranged in the same way as capitularies but give the full texts of all the pericopes in the order of the church year – prefaced by the liturgical formula *In illo tempore*. Within the limits of this narrow definition, Anglo-Saxon evidence is restricted to merely three fragments (Va, Vc, Vf)[64] and one complete gospel lectionary (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. xvii. 20 (Vb)).

Another group of manuscripts, which are generally referred to as lectionaries,[65] has to be dealt with separately: Cambridge, Pembroke College 302 (Ub),

---

[61] In the old Roman plan ('Gregorian sections') certain saints' days are chosen as fixed points for counting of the Sundays after Pentecost, namely the feasts of Peter and Paul (29 June), Laurence (10 August), Cyprian (14 September) or Michael (29 September). Accordingly, the Sundays are called 'dominica post natale S(s) Apostolorum (Petri et Pauli) Laurentii, Cypriani, Angeli'). For details, see Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, pp. 72–3, 164–6 and 506.

[62] Thus Tb (Oslo, Riksarkivet, Lat. fragm. 201 + Universitetsbiblioteket, Lat. frag. 9) contains only parts of the Passion according to Matthew without reference to the liturgical day.

[63] For details, see Frere, *The Roman Gospel-Lectionary*, pp. 214–20, Gneuss, 'Liturgical Books', p. 107 and Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, pp. 115–17 and 457–76.

[64] London, BL, Stowe 944 (Va), Warsaw, Biblioteka Narodowa, i. 3311 (Vc) and London, College of Arms, Arundel 22, fols. 84 and 85 (Vf).

[65] See the descriptions in the manuscript catalogues and hence the classification in Gneuss, 'Liturgical Books', p. 107.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, lat. liturg. f. 5 (Uc) and a part of Warsaw, Biblioteka Narodowa i. 3311 (Ue) give only a selection of gospel texts.[66] These texts are, however, not given in the liturgical order but in the order of the gospels (Matthew, Mark, Luke, John) and do not name the liturgical day at the beginning of the passage. These witnesses are therefore not lectionaries in the strict sense, as they could not be employed in the mass in this form. They might instead have been intended for private devotion.[67] For present purposes, only the fragments Va, Vc and Vf and the full lectionary Vb, the principal witness, are suitable for analysis.

Missals

Missals, which contain all the prayers, chants and readings for mass, finally replaced three separate volumes, namely sacramentaries, graduals and lectionaries.[68] As a late development, they emerge in the tenth and eleventh centuries. Hence the only extant Anglo-Saxon missal which covers the major parts of the church year is the 'New Minster Missal' (Le Havre, BM, 330; s. xi^2; Wa).

Other manuscripts reflect transitional stages. In the oldest part of the 'Leofric Missal' (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 579; Wb), marginal notes for the chants and the readings are added to the mass formulas and thus transform the original sacramentary into a provisional missal (s. xi^{med}).[69] Similarly, the sacramentary London, Society of Antiquaries 154* (Wf) is supplemented by an appendix which contains the first and second readings for a number of liturgical days.[70]

More than twenty fragments of Anglo-Saxon missals from the tenth and eleventh centuries, most of which have only recently been identified or discovered

---

[66] The fragments Malibu, John Paul Getty Museum 9 (Ud), in spite of the liturgical formulas *in illo tempore*, do not belong to this group, as their text can be shown to follow the pure Vulgate tradition. See Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, pp. 463–4 and for a manuscript similar in textual character, London, BL, Royal 1. A. XVIII (Ua). E. C. Teviotdale has pointed out to me that more Vulgate manuscripts of this kind have survived.

[67] Private devotion seems most likely in the case of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Lat. liturg. f. 5 (S. C. 29744), the 'St Margaret's Gospels', which belonged to Margaret of Scotland, wife of Malcolm III (1057–93).

[68] For details, see Gneuss, 'Liturgical Books', pp. 99–102, Pfaff, 'Massbooks', pp. 7–34 and Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, pp. 118 and 477–92.

[69] For the suggestion that Bishop Leofric himself was the executing scribe of the marginal notes, see E. M. Drage, 'Bishop Leofric and the Exeter Cathedral Chapter 1050–1072: a Reassessment of the Manuscript Evidence' (unpubl. DPhil dissertation, Univ. of Oxford, 1978), pp. 139–41.

[70] See F. Wormald, 'Fragments of a Tenth-Century Sacramentary from the Bindings of the Winton Domesday', *Winchester and the Early Middle Ages. An Edition and Discussion of the Winton Domesday*, ed. M. Biddle (Oxford, 1976), pp. 541–9 and Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, pp. 487–8.

155

as flyleaves or binding strips in later manuscripts, indicate that missals were quite common in the last century of the Anglo-Saxon period.

Witnesses for the gospel readings

For an evaluation of the Anglo-Saxon sources, comparison with the witnesses from the Continent, as provided by Klauser for medieval liturgical manuscripts (s. vi–xv), proves to be illuminating. Klauser finds the following distribution[71] for manuscripts from the sixth to the eleventh century:

Century	Notes	Notes	Lists	Full lectionaries	Gospel-lectionaries
	non-Roman	Roman	Roman	Roman	Roman
s. vi	2	–	(2)[72]	–	–
s. vii	11	2	(3)	–	1
s. viii	12	–	9+(2)	–	1
s. ix	–	3	140	6	14
s. x	–	2	96	10	30
s. xi	–	–	101	18	72

Table 1: Continental witnesses

This inventory, according to Klauser,[73] shows that the different forms appear in a chronological order in three consecutive phases. Marginal notes are the original form and are the predominant method for non-Roman and Roman traditions in manuscripts from the sixth century to the eighth. Capitularies in the form described above emerge in the eighth century and are the principal means for marking pericopes before lectionaries and later missals gain full acceptance.

This line of development can now be compared to the data in the following table listing all extant Anglo-Saxon manuscripts which record liturgical gospel readings:

---

[71] This inventory was compiled from Klauser, *Capitulare Evangeliorum*, pp. xxx, xxxv, xxxvi, xxxvii, lxxi, lxxxi, xc and cxiv. The Anglo-Saxon witnesses are included in this list. Altogether, Klauser lists and briefly describes about 1300 medieval manuscripts from the seventh century to the fifteenth (pp. xxx–cxx).

[72] The items in parentheses are witnesses which are not capitularies in the strict sense and thus appear under the rubric 'notes' in my diagram of Anglo-Saxon sources, such as the 'quasi-capitularies' in London, BL, Cotton Nero D. iv (Mx) and London, BL, Royal 1. B. VII (My).

[73] Klauser, *Capitulare Evangeliorum*, pp. xiii–xiv.

The West Saxon Gospels *and the gospel-lectionary in Anglo-Saxon England*

Century	Notes	Notes	Notes	Lists	Full lectionaries	Gospel-lectionaries	Missals
	Mss.	non-Roman	Roman	Roman	Roman	Roman	Roman
s. vi	1	[–]	[–]	–	–	–	–
s. vii	1	[–]	[2]	–	–	–	–
s. viii	8	[10]	[2]	1	1(f)	–	–
s. ix	–	–	–	6	–	–	–
s. x	1	–	[3]	2	1(f)	2(f)	4(f)
s. xi	3	–	–[74]	8	1(f)	1+2(f)	20(f)

Table 2: Anglo-Saxon witnesses

The findings for Anglo-Saxon England thus basically agree with the data for the Continent, as there is also an obvious development from marginal (non-Roman and Roman) notes to capitularies, lectionaries and finally missals.

For an evaluation of the actual liturgical practice of the Anglo-Saxons, it is necessary to bear in mind that it is documents from gospelbooks – marginal notes and capitularies – which are the most numerous among our surviving sources. The transmission of these mostly sumptuous codices, however, follows very specific paths which lead to their overrepresentation – about a quarter of all illuminated books from the Anglo-Saxon period are gospelbooks.[75] The fact that full lectionaries[76] survive from the eighth, tenth and eleventh centuries, indicates that full lectionaries were much more important for Anglo-Saxon liturgical practice than today's evidence suggests.

The indisputable evidence for two readings in the eucharistic service[77] raises the question from which book the first lesson was sung. No book designed especially for this purpose – such as an epistolary – is extant. The use of bibles in the

---

[74] The rubrics in A and F might be added to this column, as they share more similarities with notes than any other method. See below, p. 170.

[75] Cf. the ratio of gospelbooks in two volumes of the 'Survey of Manuscripts Illuminated in the British Isles' (E. Temple, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts 900–1066* (London, 1976) and M. Kauffmann, *Romanesque Manuscripts 1066–1190* (London, 1972)): 'Twenty-nine out of the 106 catalogue entries [in Temple], over a quarter, are gospelbooks or Gospel lectionaries, whereas in the post-Conquest volume in the same series the 106 entries include only seven gospelbooks' (T. A. Heslop, 'The Production of *de luxe* Manuscripts and the Patronage of King Cnut and Queen Emma', *ASE* 19 (1990), 151–95, at 152).

[76] Moreover, lectionaries recording non-Roman traditions are quite numerous from the sixth, seventh and eighth centuries; for an inventory, see Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 320–3 and Martimort, *Les Lectures liturgiques*, pp. 37–9. Strikingly, most of them are palimpsests.

[77] See above, pp. 149–50.

157

form of a *lectio continua*[78] or with the help of an epistle-list[79] is unlikely because evidence for the production of full and part-bibles[80] is restricted to the beginning and the end of the Anglo-Saxon period. Moreover, apart from the 'Codex Amiatinus' none of the extant bibles contains liturgical notes.

The case for the existence of more full lectionaries is supported by the striking evidence of booklists, which indicate what kind of books were owned by Anglo-Saxons. In six of the thirteen booklists edited by Michael Lapidge, that is almost 50 per cent, a (service-)book[81] called *pistelboc* or *epistolarium* is mentioned.[82] These terms seem to denote an epistolary, that is a lectionary with the full texts for the first reading, a kind of book of which there is not a single trace from Anglo-Saxon England. Yet, the evidence from the *Monasterialia Indicia* helps us to identify what kind of book this *pistolboc* actually is. It is first of all again instructive to note that the *pistolboc* – of which no Anglo-Saxon copy seems to survive – is nevertheless worth a separate sign:[83] 'Ðære pistol boce tacn ys þæt mon wecge his hand and wyrce crystelmæl on his heafde foran mid his þuman forþon þe mon ræt god spel þær on and eal swa on þære cristes bec.' The phrase 'because one reads the gospel in there and likewise in the gospel-books'[84] indicates that the *pistolbec* mentioned in the booklists are most probably not 'epistolaries' but full lectionaries which give the text for the first and the second (gospel) reading.[85] This assumption is also supported by semiotic criteria: the sign for the *pistolboc* 'one moves one's hand and makes the sign of the cross on the front of one's head with one's thumb' resembles the liturgical prep-

---

[78] See below, p. 160.

[79] From Anglo-Saxon England, the only trace of such a document is the epistle-list in Oa (Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, M. p. th. f. 62). The Anglo-Saxon origin of this manuscript is, however, highly disputed, so that Gneuss, 'Preliminary List', does not include it. See Lowe, *CLA* IX, no. 1417 and Bischoff's summary: 'Es besteht also durchaus die Möglichkeit einer Abschrift durch einen Boten oder Begleiter Burghards in Rom neben der Herkunft aus England' (B. Bischoff and J. Hofmann, *Libri Sancti Kyliani. Die Würzburger Schreibschule im VIII. und IX. Jahrhundert* (Würzburg, 1952), p. 96 (no. 10)).

[80] For an inventory of Anglo-Saxon bible manuscripts, see Marsden, *The Text of the Old Testament*, pp. 40–1.

[81] The context in the will of Ælfwold, bishop of Crediton (997–1016), is particularly instructive: '. . . and in to Crydian tune þreo þeningbec: mæsseboc, and bletsungboc and pistelboc'. *Mæsseboc* here refers to the sacramentary (see Lapidge, 'Surviving Booklists', p. 56 and Gneuss, 'Liturgical Books', pp. 99–101).

[82] Lapidge, 'Surviving Booklists', pp. 33–89. That the booklists provide helpful evidence can be shown by the fact that the numbers and ratios tally with the extant codices in the case of sumptuous books such as psalters, gospelbooks and bibles: while psalters are listed in eleven, and one or more gospelbook(s) are recorded in nine of them, we find only one instance of a bible.

[83] *Monasteriales [sic] Indicia*, ed. Banham, p. 24 (no. 10).

[84] Banham's translation '(because one reads) the word of God . . .' (*ibid.*) is misleading. It would translate a genitive construction (*Godes spel*) but not the compound *godspel* found here.

[85] For a first suggestion in this direction, see Gneuss, 'Liturgical Books', p. 110.

aration of the deacon who, before reading the gospel of the day, crosses himself and makes the sign of a cross in the gospelbook at the verse where the lesson begins.[86]

The identification of the *pistolboc/epistolarium* as a full lectionary is further strengthened by Ælfric's use of the terms *pistolboc* and *lectionarium* in his *Pastoral Letters*.[87] Ælfric alters the term 'epistolarium' of his source into 'lectionarium, quod quidam uocant epistolarium',[88] thus making *epistolarium* at least partially synonymous with *lectionarium*.

This is, in my opinion, enough positive evidence to suggest that full lectionaries were much more common in Anglo-Saxon times and much more important for Anglo-Saxon liturgical practice than is testified by the evidence of extant manuscripts. These lectionaries were utilitarian, non-durable manuscripts made for everyday use, were worn down, and were discarded when the liturgical tradition changed.[89] Only scraps of them have made their way to the twentieth century.[90] The evidence of gospelbooks must not be overestimated, as they were primarily regarded as objects of worship and not books or documents for the liturgy. They were preserved in their magnificence, almost like relics, on the altar and later passed into the treasury of a monastery or church. They are, however, the principal extant witnesses for the gospel-lectionary in Anglo-Saxon England, since they are most numerous and – in their capitularies – record the most detailed information.

LITURGICAL TRADITIONS

Although the reading of the gospel of the day was one of the central elements of the eucharistic service from early Christian times, there are no traces of a fixed set of readings for the major part of the liturgical year before the sixth

---

[86] For the similar phrases in the sign for the deacon who reads the gospel of the day, see above, n. 43.

[87] *Hirtenbriefe*, ed. Fehr, 13, § 52 (MS O): 'He sceal habban eac þa wæpna to þam gastlicum weorce, ær-þan-þe he beo gehadod, þæt synd þa halgan bec: saltere and pistolboc, godspellboc and mæsseboc, sangboc and handboc, gerim and pastoralem, penitentialem and rædingboc.' For minor variations in other copies and the difficulties with the identification of the manuscripts, see *ibid.* pp. lxxxvi–lxxxvii and 126–7, § 157 and Gneuss, 'Liturgical Books', p. 121.

[88] *Hirtenbriefe*, ed. Fehr, p. 51, § 137: 'Presbyter debet habere etiam spiritalia arma, id sunt diuinos libros, scilicet missalem, lectionarium, quod quidam uocant epistolarium . . .'

[89] Most of the extant lectionaries have therefore only survived as palimpsests (see above, n. 76) or as fragments used as binding-strips or flyleaves in later manuscripts. See Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, pp. 457–8.

[90] Hartzell similarly argues for the transmission of missals: 'That few missals survive must not convince us they were not written. The missal is, par excellence, the missile of the expanding church, the missionary church, the crusading church, the church in motion . . .' (K. D. Hartzell, 'An Eleventh-Century English Missal Fragment in the British Library', *ASE* 18 (1989), 45–97, at 46).

159

century, that is to say, only shortly before our first Anglo-Saxon witnesses. Until the era of fixed readings, bibles or gospelbooks were probably used in a series of continuous or consecutive readings (*lectio continua*).[91] The special character of annually recurring feasts such as Easter and Christmas, however, suggested early on the selection of readings in harmony with the meaning of the feasts and their seasons. Thus the Roman rite from the late eighth century shows almost no variation in the readings for the masses in Lent, Easter, the 'Great Fifty Days' from Easter to Pentecost, Advent and Christmas. As the progressive organization of the liturgical year rendered a *lectio continua* also for the liturgically more indistinct periods less and less probable, the set of readings becomes increasingly fixed.[92] Yet, nowhere is there to be found a systematic attempt at organizing or reforming a system of readings. For a number of days in the liturgically rather indistinct periods after Epiphany and Pentecost, the choice of readings for the ferial days was only fixed in post-Anglo-Saxon times, so that Anglo-Saxon sources still show a considerable amount of variation. However, it is these varying elements which allow a classification of the witnesses and their rites.

As a basic method of investigation of the different traditions, I compiled two comparative inventories – one for the feasts of the *Proprium de tempore* or Temporale, the other for the *Proprium sanctorum* or Sanctorale.[93] Each liturgical day has been given a separate entry under which all the sources which mention the day are listed, together with their reading(s).[94] Compare the entry for the second Sunday (#74) and the fifth Thursday (#99) in Lent:

○	*no reading*	Oa, Pa, Pb
■	Matt. XV.21–8	Ni, Ph, Qa, Qb, Qc, Qe, Va, Vb, Vc, Wb, Ya, Yb, Yc, ZÆ (*CH*II.8)
	Matt. XVII.10–23	Pg
	Mark I.40–4	Vb

---

[91] See Klauser, *Capitulare Evangeliorum*, pp. x-xiii, Martimort, *Les lectures liturgiques*, pp. 15–20, Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 293–304 and, for the early development, S. van Dijk, 'The Bible in Liturgical Use', *The Cambridge History of the Bible. 2: The West from the Fathers to the Reformation*, ed. G. Lampe (Cambridge, 1969), pp. 220–51, esp. 225, and G. Willis, *St Augustine's Lectionary*, Alcuin Club Collections 44 (London, 1962).

[92] For the development of the liturgical year, see Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 304–14, Harper, *The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy*, pp. 45–57 and Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, pp. 60–80.

[93] The term 'Temporale' refers to the Sundays and ferial days as they run throughout the liturgical year without any regard for their date or interruption by saints' days. The Sanctorale entries contain information about the lessons for days of individual saints or for the *Commune Sanctorum*.

[94] Examples are taken from the inventories for the items for the days of the Temporale (#) and the Sanctorale (‡) in Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, pp. 298–351 and 352–83. The affiliation of a reading to different Roman traditions is recorded by the symbols ○ (type 2) and ■ (type 3). See below, pp. 161–3.

160

Mark II.13–17	Sa, Sb, Sc, Sd, Se
Mark IX.30–41	Sx
John III.1–[95]	Mv, Mx, My

For this Sunday – the Sunday after the Ember Days in Lent – the sources document a variety of different readings. While the lesson begins with John III.1 in the non-Roman sources (Mv, Mx, My), three Roman capitularies (Oa, Pa, Pb) name only the day but provide no reading. The passage Matt. XV.21–8 is chosen in the majority of Roman sources.

# 99	Fifth Thursday in Lent
○ Luke VII.36–47	Pa, Pb, Pc, Pg, Ph, Qa, Qb, Qc, Sa, Sb, Sc, Sd, Se, Sx, Wb, Ya
Luke XX.1–8	Vb
■ John VII.40–53	Na, Ph, Qe, Sa, Sb, Sd, Se, Yc, A

This entry shows that the fifth Thursday in Lent[96] is not recorded in any of the sources documenting non-Roman traditions (hence no manuscripts with the siglum M). It is only found in the Roman rite, in one witness with marginal notes (Na), in all the capitularies and most of the lectionaries. With regard to the readings chosen, it is possible to distinguish two main groups, one reading Luke VII.36–47, the other John VII.40–53. Five capitularies (Ph, Sa, Sb, Sd and Se) give both texts.[97] The 'Florence Lectionary' (Vb) differs from these two basic groups with the idiosyncratic lesson Luke XX.1–8.

The two main groups recorded in my second example are not only found there but appear in a number of entries. More importantly, the respective sources also show major differences in their plan of the church year, in particular in the number of the Sundays after Epiphany and Pentecost.[98] These discrepancies are not only found in lectionaries but also in sacramentaries and graduals. The variations in the number of Sundays after Pentecost are indeed so distinctive that they allow a distinction of three different phases in the

---

[95] The end of the lesson cannot be determined here as the closing words of the pericope are recorded neither in the *capitula*-tables (Mx, My) nor in the marginal notes to the 'Burchard Gospels' (Mv). See above, pp. 152–3 and n. 95.

[96] For the late introduction of the Thursdays in Lent, see below, pp. 167–8.

[97] The second reading is usually introduced by *Item aliud*. This method is chosen by the common ancestor of Sa, Sb, Sc, Sd and Se for liturgical days whose readings show variation in the tenth and eleventh centuries. See Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, pp. 445–6.

[98] The number of these Sundays changes according to the date of Easter, which can fall between 22 March and 25 April. Hence their number varies between one to six after Epiphany and twenty-three to twenty-eight after Pentecost. See the tables in Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 404–10 and Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, p. 505.

161

development of liturgical books. Following Antoine Chavasse,[99] these consecutive phases are called type 1, 2 and 3. For the sacramentaries, Chavasse's type 2 (20 Sundays after Pentecost) is represented by the Gregorian books, type 3 (25–6 Sundays after Pentecost) by the *Gelasiana mixta* or Eighth-Century Gelasian Sacramentaries.[100] Gospel-lectionaries have only survived in the form of type 2 and its augmented version, type 3. The prototype of type 3, which set the model for later developments up to the *Missale Romanum*, is the 'Comes of Murbach' (Besançon, BM, 184, fols. 58–74), an epistle- and gospel-list of the mid-eighth century.[101]

Chavasse's types supersede the distinctions drawn by Frere and Klauser[102] as he was able to show that the different types established by Klauser are merely versions of his type 2.[103] See the comparative diagram of Klauser's, Frere's and Chavasse's classifications:

Frere (1934)	Earlier	Martina	Standard	(Vitus-4 and 15)
Klauser (1935)	Π	Λ	Σ	(Δ)
Chavasse (1952)	type 2	type 2	type 2	type 3

Klauser's extremely fine classification,[104] which is based on alterations in the Sanctorale, allows a very precise local and temporal allocation of the manuscripts. It is so restrictive, however, that only four (six?) Anglo-Saxon manuscripts agree with one of his groups:

[99] A. Chavasse, 'Les plus anciens types du lectionnaire et de l'antiphonaire romains de la messe. Rapports et date', *RB* 62 (1952), 1–91. The classification is based on R. Hesbert, 'Les évangiles des dimanches après la pentecôte', *Le Codex 10673 de la Bibliothèque Vaticane. Fonds Latins. Graduel bénéventaine (XI* siècle)*, Paléographie musicale 14 (Tournai, 1931), 129–44.

[100] For the complicated history of different types of sacramentaries and their designations, see K. Gamber, *Sakramentartypen. Versuch einer Gruppierung der Handschriften und Fragmente bis zur Jahrtausendwende*, Texte und Untersuchungen 49–50 (Beuron, 1958), and Pfaff, 'Massbooks', pp. 8–9.

[101] The 'Comes' is ed. A. Wilmart, 'Le Comes de Murbach', *RB* 30 (1913), 25–69; for a description, see also Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, p. 347.

[102] Frere, *The Roman Gospel-Lectionary* and Klauser, *Capitulare Evangeliorum*. Investigation into the origin and organization of the liturgical readings has been pursued from the mid-nineteenth century; see the now dated studies by E. Ranke, *Das kirchliche Pericopensystem aus den ältesten Urkunden der Römischen Liturgie dargelegt und erläutert* (Berlin, 1847) and S. Beissel, *Entstehung der Perikopen des Römischen Meßbuches*, Ergänzungshefte zu den Stimmen aus Maria Laach 96 (Freiburg, 1907; repr. Rome, 1967).

[103] See Chavasse, 'Les plus anciens types', p. 6: 'Ces trois variétés [Klauser's Π, Λ, Σ] se distinguent l'une de l'autre par leur sanctoral plus ou moins riche, mais leur temporal demeure identique, à peu de choses près, et c'est pourquoi nous disons qu'elles constituent, en réalité, trois variétés d'un même type fondamental.'

[104] Frere's analyses are comparable to Klauser's in their concentration on changes in the Sanctorale, but his closer investigations anticipate Chavasse's work. For the 'Alternative Ferias', see below, p. 166.

Π (= 'Earlier'):   (Oa)[105]; Nd
Λ (= 'Martina'):   Pc
Σ (= 'Standard'): Pa; Pb; Nc(?)[106]

More importantly, the broader lines of development are more easily discerned by changes in the lessons for days of the Temporale. For the analysis of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, Chavasse's classification is preferable because of its broader approach, its inclusion of other types of liturgical manuscripts and therefore its comparative value.

The gospel-lectionary in Anglo-Saxon England

The investigation of the lessons amounted to the analysis of readings for altogether about 500 days, 270 days of the Temporale and 220 days of the Sanctorale and yielded the general classification and grouping of the Anglo-Saxon sources set out in Table 3 overleaf.

   None of the surviving witnesses belongs to a specifically Anglo-Saxon tradition. Even the lessons for the Sanctorale bear no mark of their Anglo-Saxon background: specific pericopes for Anglo-Saxon saints are only recorded in three books from the very beginning and end of the period.[107]

Non-Roman traditions

The main borderline can be drawn in the eighth century, as by the ninth century Roman traditions had ousted various other traditions which are recorded in Northumbrian sources of the seventh and eighth centuries. In the early period, improvisation was still the rule, as is documented by a number of different non-Roman and Roman, but also mixed traditions. Among the non-Roman witnesses, the predominant tradition[108] roots itself in a basically Neapolitan system[109] which was adapted for the needs of the Northumbrian

---

[105] See above, n. 79.

[106] The eight notes in this gospelbook cannot be attributed with certainty. Their only distinctive feature is the provision of two lessons for the second Sunday after Epiphany (#21)) which also occurs in capitularies of the mixed types (e.g. Pg).

[107] See the pericopes for Benedict Biscop (‡1) in Bede's homiliary (Xa), for Cuthbert (‡24, ‡109) in the 'New Minster Missal' (Wa) and for Swithun (‡67) in the 'Red Book of Darley' (Wh).

[108] The only real exception are the seventeen marginal notes (s. viii) in Durham, Cathedral Library, A. II. 16 (Me) which follow an Old Gallican tradition. The notes are ptd C. H. Turner, *The Oldest Manuscripts of the Vulgate Gospels. Deciphered and Edited with an Introduction and Appendix* (Oxford, 1931), p. 217.

[109] Naples is suggested by the lessons for the feasts of St Januarius (‡118, ‡119) and a feast for the main church of Naples ('dedicatio basilicae Stephani'; ‡301). Lapidge also presumes a Naples origin for 'In dedicatione sanctae Mariae' (‡301) and 'Et in dedicatione fontis' (‡302); see B. Bischoff and M. Lapidge, *Biblical Commentaries from the Canterbury School of Theodore and Hadrian*, CSASE 10 (Cambridge, 1994), 157.

163

Date	*Tradition*	*Witnesses*	*Origin*
s. vii	early Roman	Ng, Nh	Continent
s. vii/viii	Northumbrian-Neapolitan	Ma, Mb, Mc, Mg, Mv, Mx, My	Northumbria
s. vii/viii	Old Gallican	Me	Northumbria
s. viii	Northumbrian-Neapolitan-Roman	Md, Mf, Xa	Northumbria
s. viii	Roman	Nk	Northumbria
	type 2: 'Earlier' (Π)	Nd, Oa	Northumbria
	mixed type	–	
	type 3	–	
s. ix	Roman		
	type 2: 'Standard' (Σ)	Pa, Pb	Continent
	type 2: 'Martina' (Λ)	Pc	Continent
	mixed type 2/3	Px, Qc	Continent
	type 3	Qe	Continent
s. x	Roman		
	type 2	Nc?	England
	mixed type 2/3	Nc?, Ph	England
		Qa	Continent
	type 3	Na, Ni	England
s. xi	Roman	Wz	England
	type 2	–	
	mixed type 2/3	Qb, Pg, Sx	England
	type 3	Sa, Sb, Sc, Sd, Se, Tc, Va, Vb, Vc, Vx, Wa, Wb, Wd, Wj, Wl, Wm, Wn, ZÆ, A, F	England

Table 3: Classification of the Anglo-Saxon witnesses

164

church.[110] An ancestor of this tradition may have come to England in a volume which Benedict Biscop brought back from one of his journeys to Rome, or, as Michael Lapidge has recently suggested, may have come with Abbot Hadrian to Canterbury and then to Northumbria.[111]

Lessons rooted in this Neapolitan tradition are recorded in the highly innovative and idiosyncratic forms of marginal notes to the *capitula*-tables in the 'Lindisfarne Gospels' (Ma), Royal 1. B. VII (Mb) and the 'Codex Amiatinus' (Mc), in the 'quasi-capitularies' of the 'Lindisfarne Gospels' (Mx) and Royal 1. B. VII (My), and also in the single marginal note to a bible, the 'Codex Amiatinus' (Mg). Supplemented by Roman lessons it serves as the basis for the lessons in Bede's homiliary (Xa) and the notes to Royal 1. B. VII (Md) and Durham, Cathedral Library, A. II. 17 (Mf). Its principal and most precise witness are the marginal notes to the 'Burchard Gospels' (Mv).

This system is only recorded in these Anglo-Saxon witnesses and is in the surviving form certainly not purely Neapolitan. Moreover, none of the extant sources is identical with another:[112] in each manuscript the basic tradition is augmented by new lessons from other, mainly Roman, sources.[113]

Roman traditions

Only representatives of the Roman traditions survive from the ninth century onwards. In the ninth and tenth centuries, we find sources following types 2 and 3, but also mixed types. Therefore the fixing of the readings can be shown to have been a gradual process, which did not exclude the coexistence of different types for a rather lengthy period.

Type 3 emerges in a source of the ninth century (Qe) and has gained acceptance by the eleventh century, when all the important witnesses represent type 3. This is especially true for genuinely liturgical witnesses, such as lectionaries and missals, and for vernacular sources, such as Ælfric's homilies and the rubrics to the *WSG*. But liturgical uniformity was unheard of in the early Middle Ages, so

---

[110] For its readings, see G. Morin, 'Les notes liturgiques de l'Évangéliaire de Burchard', *RB* 10 (1893), 113–26, Brown, 'The Latin Text', 34–43 and Chapman, *Notes on the Early History*, pp. 52–63. For further details, see Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, pp. 133–46 and 387–99.

[111] For details, see Chapman, *Notes on the Early History*, pp. 159–61 and Bischoff and Lapidge, *Biblical Commentaries*, pp. 166–7.

[112] The actual use of this system has sometimes been doubted because of the difficult and unsystematic recording of the lessons in the *capitula*-tables and 'quasi-capitularies' or, more generally, because of the attested Northumbrian loyalty to Rome, which would not allow the use of a Neapolitan system. These arguments are, however, somewhat anachronistic, as the sources only testify to liturgical improvisation, by their search for the best method of marking pericopes and by the incompleteness of the lessons. For details, see Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, pp. 141–6.

[113] Even its basis should probably rather be described with Chavasse as 'la vieille organisation romaine' (Chavasse, 'Les plus anciens types', p. 74, n. 1).

that even within a given family or type the documents do not always agree at all times and in all places.[114]

While the augmented system of 25 or 26 Sundays after Pentecost, the salient characteristic of type 3, had already gained acceptance in the tenth and eleventh centuries,[115] variations are still found in the lessons for the Sundays after Epiphany[116] and the ferial days after Epiphany and Pentecost. For the ferial days, type 3 was not adjusted from the readings of type 2, but a completely new system was introduced, named 'Alternative Ferias' by Frere.[117] Capitularies of the mixed types (Pg, Ph, Qa, Qb, Qc) use the new series for the Sundays, but retain the old type 2 or an otherwise altered series of the ferial days.

Since a number of witnesses do not give readings for the ferial days but only for Sundays, they can only very generally be classified as 'type 3' and have to be analysed with the help of distinctive readings on other liturgical days.[118] This method can be illustrated by the characteristics which establish the group comprising the rubrics to the *WSG*. Their liturgical tradition follows the new series for the Sundays after Pentecost and after Epiphany, and also employs the 'Alternative Series' for the ferial days:

\# 175 Friday, seventh week after Pentecost
- ■ **Mark V.1–20**　　　　**Qe, Vb, A**
- ○ Mark VIII.11–26　　Pg, Ph, Qb, Sa, Sb, Sc, Sd, Se

\# 205 Wednesday, fifteenth week after Pentecost
- ■ **Mark I.40–45**　　　　**Qe, Vb, A, F**
- ○ Mark XI.11–18　　Pg, Ph, Qb, Sa, Sx

---

[114] The only cases with more or less full agreement are two groups of capitularies (Qa, Qb, Qc and Sa, Sb, Sc, Sd, Se), each of which derives from a common ancestor.

[115] For this new series, six readings for the Sundays were added to the original twenty readings of type 2 (Klauser's Σ and Frere's 'Standard'), to adjust the tradition to the actual number of Sundays after Pentecost. See Chavasse, 'Les plus anciens types', pp. 11–16 and Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, pp. 163–6.

[116] The ten readings provided for the Sundays after Epiphany in type 2 are always too many, as the largest possible number of Sundays is six. This means that the need to modify the system was not as urgent as in the case of the too few Sundays after Pentecost – the spare readings were just not used. Thus the capitularies of the mixed types (Ph, Qa, Qb, Qc) give ten Sundays, the group Sa, Sb, Sc, Sd and Se six, and Qe, in accordance with the 'Comes of Murbach', five. For details, see Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, pp.167–8.

[117] Frere, *The Roman Gospel-Lectionary*, pp. 119–23. Since Chavasse only describes modifications in the Sundays after Pentecost (and partly Epiphany), the description of the other features is based on the analyses of Frere and the readings in the 'Comes of Murbach' (ed. Wilmart).

[118] For other days with distinctive readings, see Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, pp. 168–72.

166

The second example is especially instructive, as it shows not only the rubrics in A but also the single rubric in F to belong to a tradition which is only scarcely attested. The group consists of the capitulary 'Qe', the 'Florence Lectionary' (Vb) and the rubrics to the *WSG* (A and F). In some cases, the readings in the 'New Minster' (Wa) and the 'Leofric Missal' (Wb) agree with those of the group:

104 Tuesday in Holy Week
    Mark XIV.1–XV.46   Pg, Ph, Sa, [Sb], Sd, Se, Tc, Vb, Wb, Yc, A
■ **John XII.24–43**   **Qe, Vb, Wb, A**
○ John XIII.1–32   Nd, Oa, Pa, Pb, Pc, Ph, Sa, Sb, Sc, Sd, Se
    John XIII.16–32   Pg, Qa, Qb, Qc, Sx

216 Ember Friday in autumn
○ Luke V.17–26   Pg, Qa, Qb, Qc, Sa, Sb, Sd, Se, Sx
■ **Luke VII.36–50**   **Ph, Qe, Vb, Wa, Wb, Wn, Ya, A**

For an example from the Sanctorale, see the readings for the feast of St Sylvester:

○ Matt. XXIV.42–7   Oa, Pa, Pb, Pc, Pg, Ph, Qa, Qb, Qc, Sa, Sb, Sc, Sd, Se, Sx, Vx
■ **Matt. XXV.14–23**   **Qe, Vb, Wa, Wb, A**

Yet, these agreements do not mean that the manuscripts are direct copies from a common exemplar or from one another. There are too many discrepancies on other days,[119] for example, on the Thursdays in Lent. The stational masses for these Thursdays were established comparatively late under Pope Gregory II (715–31). Thus two distinctive series occur which, according to Frere, afford 'a very valuable criterion for distinguishing and classifying different groups of MSS'.[120] The older series introduced in Frere's subgroup 'Standard' (Klauser's Σ) of type 2 chooses lessons from the synoptic gospels according to Matthew and Luke; in other manuscripts, mainly those representing type 3, only passages from John are selected.[121] However, there are also mixed systems, as the witnesses belonging to the established subgroup show:

---

[119] Cf. the readings for the second Sunday in Lent, above p. 160–1.
[120] Frere, *The Roman Gospel-Lectionary*, p. 65.
[121] The selected passages in the older series are Matt. XV.21–8, Luke XVI.19–31, Luke IV.38–44, Luke VII.11–16 and Luke VII.36–50, in the new series John VIII.31–47, V.30–47, VI.27–35, V.17–29 and VII.40–53; cf. the full entry of the fifth Thursday, above p. 161. Maundy Thursday follows a different tradition.

Thursday in Lent	Qe	Vb	Wb	A
First (#71)	new	old	new	both
Second (#78)	both	old	old	new
Third (#85)	old	new	old	old
Fourth (#92)	both	new	old	new
Fifth (#99)	new	Luke XX.1–8	old	new

Apart from the incongruities of their readings, the manuscripts which form the nucleus of the subgroup (Qe, Vb, A) show considerable variance in their dates and places of origin:

Qe: s. ix^{ex} or x^{in} – Continent, Liège (provenance from s. x^{med}: Canterbury)
Vb: s. xi^1 – Canterbury (provenance from s. xi: Continent)
A: s. xi^{med} – Exeter

The origin of the subgroup is thus definitely not specifically Anglo-Saxon, but can be traced in continental sources of the prototypical type 3. This system was brought to England in different versions and was also modified in England itself. It is the tradition which later served as the basis for the readings in the Sarum and York Missals and also in the *Missale Romanum*.

In summary, the surviving Anglo-Saxon sources of type 3 may be classified tentatively into the following subgroups, which, however, reflect different degrees of conformity and distinctiveness:

mixed type 2 / type 3:	Pg, Ph[122] – Qa, Qb, Qc[123]
unspecific type 3:[124]	Na, Ni, Va, Vc, Wj, Wl, Wm, Wn, ZÆ
Anglo-Saxon group:	Sa, Sb, Sc, Sd, Se[125] – (Sx)
continental–late-Anglo-Saxon group:	Qe, Vb, (Wa), (Wb), A, F

Problems

Some problems emerge when we consider the difficult evidence of gospel-books. For the ninth century, an era of constant debate in Anglo-Saxon studies, our information is restricted to the – albeit precise – information of six capitularies in gospelbooks. All of these sources were, however, written on the Continent and only came to England in the tenth or eleventh century, so that there is not a single witness of genuine Anglo-Saxon origin from the ninth

---

[122] Pg shares some features with Frere's type 'Vitus-4' (Klauser's Δ), Ph with Frere's type 'Vitus-15'. An overall similarity is therefore notable; for details, see Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, pp. 420–8.   [123] For details, see *ibid.* pp. 430–7.

[124] These manuscripts only record the augmented series for the Sundays after Pentecost (type 3) or readings for other indistinct days.   [125] See below, p. 169.

century. This might serve as another piece of evidence that even the basic liturgical rites were on the decline in this century, especially when compared with the situation on the Continent. More continental capitularies are extant from the ninth century (140) than from the tenth (96) or eleventh (101) centuries.[126] For Anglo-Saxon England, one would expect at least the evidence of fragments of lectionaries or marginal notes in older gospelbooks.[127]

Another example which points towards the specific problems of gospelbooks is the comparison of the liturgical traditions in three manuscripts written by a single scribe, Eadwig (Eadui) Basan:[128]

Pg: mixed type 2/3 (predominantly type 2)
Sx: mixed type 2/3 (predominantly type 3)
Vb: type 3 (subgroup Qe, A, F, [Wa], [Wb])

While two sources record different sorts of mixed types, the lectionary Vb follows a very pure form of type 3. It might be argued that Eadui did not stay at one monastery or that the different monasteries he worked at adhered to different traditions. A much more likely conclusion, however, is that gospelbooks are a dubious source for the investigation of Anglo-Saxon liturgical practice.

The great reverence for gospelbooks also accounts for the overwhelming evidence of four (five) capitularies (that is, almost a third of all extant capitularies) written at the beginning of the eleventh century at Christ Church, Canterbury, or Peterborough – Sa, Sb, Sc, Sd, (Se).[129] This great number of copies is certainly not due to their liturgical material and its intentional distribution, since the tradition recorded is not specifically Anglo-Saxon and was presumably already outdated at the beginning of the eleventh century. The additional material was copied painstakingly because of the sumptuousness of the books. This sumptuousness has made them precious and thus durable.[130]

Hence the evidence of the different sources has to be considered in a certain hierarchy: it is only utilitarian documents such as lectionaries and missals which very possibly record the traditions actually in use, as these are functional books

---

[126] See above, p. 156.
[127] From the tenth century, such notes are found, for example, in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. D. 2. 14 (Ni; s. vi–vii) and Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 1. 24 (Nc; s. viii).
[128] On this scribe, see D. Dumville, *English Caroline Script and Monastic History: Studies in Benedictinism, A.D. 950–1030*, Studies in Anglo-Saxon History 6 (Woodbridge, 1993), 111–40 (in particular 120–2) and R. Pfaff, 'Eadui Basan: Scriptorum Princeps?', *England in the Eleventh Century. Proceedings of the 1990 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. C. Hicks, Harlaxton Medieval Stud. 2 (Stamford, 1992), 267–83.
[129] For details, see Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, pp. 193–5 and 442–56. Se (Cambridge, St John's College 73) is a later copy (after 1081?) of Sd.
[130] Heslop, 'The Production of *de luxe* Manuscripts'.

made exclusively for the liturgy. Capitularies, by contrast, require a more careful investigation, as they may reflect an old tradition which was only copied because it was recorded in a magnificent exemplar.

The rubrics to the West Saxon Gospels

In A, some 170 passages are marked as lessons for the Temporale, twenty-five for the Saints' Days and twelve for the *Commune Sanctorum*.[131] The liturgical system added to the text of the *WSG* in A and also the fragmentary F in its main form – type 3 – agrees with other contemporary manuscripts, not only with capitularies, but also with functional books such as lectionaries (Vb), missals (Wa, Wb) and – seen in a wider perspective – the homilies of Ælfric. As the tradition thus agrees with a system most likely in use in the eleventh century, this could provide evidence for A's use as a gospel-lectionary.

The rubrics show, however, a puzzling idiosyncrasy which not only defeats the theory of the manuscript's employment in the liturgy of the mass but also helps to establish the function of the rubrics. Certain rubrics do not record the commonly chosen Roman text, but mark parallel passage(s) from another of the synoptic gospels,[132] a method which is technically called *concordia*. On Sexagesima Sunday Luke VIII.4–15 ('The Parable of the Sower' and 'The Purpose of Parables') is read in all the Roman sources of type 2 and 3. The rubric in A, by contrast, indicates the beginning of the gospel of the day before Mark IV.3. Mark IV.1–12, however, also relates 'The Parable of the Sower' and is thus a parallel text in the synopsis:

56 Sexagesima
       Mark IV.3–(20)[133]   A
○■   Luke VIII.4–15   Na, Nd, Oa, Pa, Pb, Pc, Pg, Ph, Qa, Qb, Qc, Qe,
                                   Sa, Sb, Sc, Sd, Se, Sx, Vb, Vc, Wb, Ya, Yb, Yc,
                                   ZÆ (*CH* II.6)

This item is not the only instance of *concordia* readings. Instead of the regular pericope the parallel passages are recorded for the Wednesday in the fourth week after Epiphany (Matt. VIII.19–22) instead of Luke IX.57–62), Sexagesima

---

[131] For a detailed analysis of the readings and an explanation of the unequal numbers of Temporale and Sanctorale items, see Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, pp. 263–70.

[132] The so-called 'Synoptic Gospels' (Matthew, Mark and Luke) are very similar in contents and structure. Matthew and Luke knew and used the Gospel according to Mark and only added additional material from other sources into its general framework. John is different in both structure and contents, so that there are only a few parallel passages.

[133] As A does not mark the end of the readings, it can here only be surmised from the parallel passages.

(Mark IV.3–(20) instead of Luke VIII.4–15), Quinquagesima (Mark X.46–(52) instead of Luke XVIII.31–43),[134] Palm Sunday (Luke XIX.29–(38) instead of Matt. XXI.1–9) and the twenty-third Sunday after Pentecost (Mark XII.13–(17) instead of Matt. XXII.15–21).

Both the regular pericope and a parallel text are recorded for the Ember Saturday in Lent (Matt. XVII.1–9; Mark IX.2–(8)), the third Sunday in Lent (Luke XI.14–28; Matt. XII.22–(30)), the Wednesday in the third week of Lent (Matt. XV.1–20; Mark VII.1–(23)), the Rogation Days (Luke XI.5–13; Matt. VII.7–(11)), the eighth Sunday after Pentecost (Mark VIII.1–9; Matt. XV.32–(9)), the Ember Wednesday in autumn (Mark IX.17–29; Matt. XVII.14–(21)) and the feast of St Peter (Matt. XVI.13–19; Mark VIII.27–(33)). Two parallel passages are given, in addition to the regular pericope, for the fourth Sunday before Christmas (Matt. XXI.1–9; Mark XI.1–10; Luke XIX.29–38).

Most of the alternative passages are taken from the gospel according to Mark, a very good source for *concordia* readings, as it is a synoptic gospel and one only rarely used in the Roman tradition.[135] The majority of these cases of *concordia* occur for important liturgical days, for example, Sundays and days of fasting, such as the Ember Days or the Rogation Days, liturgical days for which homilies are also generally provided.

These parallel passages are evidently not mistakes by a careless scribe who mixed up the beginning words of the gospels. The correct Latin incipits recorded respectively show that the parallel passages are a deliberate choice. Compare the incipits for the Ember Wednesday in autumn:

Ðys sceal on wodnesdæg to þam fæstene ær hærfestes emnyhte. Et cum uenisset ad turbam accessit ad eum homo genibus prouolutus (Matt. XVII.14).
Ðis sceal to þam ymbrene innan hærefeste on wodnesdæg. Respondens unus de turba dixit. magister attuli filium meum ad te (Mark IX.17).

Among our Anglo-Saxon sources, this provision of parallel passages is unique. There are, however, a number of continental witnesses which share this characteristic,[136] in particular the capitulary in Paris, BN, lat. 325 (Northern Italy/ Piedmont, s. xi).[137] The striking similarities of this gospel-list with the rubrics in A (concern-

---

134 There is no full agreement in this case: the parallel passages are Mark X.46–52 and Luke XVIII.35–43 ('Jesus heals a blind beggar'). A lacks Luke XVIII.31–4 ('Jesus speaks a third time about his death').

135 In Mark there are only twenty-three rubrics compared to seventy-three in Matthew, forty-six in Luke and fifty-seven in John. Seven of those in Mark are parallel passages, so that only sixteen of the rubrics in A are used in the pure Roman tradition.

136 For a group of capitularies which were copied in the German–French area (s. x/xi), see Frere, *The Roman Gospel-Lectionary*, pp. 137–9.

137 For a description of the capitulary, see Frere, *The Roman Gospel-Lectionary*, pp. 200–1, Klauser, *Capitulare Evangeliorum*, p. lx (no. 292) and Lenker, *Perikopenordnungen*, pp. 277–9.

171

ing the plan of the church year, etc.) furthermore suggest a capitulary from the Continent as the exemplar for the liturgical system copied into the rubrics of A.

The function of the rubrics to the West Saxon Gospels

To sum up, the rubrics to manuscripts A and F of the *WSG* are a later addition in one branch of manuscript transmission and are thus not connected with or triggered by the original translation project. Linguistic evidence suggests that the rubrics originated in the south-western area of England at the end of the Old English period. They were copied from a no longer extant exemplar, which probably provided the liturgical information in marginal notes. The liturgical tradition recorded in the rubrics is a very prototypical form of the Roman type 3 and agrees with the type commonly used in the Anglo-Saxon liturgy in the eleventh century.

The manuscripts were, however, most probably not used in the Anglo-Saxon liturgy as gospel-lectionaries. Among our Anglo-Saxon material, there is no (other) indication of an employment of the vernacular for the reading of the gospel of the day. Apart from the lack of signs in the Passion pericopes,[138] and the lack of notes which would indicate the end of the reading in A, the parallel passages in particular contradict this suggestion. Why then was the vernacular translation combined with the contemporaneous liturgical system?

Formally, the similarities of the rubrics to the headings of other manuscripts with homiletic material are striking, in particular the reference to the liturgical day in Old English (or Latin), the provision of the Latin incipit of the text and the formulaic phrases in the Old English part of the rubric. Still more important is the fact that only exegetical homilies show a characteristic which allows for an assumption concerning the function of the parallel passages. Thus in his homily for the third Sunday in Lent, Ælfric exploits both the commonly read pericope Luke XI.14–28 'Jesus and Beelzebul' and its parallel passage in Matt. XII.22–9.[139] In the rubrics of A, both these texts are marked:

81   Third Sunday in Lent

	Matt. XII.22–9	[Ni], **ZÆ (Pope, iv), A**
O■	Luke XI.14–28	Nd, Oa, Pa, Pb, Pg, Ph, Qa, Qb, Qc, Qe, Sa, Sb, Sc, Sd, Se, Sx, Va, Vb, Vc, Wb, Ya, Yb, Yc, **ZÆ (Pope, iv), A**

---

[138] In lectionaries and a number of gospelbooks, liturgical signs are recorded in the Passion pericopes which are read on Palm Sunday (Matt.), Tuesday (Mark), Wednesday (Luke) and Friday (John) of Holy Week. These signs – *c* ('celeriter') for the commentator, *s* ('sursum') for the Jews and *t* (later †; 'tenere, trahere') for Jesus – tell the deacon in which voice and rhythm the part has to be proclaimed. See Young, *The Drama of the Medieval Church*, pp. 101 and 550 and in particular, B. Stäblein, 'Passion', *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* 10 (1962), 886–97.

[139] *Homilies of Ælfric*, ed. Pope I, 259–85.

172

On the third Sunday before Christmas (#259), the passage 'The Coming of the Son of Man' is read in the version according to Luke (XXI.25–33). Accordingly, Ælfric's homily starts with the translation of this pericope. In the exegesis, however, its content is then clarified (cf. 'swutelicor') with the help of the parallel verse Matt. XXIV.29:[140] 'Matheus se godspellere awrat swutelicor þas tacna þus cweþende: þærrihte æfter þære miclan gedrefednysse bið seo sunne aþystrod. and se mona ne sylð nan leoht and steorran feallað of heofonum. and heofenan miht beoð astyrede. and ðonne bið ætywed cristes rodetacn on heofenum. and ealle eorðlice mæigða.' In his homily for Sexagesima Sunday, Ælfric illustrates his exegesis of Luke's version of the 'Parable of the Sower' (see above, p. 170) by a deliberate reference to 'se oðer godspellere'. Luke does not tell how manifold the fruit was, information which Ælfric needs in order to continue with his exegesis on the basis of a homily of St Augustine. The exact numbers are, however, given in the parallel passages Matt. XIII.8 and Mark IV.8:[141] 'Se oðer godspellere awrat þæt sum dæl þæs sædes þe on ðan godan lande asprang. ageaf ðritigfealdne wæstm. sum sixtigfealdne. sum hundfealdne.' These similarities suggest that the function of the combination of the vernacular gospels with the liturgical system is related to the homiletic tradition. A homilist could thus have used the text of the *WSG* for the translation of the gospel of the day into Old English, a feature with which almost all exegetical homilies in the vernacular begin.[142] For the exegesis of the text, a preacher trying to elucidate the deeper meaning of the gospel text might have found help in the vernacular gospel text and other versions of the relevant passage.

Both the linguistic evidence and the continental origin of the exemplar suggest that the rubrics originated in Exeter, the scriptorium of A, in the middle of the eleventh century. Accordingly, the 'Leofric Missal' definitely belongs to the same subgroup as the rubrics in A and F. Furthermore, the agreements with the lessons in the capitulary Qe from Liège become even more intriguing when compared to Drage's analysis of book production at Exeter at Leofric's times:[143]

The study of the manuscripts copied at Exeter or owned by Leofric or his Chapter during his episcopate has enabled us to observe that Leofric brought a mixture of English and continental influences to bear upon his and the Chapter's activities. I believe that the continental influences were especially important. William of Malmesbury

---

[140] *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies*, ed. Clemoes, p. 525.

[141] *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies. The Second Series. Text*, ed. M. Godden, EETS ss 5 (London, 1979), 56.

[142] 'For the contemporary congregations these translations must have had the advantage of novelty to add to their normal interest, for the corresponding lessons were read in Latin. Their presence alters the proportions and the emphasis of the homilies, not only making it desirable to shorten the exegesis but giving some encouragement to simplified interpretations of which the chief function is to emphasize the direct meaning of the gospel itself' (*Homilies of Ælfric*, ed. Pope I, 150).   [143] Drage, 'Bishop Leofric', p. 282.

asserted that Leofric was 'apud Lotharingos altus et doctus'. His adoption of the Rule of Chrodegang . . ., his introduction of a Collectar modelled on that of Stephen of Liège, his importing of continental manuscripts (one of which included miniatures added in the Liège area around 1040) combine to suggest strongly that it was in the Liège area, if not in Liège itself, where there was a community living according to the Rule of Chrodegang, that Leofric was educated.

The evidence for Leofric's connections to Liège and the homiletic function of the parallel passages agrees, since Exeter Cathedral was a secular institution and the canons put much emphasis on preaching. Consider, for example, the instructions in the *Rule of Chrodegang*.[144] 'For þi þonne we gesettað þæt tuwa on monþe, þæt is ymbe feowertine niht, man æfre þam folce bodige mid larspelle, hu hi þurh Godes fultum magon to þam ecean life becuman. And þeah hit man ælce Sunnandæge singallice and freolsdæge dyde, þæt wære betere. And do ma þa larbodunge be þam þe þæt folc understandan mage.' Hence Exeter at the time of Leofric might well have been the place where the vernacular translation of the gospels was combined with the gospel-lectionary then in use. The rubrics to the *WSG* do not give evidence for the reading of the gospel in the vernacular at the liturgically proper time for the gospel during the performance of the mass. However, the text of the *West Saxon Gospels* may indeed have been read to the congregation during the mass – instead of or as part of a homily.

---

[144] *The Old English Version of the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang together with the Latin Original. An Old English Version of the Capitula of Theodulf together with the Latin Original. An Interlinear Old English Rendering of the Epitome of Benedict of Aniane*, ed. A. S. Napier, EETS os 150 (London, 1916), 50 (ch. xlii).

APPENDIX

MANUSCRIPTS AND SIGLA[145]

WEST SAXON GOSPELS (WSG)

■	A	Cambridge, University Library, Ii. 2. 11	xi^{med}, Exeter
	B	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 441	xi^1
	C	London, BL, Cotton Otho C. i, vol. i	xi^1, Malmesbury?
	Cp	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 140	xi^1, Bath
■	F	New Haven, Beinecke Library, Beinecke 578	xi^1, South-East
	H	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 38	xii/xiii, Canterbury?
	L	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Eng. Bib. c. 2	xi^1
	R	London, BL, Royal 1. A. XIV	xii^2, Canterbury

NON-ROMAN TRADITIONS

M Notes (non-Roman traditions)
Notes in *Capitula*-tables

Ma	London, BL, Cotton Nero D. iv	vii/viii, Lindisfarne
Mb	London, BL, Royal 1. B. VII	viii, Northumbria
Mc	Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Amiatino 1	$viii^{in}$, Northumbria

Marginal notes to gospel text

Md	London, BL, Royal, 1. B. VII	[viii, Northumbria]
Me	Durham, Cathedral Library, A. II. 16	viii, Northumbria
Mf	Durham, Cathedral Library, A. II. 17	$viii^{in}$, Northumbria
Mg	Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Amiatino 1	viii, Northumbria
Mv	Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, M. p. th. f. 68	vi, Italy [vii/viii, Northumbria]

'Quasi-capitularies'

Mx	London, BL, Cotton Nero D. iv	vii/viii, Northumbria
My	London, BL, Royal 1. B. VII	viii, Northumbria

---

[145] The dates and places of origin given in square brackets refer to later added (marginal) notes. ○ refers to type 2, ■ to type 3 of the Roman traditions. See above, pp. 160–3.

Ursula Lenker

ROMAN TRADITIONS

N Marginal notes (Roman traditions)

▪ Na London, BL, Add. 40000 x^{in}, Continent [x/xi]
◯▪ Nc Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 1. 24 viii, Northumbria [x, Ely?]

◯ Nd Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, M. p. th. f. 68 vi, Italy [viii, Northumbria]

Ng Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. D. 2. 14 vi/vii, Italy [*ibid.*]
Nh Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. D. 2. 14 vi/vii, Italy [*ibid.*]
▪ Ni Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. D. 2. 14 [ix/x, England]
Nk Stonyhurst College, Lancashire, *s.n.*
(= London, BL, Loan 74) vii/viii, Northumbria

O Gospel-list

◯ Oa Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, M. p. th. f. 62 viii, England?, Continent?

P–S Gospel-lists in gospelbooks

P Gospel-lists (Sundays after Pentecost: Gregorian sections)

◯ Pa Coburg, Landesbibliothek, 1 ix^{med}, Metz?
◯ Pb London, BL, Add. 9381 ix/x, Brittany?
◯ Pc Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 45–1980 ix/x, Brittany?
◯▪ Pg London, BL, Add. 34890 xi^{1}, Canterbury?
◯▪ Ph Paris, BNF, lat. 272 x, Winchester
◯▪ Px Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 381, fols. i and ii ix/x, Continent

Q Gospel-lists (Separation of Temporale and Sanctorale items)

◯▪ Qa Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. D. 2. 16 x^{1}, Landévennec
◯▪ Qb Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 155 xi^{in}, Barking?
◯▪ Qc New York, Public Library, 115 ix^{2}, Landévennec
▪ Qe London, BL, Cotton Tiberius A. ii ix/x, Lobbes (Liège)

S Gospel-lists (Sundays after Pentecost: continuous numbering 1st to 25th/26th Sunday)

▪ Sa Cambridge, Trinity College B. 10. 4 xi^{1}, Canterbury?
▪ Sb London, BL, Royal 1. D. IX xi^{1}, Canterbury?
▪ Sc London, BL, Loan 11 xi^{1}, Canterbury?

176

	Sd	London, BL, Harley 76	xi^1, Canterbury?
■	Se	Cambridge, St. John's College 73	xi^{ex}, Bury St Edmunds
○■	Sx	Hanover, Kestner-Museum WM XXIa. 36	xi^1, Canterbury

T-V Lectionaries
T Full lectionaries with readings for the first and second reading

	Ta	Durham, Cathedral Library, A. IV. 19, fol. 89	viii, Northumbria
	Tb	Oslo, Riksarkivet, Lat. fragm. 201 +	x
		Oslo, Universitetsbiblioteket, Lat. fragm. 9	x
■	Tc	Oslo, Riksarkivet, Lat. fragm. 211	x/xi

U Gospel-lectionaries without reference to the liturgical days

Ua	London, BL, Royal 1. A. XVIII	ix/x, Brittany
Ub	Cambridge, Pembroke College 302	xi^{med}, Canterbury
Uc	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Lat. liturg. f. 5	xi^{med}, Scotland?
Ud	Malibu, John Paul Getty Museum 9	xi^{in}, Canterbury
Ue	Warsaw, Biblioteka Narodowa, i. 3311	x/xi

V Gospel-lectionaries

	Va	London, BL, Stowe 944, fols. 41–9	xi^1, Winchester
■	Vb	Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. xvii. 20	xi^1, Canterbury?
■	Vc	Warsaw, Biblioteka Narodowa, i. 3311	x^2
	Vf	London, College of Arms, Arundel 22, fols. 84 and 85	x^2, Winchester?
■	Vx	Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 88–1972, fols. 2–43	xi/xii, Canterbury?

W Missals

	Wa	Le Havre, BM, 330	xi^2, Winchester
■	Wb	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 579 (Leofric Missal 'A')	$[xi^{med}$, Exeter]
	Wc	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 579 (Leofric Missal 'C')	x/xi
■	Wd	London, BL, Royal 5. A. XII, fols. iii-vi	xi^{med}, Worcester
	Wf	London, Society of Antiquaries 154*	x^{ex}, Winchester?
	Wh	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 422	xi, Sherborne
	Wi	Bergen, Universitetsbibioteket, 1549.5	xi/xii
■	Wj	Oslo, Riksarkivet, Lat. fragm. 204, fols. 1–4 and 9–10	xi^{med}
■	Wl	Oslo, Riksarkivet, Lat. fragm. 207, 208, 210	x/xi, Winchester

177

■ Wm Oslo, Riksarkivet, Lat. fragm. 228 xi^2

■ Wn London, BL, Harley 271, fols. 1* and 45* xi^{ex}

   Wz Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 391 xi^2, Worcester

X   Homilies (non-Roman tradition)

Xa   Beda (ed. Hurst 1955)

Y   Homilies (Roman traditions)

■ Ya   Paul the Deacon (ed. PL 95, 1159–66)

■ Yb   Smaragdus (ed. PL 102, 13–552)

■ Yc   Haymo (ed. PL 118, 11–804)

Z   Vernacular Homilies

■ ZÆ   Ælfric (*CH*1: ed. Clemoes 1997; *CH*2: ed. Godden 1979, ed. Assmann
        1889, Irvine 1993 or Pope 1967–8)

  ZBl   Blickling Homilies (ed. Morris 1874–80)

  ZDiv various Old English homilies (see Cameron 1973)

  ZVer Vercelli Homilies (ed. Scragg 1992)