

118. Durham, Cathedral Library A.II.17

“The Durham Gospels” + “The Uncial Leaves”

[Ker 105, Gneuss 220/221, Lowe 2.149/150]

(with 67. Cambridge, Magdalene College Pepys 2981 [19])

HISTORY: Durham MS A.II.17 is made up of approximately half the complete text of one Gospel book, “Durham Gospels”, and the fragment of another, “Uncial Leaves.” Both are from the late 7c or early 8c, and were written at Lindisfarne and Wearmouth-Jarrow, respectively.

“Leaves” is a single quire, of part of Luke, written in uncial and spaced *per cola et commata* as it was adopted for Biblical use in the 7c, and in layout and script closely resembling the Codex Amiatinus (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana Amiatino I). The quire was written in Wearmouth-Jarrow; both Lowe (*CLA* 2, no. 150) and T.J. Brown (in Verey et al. 1980: 49) suggest it was done in the time of Abbot Ceolfrith (680–716). It is now bound after “Durham,” a book of similar date written in long lines of half-uncial, probably at Lindisfarne. “Durham” now begins with 18 chapters of John, contains approximately three chapters of Matthew, 14 chapters of Mark, and ends with Luke, from which substantial internal material is missing. The incompleteness of Luke seems to provide the rationale for the presence of “Leaves” — that both were incomplete at the time they were bound together. In the 10c the book migrated for a time to Chester-le-Street along with other mementos of the times of St. Cuthbert. Ill-formed and perhaps childish scribbles in Latin and OE from mid-10c Chester-le-Street (as shown by age of script and reference to Bishop Aldred [944–968]) appear in at least seven places in the two different texts, suggesting the mid-10c as the earliest possible date by which we can locate “Leaves” and “Durham” in the same scriptorium. A poem on Æthelstan in a late 10c/early 11c hand on f. 31v was also added, most likely while the manuscript was at Chester-le-Street (Lapidge 1981: 84).

[Note: Verey (in Verey 1980: 63–64) suggests that “Durham” was relatively complete in the 10c, and that its mutilation — and the reduction of “Leaves” to one quire — took place later and over a gradual period of time. On f. 2r there is a 16c inscription

by Thomas Swalwell (Chancellor of Durham, d. 1539), ‘C. Ewa(n)gelia I(ohann)is | marci & luce no(n) glo. de la splendement’ [*i.e.*, “spendement” book-room], indicating that John at that time stood first, so 1539 is the terminus ad quem for the reordering (on Swalwell’s hand see Piper 1978: 228–30 and pls. 60, 62, 69.)

The four slightly cut-down leaves, ff. 38₁–38₄ of “Durham,” contain the only remaining part of Matthew as well as part of the *Capitula* of Mark; they are the outer bifolia of a quire of 10, 38₁/38₄, 38₂/38₃, and were for a considerable length of time bound into Durham A.II.22 (Alexander de Hales, “*Postillae super Evangelia*,” s. xiii) as front and back end-leaves, as the Durham librarian Thomas Rud (fl. 1717–1726) notes in his Durham catalogue (Rud 1825: 21). Rud mentions “*folia sex (tria in initio, totidem in fine)*.” They remained a part of A.II.22 until well into the 19c and missed the foliation that now determines pagination in A.II.17, as is clear from the supplemental and recent (post 1961, cf. McGurk 1961) nature of their numbering.

The editors of the “Durham Gospels” facsimile painstakingly analyze the main text and corrections to it, and the prefatory and marginal material, concluding that the exemplar for “Durham” was an Italian type of gospel-book which was then corrected against the prevailing type of gospel-book in the North; thus the corrections that were made were in general a revision of the Italian original against an Italo-Northumbrian type but with no real attempt to create a clear comprehensive assimilation of the two. Verey (in Brown 1972: 244) sees work by the same correcting hand in both “Lindisfarne” (London BL, Cotton Nero D. iv [206] and “Durham.”

[Note: According to Verey, “the most probable conclusion to be drawn from the evidence is that ‘Durham’ derives from a text-type close to O [Oxford, Bodleian Bodley Auct. D.2.14 (339)] (or possibly O itself), imported from Italy, that the same type was later followed in Q [“Book of Kells” (Dublin, Trinity College 58 (A.1.6)] John, and that the link between O(X) [Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 286 (47)] and Q John goes through, or very close by, “Durham” itself. With the exception of the Hebrew Names, nothing in the prefatory material appears to derive from the Irish in Northumbria” (Verey 1980: 73).]

Evidence for type and tradition can also be gleaned from material added to the gospel-texts by the main corrector. “Eusebian sections,” first introduced by Jerome, divide the gospel-texts into “episodes” to facilitate a comparison of parallels common to two or more gospels, and are a hallmark of the Vulgate tradition. The parallels themselves are numbered and set out in the so-called Canon Tables which were compiled by Eusebius of Caesarea (fl. 4c) and are frequently included in Hiberno-Saxon gospel-books. While “Durham” has lost all trace of any Tables it might have contained, it is also possible that the presence in its margins of not only the Eusebian section and table numbers, but also reference to the numbering of the parallels

themselves, may have obviated the need for them, and hence may indicate a different tradition from that of the Hiberno-Saxon texts. A comparison of “Durham”’s liturgical marginalia, noting temporal pericopae against those of other books, shows that the main corrector was working from an Italo-Northumbrian archetype of most probably a Neapolitan origin (cf. Verey in Verey et al. 1980: 26–28).

Capitula divisions for the four gospels were not standard in the early Middle Ages but instead were differentiated into families; these divisions were often grouped and summarized as a table of contents before each gospel. “Durham” preserves only one such list, showing a Capitula division type that creates a “somewhat anomalous” situation (Verey in Verey et al. 1980: 19); its closest summary list family is identified with 8c Canterbury books which nevertheless differ considerably in style from the northern Lindisfarne type to which “Durham” itself belongs. Those two partial gospel Prologues (Mark and Luke) that remain in “Durham” belong to a somewhat-heretical Prologue tradition of monarchianism which blurs the distinction among the Persons of the Trinity. That such Prologues were so inherently arcane and difficult to understand may explain why heretical material remained in canonical texts as late as the 8c. But while the Capitula and Prologue material suggest a more Italian orientation, a list of Hebrew Names in Mark relocates “Durham” back within the Hiberno-Saxon tradition. The inclusion of these Names that probably derive from Jerome is perhaps another example of the influence of early Irish scholarly preoccupation with eclectic learning (Verey in Verey 1980: 23). The order of all three items of the prefatory material, and their individual peculiarities of type (Capitula family from southern England and probably the continent, the Irish tradition of the Hebrew Names, and the non-Hiberno-Saxon texts of the Prologues) renders “Durham” unique as a witness to this particular combination of elements (cf. Verey in Verey et al. 1980: 20–23, Chapman 1908).

The “Uncial Leaves” fragment at the back of “Durham” contains Luke 21.33 (‘caelum et terra’)—23.44 (‘in nonam horam’) on ff. 103–111, omitting Luke 22.26–33 through loss of the outer column of f. 105. All of the codicological evidence that can be gleaned from this fragment points circumstantially to an Italian gospel-book as source, and yet careful study has shown that the complete book to which “Leaves” belonged was written not only in England but by an English scribe whose source was an Italo-Northumbrian exemplar, and that it is textually similar to the “Lindisfarne Gospels” in content. Turner (1909: 538–39) was convinced enough by similarities between the two to posit the original “Leaves” codex as the exemplar from which “Lindisfarne” was copied, while Mynors (1939: 15) rejected this

claim. Verey (in Verey et al. 1980: 32–34) has re-examined Turner’s suggestion and noted that while the remnant of “Leaves” is too slight to prove Turner’s contention, the textual agreements are indeed compelling and the relationship between “Leaves” and “Lindisfarne” remains at least plausible, given the degree of accord between them (see the discussion by Brown in Verey et al. 1980: 50–51).

In 1701, George Hickes procured three lines of text cut from f. 70 (probably already missing nine lines of text and colored capital) for Samuel Pepys’ Calligraphical Collection, which now forms Cambridge, Magdalene College Pepys 2981 (19) [67]. Durham A.II.17 has left its Community of St. Cuthbert (either at Lindisfarne, Chester-le-Street, or Durham itself) for a lengthy spell at least twice since its creation in the late 7c. It was loaned to Richard Bentley, master of Trinity College, Cambridge, around 1716, and not returned until 1739, and it is said that he wrote the ownership inscription on f. 1r. It was also lent to Humfrey Wanley in 1702 until at least 1704 (see Heyworth 1989:186–87 and 198), *pace* Verey, who thought its absence from Durham accounted for Rud’s need to consult Wanley’s *Catalogus* for a description, and thought also that Wanley’s own diary (3 June 1723) showed that he relied in turn on yet another source for his catalogue entry, either George Wheler or George Hickes himself (Verey et al, 1980: 65–66). Gneuss identifies this codex as D2 in his listing of Liturgical Books (1995: 108). Listed (but not collated) by Wordsworth and White as ξ (1889: 1.xxvii).

CODICOLOGICAL DESCRIPTION: Foll. 108 + 9, irregularly foliated in pencil ‘2–102 + 103–111’: doubling occurs for ff. 70, 70., 75, 75. and 80, 80.; ff. 38., 38₂, 38₃, and 38₄ recently foliated [ff. 80v, 80,r appears on a supplementary fiche, see “Photo Notes”]. Quires of 10, except quire VIII of 8 leaves and X and XIV of 12. Original quire signatures occur intermittently but most have been cut off or lost or were never entered (details in “Collation”). Prior to its 1975–1976 rebinding, A.II.17 had been rebound in the 19c and before that, most probably in the 16c or just later. Study done during the most recent work shows that the quires were stitched together before text was added. The “Durham” folios were pricked for ruling from the recto through each individual quire, and the sheets seem to have been ruled on both sides. The “Leaves” folios were pricked and ruled from the recto, with rulings done for two or three leaves at a time. Most of the “Durham” leaves are calfskin, the remaining total representing more than sixty calves; however some of the finer and paler folios may have been sheepskin.

“Durham” (ff. 1–102): The vellum of “Durham” is thick, has some wormholes and other damage apparent in it, and is in places very discolor-

ed. Page size is ca. 340 × 260 mm., trimmed slightly at the top; many pages have been trimmed at the bottom, to ca. 285 × 260 (ff. 7, 11, 18, 19, 21, 30, 33, 37, 40–46, 48, 49, 53–56, 57–64, 65–66, 68, 86, 88–89, 94–95, 99); ff. 50 and 51 have been cut but membrane not removed. Top third of f. 70 (8 lines of writing) trimmed (see “History”). Top half of f. 75 has been trimmed, losing 9 lines. Ff. 38,–38₄, long bound in another codex, are trimmed to 335 × 260 mm. Writing areas have a width of 185/195 mm. and a length of between 245 and 265 mm. Ff. 2–38 (John) have 21 long lines, while 38,–102 are ruled for 22 long lines. Ruled after folding, pricked both sides, single bounding lines. The text of “Durham” is written out in long lines of half-uncial with many pages having last lines ending in formal insular minuscule; punctuation done by two hands, one pointing as if *per cola et commata* (cf. Verey in Verey et al. 1980: 17). Many colored capitals, colored and ornamented single words that begin Eusebian sections or verses, and highly colored and ornate phrases in text letters or large initials: these all have dark-brown outline, some with red dot patterns surrounding them, and most with one or more of green, yellow, or violet as filler (on ornamentation, see Coatsworth in Verey et al. 1980: 54–58). One full-page incipit initial for John remains (f. 2r), initials outlined in black with green inner band, enclosing an animal interlace pattern, white on black ground, touches of rose, terminals of interlace, spiral and trumpets in black and yellow (cf. Alexander 1978: 40; Coatsworth in Verey et al. 1980: 59; color plate in Verey et al. 1980, pl. II). One full-page illustration remains (f. 38₃r), of the Crucifixion, Christ bearded and robed, seraphim to left and right of hirsute head, below on left Longinus with spear, Stephaton on right with sponge, colors mauve, yellow, purple, orange, green, and blue-green, cross outline with green and filled with orange, frame green, interlace in lower borders made of yellow dots (cf. Alexander 1978: 41 and pl. 202; color plate in Verey et al. 1980, pl. I); this page shows signs of having been used as a pastedown according to Mynors (1939: 17), though Coatsworth blames water damage, probably from 19c efforts to flatten the page (Coatsworth in Verey et al. 1980: 53; but Verey *ibid.*, 64, confirms it was used as a pastedown in Durham A.II.22). Running titles, ‘secundum’ on the verso and the evangelist’s name on the facing recto, appear throughout the book in red vegetable ink.

[Note: The layout and script of this book closely resemble those of the “Book of Durrow” (Dublin, Trinity College 57) and “Echternach Gospels” (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 9389), perhaps both written and decorated by the “Durham” scribe himself. T. J. Brown and Bruce-Mitford saw an identical hand writing, decorating, and illustrating “Durham,” “Echternach,” and very close to that of “Lindisfarne” and

“Durrow” (Bruce-Mitford in Kendrick et al. 1958–1960: 2.1, 100–2, 246–50; cf. T. J. Brown 1972: 227–35).]

The main correcting hand, shared by the “Lindisfarne Gospels” (BL Cotton Nero D. iv [206]), worked on “Durham” both before and after the rubrication was added; it is to the corrector that we may ascribe the *per cola et commata* punctuation, and the marginal Eusebian numbering, liturgical notations, and Capitula references. M. P. Brown suggests that this repunctuation of “Durham” occurred “after the textual recension used in the Lindisfarne Gospels became available” (M. P. Brown 2003: 253), making *per cola et commata* a later, rather than earlier, addition to the book. The Capitula divisions appear in the margins opposite their gospel-texts; they are generally red bold half-uncial, placed between sets of one or more puncti and a stroke, and are similar to the red numbers that refer to the Eusebian Canon tables. The liturgical notations for lectional pericopae occur mostly in the left-hand margins, and almost all appear in a rectangular frame, at times using *signes de renvoi* to clarify the specific incipit.

“Leaves” (ff. 103–111): the text is spatialized *per cola et commata* in two columns of 22 lines, double-ruled; pricked on inner and outer edges and with double bounding lines on each column, written in uncial proper. Page size differs from “Durham,” measuring ca. 300 mm. × 255 mm., trimmed, writing area ca. 250 mm. × 195 mm. F. 105 has lost its outer column. The membrane (Verey 1980: 16 says “probably sheepskin”) for this book differs considerably from that of “Durham” as it is finer, of superior quality, having far fewer instances of natural damage before the addition of the text, and is white rather than tan. All leaves that remain have their hair-sides outside (HHHH). “Leaves” begins and ends in Luke, overlapping with some of the Lucan material at the very end of “Durham”. It has running headers in rustic capitals drawn in script ink every other opening, and this contrast in script resembles Italian book layout. While there are no colored illustrations or letters within the fragment of “Leaves” that remains, red is used in the margins for Eusebian and Capitula numbers.

Within the body of “Durham”, colors are better or more poorly preserved depending on the state of the vellum in that part of the book. The artist used the forms of birds and beasts to invigorate his capitals, or left them shaped with complex strand outlines against an uncolored or monochromatic background. Ornamental motifs of fret, fold, dot, curvilinear, and interlace patterns were employed to create the unusual complexity out of which the zoomorphic forms emerge into capitals throughout the book. Only three full-page decorations survive out of what must have been a wealth of exceptional Northumbrian artwork. These pages that remain

have all suffered damage from wear or ignorant binding methods: they are the monogram page (f. 2r) that opens the Gospel of John, the interlace frame on f. 38₃r, and the Crucifixion scene that fills f. 38₃v, which has been expertly described by Coatsworth (in Verey et al. 1980: 58–63). The conclusion to be drawn from an examination of the art in “Durham” is that it is related in style and date to the “Lindisfarne Gospels”, although some shared iconographic significance can be found with Monkwearmouth-Jarrow sculpture of roughly the same period.

At least seven awkward inscriptions made by a late 10c hand, perhaps of a student, can be found in both parts of Durham A.ii.17: four occur in the “Durham” section at ff. 79r, 80r, 80v, and 96v (the last an incomplete alphabet, cf. Keefer 1997), while three more occur in “Leaves” at ff. 104r, 105r, and 106r. They are of about the same age, datable to the episcopacy of Aldred at Chester-le-Street, between 944 and 968. The same immature hand apparently added drawings in “Leaves” as well at f. 104r and f. 106r, while a drypoint doodle on f. 104r is contemporary but by a better artist. Fragmentary Latin verses stand in the lower margin of f. 31v: they shift in expertly between caroline minuscule and pointed insular minuscule and may again be attributed to 10c Chester-le-Street. F. 74v (the baptism and genealogy of Christ) was neumed probably in the late 10c. Shaky attempts to copy parts of the text appear on ff. 34v and 35v, while pen trials abound in the margins of ff. 36v, 38v, 74v, 80v, 86r, 91r, 94r, and 98r. Thomas Swallow (chancellor of Durham, d. 1539) added the library inscription on f. 2r (top). Rebound 1975–1976 by Roger Powell (cf. Powell in Verey et al. 1980: 108–11), replacing a 19c binding. There is evidence of rebinding in the 16c or a bit later.

COLLATION: Foll. 108 (i + 70, 75, 80 dupl. + three unnumbered after 38.) + foll. 9. F. 1 + I¹⁰ lacks 1, sig. ‘R’ on f. 10v (ff. 1, 2–10); II¹⁰ wants 5–6, sig. [‘S’] cut away from bottom of f. 18 (ff. 11–18); III¹⁰ sig. ‘T’ (ff. 19–28); IV¹⁰ sig. [U] not visible on f. 38v (ff. 29–38); | V¹⁰ two conjoint bifolia, wants three inner bifolia after 2, sig. ‘F’ on f. 38₄v (foliated ‘38., 38_{2,4}’); VI¹⁰ wants 2 and 3, sig. [G] trimmed from f. 46v (ff. 39–46); VII¹⁰ sig. [H] trimmed from f. 56v (ff. 47–56); VIII⁸ sig. [I] trimmed from f. 64v (ff. 57–64); IX^{10?} wants 4/7 and 8–10, sig. [K] not showing at bottom of f. 69v (ff. 65–69); X¹² wants 2, 3, 8, 9, sig. ‘L’ on f. 75*v (ff. 70, 70., 71–75, 75.); XI¹⁰ sig. [M] lacking (ff. 76–79, 80/80., 81–84); one quire wanting; XII¹⁰ wants 1, 2, sig. [O] not visible on f. 92v (ff. 85–92); XIII¹⁰ sig. [P] not visible on f. 102v (ff. 93–102). “Leaves” XIV¹² wants 10, 11, 12 (ff. 103–111).

[Note: The collation generally follows Verey in Verey et al. 1980: 28–31. The reconstruction of quire X as of 12 is somewhat conjectural but Verey considers it the most likely. At least 96 and perhaps as many as 118 folios are missing through cuts at or before the original fold. An 18c librarian has added quire signatures immediately below or beside last lines on first rectos, of course leaving out ff. 38,–38₄: ‘A’ (f. 2r), ‘B’ (f. 11r), ‘C’ (f. 19r), ‘D’ (f. 29r), ‘E’ (f. 39r), ‘F’ (f. 47r), ‘G’ (f. 57r), ‘H’ (f. 65r), ‘I’, ‘I², ‘I³, ‘I⁴, ‘I⁵, ‘I⁵’ (ff. 70–74 rectos), ‘K’ (f. 76r), no sigs. visible on f. 85r or 93r. Probable collation of “Durham” before the move of John (and disregarding “Leaves”): (Matt.) i [+ A–E¹⁰], F¹⁰; (Mark) G–H¹⁰, I⁸, K¹⁰; (Luke) L¹², M¹⁰, [N¹⁰], O–P¹⁰, [Q¹⁰]; (John) R–U¹⁰, [X⁴]

CONTENTS:

f. 1rv blank except for early modern ex libris on recto (top).

“Durham,” nos. 1, 3–5 (ed. of Gospels, Wordsworth and White 1886, this manuscript collated as ξ; marginal liturgical notes pr. Turner 1931: 217, and, more correctly, Verey in Verey et al. 1980: 26–27):

1. ff. 2r–38v Gospel of John 1.1–19.33, wants 6.54–7.26: (16c *ex libris* at top) INCIPIT EUANGELIU(M) | SECUNDUM IOHANN`em´ | ‘IN PRIN|CIPIO | ERAT UERBUM . . . nisi manducaueritis’ [between ff. 14v–15r a bifolium wanting, wants rest of 6.53 to 7.26] ‘Numquid uere cognouerunt’; ends imperfect: ‘ad ie(su)m (autem) cum uenissent’.
2. f. 31v (bottom margin, 4 added lines of late 10c/early 11c square insular minuscule) Fragment of poem (ca. 927) in praise of King Æthelstan: ‘+ Quarta dirie gressus . . . uiuit rex adelstanum. | Costantine’ (ed. Lapidge 1981: 87; text also in Cotton Nero A. ii ff. 10v–11v [203]).
3. ff. 38_r–38_r [3 leaves, three inner bifolia wanting after f. 38₂] Gospel of Matthew 25.35–28.20, wants 26.34–28.16: ‘sitiui & dedistis . . . (f. 38₂v/22) Ait illi Ie(su)s’ [wants rest of Matt. 26.34 to 28.17] (f. 38_r/1–14) ‘& uidentes eum adoraue|runt’; ends: ‘ad consumma|tionem saeculi’.

[Note: The Matthew pages are heavily trimmed on the outer edge, cutting into the text.]

- f. 38_v full-page illustration, Crucifixion Page, inscriptions: (upper margin) ‘Scito quis & qualis est qui talia cuius titulus cui | nulla est inuenta passus pro nobis p(ro)p(ter) hoc culpa’; (top of cross) ‘hic est | ie(su)s rex | iudaeor(um) | initi(um) & finis | A Ω’; (by angel on right) ‘ut|ru(m)q(ue) | sibi | d(omi)ne | [. . .]’; (right margin, first letters angling from top) ‘Auc/torem mortis deieciens uitam nostram restituens si tamen conpatiamur’; (left side) ‘Surrexit a mortuis [sedet ad] dexteram patris’; (lower margin) ‘ut nos cum resuscitados simul & regnare

[. . .]'; (above left lower figure) 'Longinus' (detailed description of page, Mynors 1939: 17; Coatsworth in Verey et al. 1980: 59).

4. ff. 38₄r–69v Mark:

a. ff. 38₄r/1–39r/8 Mark Capitula List of 13 brief summaries, corresponding to de Bruyne's B family, McGurk's B(13) (McGurk 1961: 113, 115): **INCIPIUNT TITULUM SECUNDUM MARCUM**. | 'DE IOHANNE BAPTISTA | & uictum & habitum eiusdem | babtizatus ie(su)s & tempatus | uicit'; ends: 'Iudicium principum quo condemnat [sic] | ie(su)m passio ie(su) & sepultura & resurrectio (eius)' (ed. de Bruyne 1914: 282–86, cf. 598; cf. Wordsworth and White 1886: 174–86 ["I"] capitula) and discussion by Verey in Verey et al. 1980: 18–21).

b. f. 39r/11–17 Hebrew Names, derived from Jerome, "Liber Interpretationis Hebraicorum nominum": 'ABBA syrum. pater . . . siue | electus pacificis' **finis inter. nominum ebreorum** (cf. Verey in Verey et al. 1980: 23–24, color reproduction of f. 39r, pl. III; another in Mynors 1939, frontispiece).

c. f. 39r/19–39v/22 Prologue to Mark (partial): **incipit argumentum** | 'MARCUS euangelista | d(e)i & petri in | in [sic] babtismate'; ends imperfect: 'ut instituens | nos ad intellegendum singula in breui conpingens nec' (ed. Wordsworth and White 1886: 171–72).

[Note: Two leaves wanting after f. 39, containing the rest of the prologue; illustration; opening of Mark; Mark to 1.12.]

d. ff. 40r/1–69v Mark 1.12–16.14, lacking 14.66–15.17: '& statim sp(iritu)s expellit . . . (f. 67v/22) alapis eum cedebant' [one leaf wanting, breaks off after Mark 14.65, resumes at 15.17] (f. 68r) 'plectentes spineam coronam'; ends imperfect: 'recumbentib(us) illis xi apparu(it)'.

[Note: Four leaves cut out after f. 69. The top third of f. 70, containing 8 lines of writing, has been trimmed off. Part of this is preserved as Cambridge, Magdalene College Pepys 2981 (19) [67] preserving three lines of writing.]

5. ff. 70r–102v Luke:

a. f. 70rv Prologue to Luke (partial due to trimming of leaf): 'obiit in bythiniam . . . principio euangelii iohannis || . . . [in]perabilis d(e)i praedicans . . .'; ends imperfect: 'quod operantem agricolam oporteat' (ed. Wordsworth and White 1886: 269/4–270/3, 270/9–271/5; cf. textual note 9).

[Note: Two leaves wanting after f. 70 contained the rest of the prologue/capitula?; illustration/opening of Luke to 1.8.]

b. ff. 70,r–102v Gospel of Luke 1.8–22.2, wanting from 2.22 to 3.11 and from 8.37 to 12.42: 'ante d(eu)m secundum consuetudinem . . . (f. 73v/22) eius secundum legem / moysi'; (two folios wanting; then f. 74r) '& qui

habet escas . . . qui fuit matthat (f. 75r, top third of leaf cut away) . . . qui fuit nathan . . . 'qui fuit dei' || (f. 75v) 'esuriit Dixit (autem) illi diabolus . . . (f. 84v/22) a legione. & rogauerunt illu(m)'; (after f. 84 next quire, probably of 10, plus first two leaves of following quire wanting, then f. 85r) 'super familiam suam'; ends imperfect (Luke 22.2): 'quomodo eum inter|fic(i)ent timebat uero plebem intrauit (autem)' [a number of erasures at the bottom of f. 102v].

[Note: On ff. 74v–75r, genealogy is in two columns; on top of f. 74v, verses 3.21–23 have been neumed (see note by David Hiley in Verey et al. 1980: 35); top of f. 75 has been cut off, losing parts of 3.29–31, 3.3.34–36, as indicated above.]

6. ff. 103r/1a–111v/ "Leaves," Luke 21.33–23.44, written in double columns, *per cola et commata*: 'caelum et terra | transibunt'; ends imperfect: 'usq(ue) in nonam hora(m)' (text transcribed, Turner 1931: 199–216).

[Note: The missing outer column of f. 105rv contained from Luke 22.26 to 22.33, 'praeces|sor est sicut [ministrator . . . dixit ei domine tecum] paratus sum'.]

The Chester-le-Street additions: In "Durham", f. 79r (bottom) 'et multitudo copiosa plebis' (copying the line above); f. 80r (bottom) 'nolite iudicare et non iudicabicamini' (from two lines above) | 'boge mesepreost god preost | mantat'; f. 80,v (bottom) 'boge messepreost | god preost'; f. 96v (top) an insular alphabet 'b-o' in crude but faint letters of a similar type. In "Leaves", f. 104r and f. 105r (top) 'in nomine domini'; f. 106r (top and in space between columns) 'boge messe preost god preost | aldreð god biscop | aldreð | aldreð'. "Aldreð" is doubtless Bishop Aldreð of Chester-le-Street, 944–968. The Æthelstan poem (no. 2) was in all likelihood added when the manuscript was at Chester-le-Street.

PHOTO NOTES: On the film the opening ff. 80v–80,r has been skipped. Verey (in Verey et al. 1980: 15) notes that ff. 80–80, form a bifolium of much thinner, limper membrane than the other leaves and that the foliator probably therefore skipped f. 80, and so for the same reason, apparently, did the photographer. The opening is supplied on a supplementary fiche. The "Boge" inscription on f. 80,v is too faint to show up on the film but is visible in the printed facsimile.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Alexander, J. J. G. *Insular Manuscripts, 6th to the 9th Century*. A Survey of Manuscripts Illuminated in the British Isles 1. London: Harvey Miller, 1978. [no. 10]

- Brown, M. P. *The Lindisfarne Gospels: Society, Spirituality and the Scribe*. London: The British Library, 2003.
- Brown, T. J. "Northumbria and the Book of Kells." *Anglo-Saxon England* 1 (1972): 219–46.
- Chapman, Dom J. *Notes on the Early History of the Vulgate Gospels*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908. [p. 7]
- de Bruyne, Donatien. *Sommaires, Divisions et Rubriques de la Bible Latine*. Namur: Auguste Godenne, 1914.
- Kendrick, T. D., T. J. Brown, R. L. S. Bruce-Mitford, H. Roosen-Runge, A. S. C. Ross, E. G. Stanley, and A. E. A. Werner, eds. *Evangeliorum Quattuor Codex Lindisfarnensis*. 2 vols. Olten and Lausanne: Urs Graf, 1956–1960.
- Gneuss, Helmut. "Liturgical Books in Anglo-Saxon England and their Old English Terminology." In *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England: Studies Presented to Peter Clemoes on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Michael Lapidge and Helmut Gneuss, 92–141. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985. [D.2, p. 108]
- Heyworth, P. L., ed. *The Letters of Humfrey Wanley: Palaeographer, Anglo-Saxonist, Librarian, 1672–1726*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- Keefer, Sarah Larratt. "Another Pre-Conquest Inscription in Durham Cathedral Library MS A.II.17." *Journal of the Architectural and Archaeological Society of Durham and Northumberland* 13 (1997): 65.
- Lapidge, M. "Some Latin Poems as Evidence for the Reign of Athelstan." *Anglo-Saxon England* 9 (1981): 61–98.
- Lowe, E. A. *Codices Latini Antiquiores: A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century*. Part II, rev. ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972 [orig. publ. Oxford, 1934–1971].
- , *English Uncial*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960. [p. 19, pl. 13]
- McGurk, Patrick. *Latin Gospel Books from A.D. 400 to A.D. 800*. Les publications de Scriptorium 5. Paris-Brussels/Anvers-Amsterdam: Aux éditions "Erasmé" /Standaard-Boekhandel, 1961. [no. 13*]
- Mynors, R. A. B. *Durham Cathedral Manuscripts to the End of the Twelfth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939. [nos. 3, 4, pls. 2, 3 and frontispiece]
- Piper, A. J. "The Libraries of the Monks of Durham." In *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts and Libraries: Essays Presented to N.R. Ker*, ed. M. B. Parkes and Andrew G. Watson, 213–49. London: Scholar Press, 1978.

- Rud, Thomas. *Codicum manuscriptorum Ecclesiae Cathedralis Dunelmensis catalogus classicus*. Durham: F. Humble, 1825.
- Turner, C. H. "Iter Dunelmense." *Journal of Theological Studies* 10 (1909): 529–44.
- , ed. *The Oldest Manuscripts of the Vulgate Gospels*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931.
- Verey, Christopher, T. Julian Brown, and Elizabeth Coatsworth, eds. with an appendix by Roger Powell. *The Durham Gospels (Durham, Cathedral Library, MS A. II. 17)*. Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 20. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1980.
- Wordsworth, John, and Henry J. White, eds. *Nouum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine secundum editionem Sancti Hieronymii*. Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889

S. L. K.