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Both writing and reading are performances invisible to medieval historians but nonetheless implicit in the material artifact of the manuscript. While it proved hard to reconstruct the writing process in a composite manuscript like Durham A.IV.19, as attempted in chapter 3, the presence of different scribes copying different texts also offers an unusual opportunity to see a community reading and studying together. The manuscript artifact allows us to enter the “thought world” of this “textual community.” Textual communities are defined not by literacy per se but by the role that written texts play as cultural resources or authorities in defining the community’s identity and values. Consequently, the writing, emending, and glossing evidenced in a manuscript artifact sheds light on the evolution of religious

formation as the community engaged in thinking about texts, as well as performing them in daily life.

The textual community visible in the additions made to Durham A.IV.19 in the late tenth century reveals something about the thought world at Chester-le-Street, both in terms of scholarship and of education, partial as that vision may be because of the fragmentary nature of the additions. On the other hand, this hybridity of the manuscript artifact is in some ways an advantage because it reveals process more than product. The additions show us scribes from a variety of clerical ranks interacting with texts and by implication each other. While the presence of scribes implies a scriptorium—even if that was not a physical room—so too the presence of teaching and study devices, particularly in Aldred’s contributions, implies pedagogical relationships between the master and a schola, even if Chester-le-Street did not have a schoolroom. Consistently throughout Durham A.IV.19, we see Aldred as glossator, scholar, and teacher acting in particular ways in relation to the texts, but have to imagine his interlocutors, extrapolating from the scribal personalities we see in the additions correlated with what we know in general about education in early medieval religious communities.

Monastic study and education of the type that might inform our understanding of the Chester-le-Street community, secular though it was, can be gleaned from Benedictine practice, as found in the Rule of St. Benedict and its Anglo-Saxon reform incarnation, the Regularis concordia. The Rule specified that books should be checked out to each monk during Lent, with time set aside during the day for reading and reflection depending on the season. Novices were also instructed in the daily office psalms and other rituals through a process of reading and recitation. The Regularis concordia elaborated on the Benedictine process of instruction in specifying reading (lectio) for junior monks, habits of the mind then implemented individually and privately in the devotional prayer (oratio) of senior monks. In its warning about excessive speed in the chant, the Regularis concordia exhorts the monks to chant “distinctly so that mind and voice agree and that we may thus fulfill the words

---

2. Although as noted in chapter 1 the Regularis concordia presumably postdates Durham A.IV.19, elements of its liturgical reform do appear in the Chester-le-Street additions, as discussed in chapter 4.


of the apostle: *I will sing with the spirit, I will sing also with the mind.* This distinction between mind (*mens* or *geþang* ) and spirit (*spiritus* or *gast*) is also reflected in the relationship between *lectio* (*rædan*) and *oratio* (*gebed*), one an intellectual activity, the other a spiritual one, but clearly interdependent. The relationships between exteriority and interiority, memory and devotion, the book and the heart, was a complex, symbiotic one that Aldred addresses in his gloss.6

In the context of meditative reading from a written text, the change from verbalizing aloud or with lips moving to silent reading was variable, with arguments pro and con for the benefits of one over the other.7 Certainly reading aloud slows down the reading process, allowing for greater attention to word units, while silent reading is more rapid, possibly allowing for greater interior reflection on the sense rather than the words. In a pedagogical setting, both strategies of oral *lectio* and silent *meditatio* might be deployed for different effects, as hinted at in the *Regularis Concordia* emphasis on *lectio* for novices until they have internalized the texts. Memorization of texts, either for corporate performance or private devotion, involved both eye and ear, with repetitive patterns of “listening, reading, reciting, and repeating” with some readers taking the text deeper through “intensive” reading of familiar texts.8

Likewise, the symbiotic relationship between writing and reading in early medieval pedagogy reveals a complex set of processes for teacher and student.9 Malcolm Parkes correlated the four functions of reading from antiquity with three Anglo-Saxon equivalents: *lectio* (*rædan*), *emendatio* (*enarratio* (*areccan*), and *iudicium* (*smeagan*).10 *Lectio* (*rædan*) involves discretion, or in modern terms,

---


“decoding” the letters to identify words and syntactical units, which would, for the writer, editor, or reader, shade over into the second stage of **emendatio**, correcting or adjusting the text. But **lectio** also entails **pronuntiatio**, verbalization or performance of the text that might assist with memory and meditation as well. The third process, **enarratio** (*arecian*) involves a conversation with the text, and possibly therefore between writer, reader, and audience. In moving beyond the literal, this stage might employ the strategies of Biblical exegesis with the four (or three) senses of Scripture.\(^{11}\) In the early medieval period, the duality of historical and spiritual/allegorical, using the analogies of body and soul, letter and spirit, was a common and dominant means of Scriptural exegesis in homilies and theological treatises; Anglo-Saxon liturgy and preaching emphasized the allegorical or spiritual sense (*gastlic andgıt*).\(^{12}\) The final stage, **iudicium** (*smeagan*) brings the reader to application. For a monastic reader engaged in **meditatio**, here is where **lectio** crossed over into **oratio**.

Glossing functioned as a tool for writing and reading at all of these stages, such that the presence of a written gloss gives us a rare opportunity to uncover some of these processes, and a vernacular gloss as found in Durham A.IV.19 adds a linguistic twist to it. In particular, Durham A.IV.19’s additions may shed light on the more misunderstood and controversial aspects of learning to read and write in the early Middle Ages in regards to the aural and oral components. While dictation to scribes seemed the norm in antiquity, in the medieval era a shift to visual copying manifested in changes of format and style of writing.\(^{13}\) But the oral component did not disappear entirely: teachers might vocalize or require their students to vocalize the text while writing; some scribes may have verbalized the text quietly or interiorly while copying from an exemplar; or the written text might trigger aural memory that could contribute to orthographic deviance from the exemplar.\(^{14}\) Some of these are visible in the additions to Durham A.IV.19.

Indeed, the interconnectedness of writing, reading, teaching, and performing goes to the heart of understanding Durham A.IV.19’s composite texts.

---


Nonetheless, this book’s chapters engage in an artificial separation of these tasks: chapter 3 focused on the scriptorium and writing, chapter 4 engaged with *oratio* in the performance of the liturgy, while the present chapter examines scholarship and teaching. This separation is justified on the grounds that certain aspects of Durham A.IV.19’s additions give more insight on academic study and the processes of learning, while others reveal more about ritual prayer. Consequently, this chapter examines scholarly reflection and pedagogy in Aldred’s glosses to the liturgical materials and in the glossed additions made at the end of Quire XI, often characterized as “educational.” But first, there is one text that more than any other allows us to listen in on a pedagogical conversation between a student and teacher, in Aldred’s instruction of Scribe B as they wrote and read the John poison prayer together.

**Learning to Write and Writing to Learn: Scribe B**

Scribe B’s one text, the prayer against poison attributed to John the Beloved, is heavily corrected as well as glossed by Aldred (QVIII.1; fol. 61r11–22; image 12). The nature of his errors and the ways that Aldred responded implies that the two of them labored over the text at the same time, yet not consistently. A close paleographic analysis of what Scribe B wrote and how he wrote it, along with Aldred’s corrections and gloss, can be read as a narrative of the writing process and as a dialogue between the two that reveals the stages of *lectio, emendatio, enarratio,* and *iudicium.* It produces a rather odd story line. More than likely, Aldred set Scribe B the task of copying this prayer from an exemplar and then walked away, coming back on occasion to check on his progress. If the task had purely pedagogical purposes—teaching writing or Latin—then a wax tablet would have served better than using precious parchment. That he copied the text into an existing quire of collectar material suggests that the prayer had intrinsic value in the additions being made to Quire VIII, regardless of Scribe B’s competency. Given some of the potentially aural errors of orthography and missing words, Scribe B may have been copying letters and words, either from oral dictation or visual copying, without understanding what he was writing. Aldred may himself have read parts aloud and required Scribe B to recite portions, perhaps even as the glossing took place.15 That the text contains a number of unusual Latin words even Aldred struggled to understand adds to this picture of a student learning to identify sounds and letters via an unfamiliar vocabulary.

---

15. See Saenger, *Space between Words,* 49 on visual copying errors by scribes not understanding the language. Parkes, “*Rædan,*” 8, notes how a beginner would read aloud so the teacher could assess a pupil’s progress; see also Parkes, *Their Hands before Our Eyes,* 9.
Scribe B’s first letter, an oversized minuscule “d,” is thin and shaky. The width of his nib was too narrow for an enlarged initial, more appropriate for the size he pursues in the rest of his text. If his exemplar had an enlarged or decorated initial, Scribe B did not have at hand the tools or artistic skill to replicate it. Both versions of this prayer in the ninth-century Book of Cerne and Book of Nunnaminster have a decorated “d” at the beginning, although there is no compelling evidence to suggest that one of these books was his exemplar. Aldred produced several enlarged or lightly decorated initials of the type attempted here by Scribe B, both in his own work as well as supplying those missing in the original collectar. Perhaps Scribe B imagined an illustrator or Aldred going back over it, if not himself, with a more appropriate tool.

Scribe B’s abbreviations, where he used them in the first two lines, are anomalous yet occur on commonly abbreviated words: spiritus, abbreviated to spis, omnia abbreviated to oia and then onis for omnis. If his source, aural or visual, offered no abbreviations on these words, then Scribe B may have invented his own because he was either unaware of or had forgotten the standard versions. But he made no more attempts after this, spelling out every word. Either he stopped himself or Aldred intervened after the second line.

In that second line (fol. 611r12) Scribe B also made two other errors, qui instead of cui and an abbreviation mark over sunt for no apparent reason. The “q” for “c” could be a simple copying error where one might expect “who” after the Trinitarian formula, or an auditory error. The lack of correction by Scribe B as he continued the line could also represent an ignorance of Latin grammar in the phrase, cui omnia subiecta sunt (“to whom all things are subject”), especially given the extraneous and inexplicable abbreviation mark over sunt. Aldred slashed through the “q” with his red ink and wrote a “c” above it, but does nothing about the sunt. Aldred’s gloss to this entire line runs high, right under and within the descenders of the first line above it, perhaps to avoid conflict with his corrections, which presumably he did first. Perhaps he conversed with Scribe B while he corrected and glossed, explaining the grammar of the text to him.

In his third line, Scribe B corrected another error, either on his own or at Aldred’s behest. He wrote potes tes for potestas (fol. 611r13); he then put a dot under the “e” and added an “a” above it. This could be either an eye skip or reduplicating error, combined with poor understanding of the Latin text. Indeed, he lacks three words found in the other five insular versions, two of

---

16. Cerne, Cambridge, University Library MS L.1.1.10, fol. 79r6; Nunnaminster, BL Harley 2965, fol. 37r12.
18. The Book of Cerne and the Book of Nunnaminster use the standard abbreviation sps scs but neither abbreviate omnia and in general include minimal abbreviations, mostly of the deity.
them predating Durham A.IV.19. He may have tried to remember too large of a soundbite from the text and dropped a word. Nothing in Aldred’s gloss acknowledged these lacunae, either because the exemplar also omitted them or because neither Aldred nor Scribe B scrupulously checked the exemplar (unless the omissions were intentional).

Aldred apparently focused initially on Scribe B’s individual letters, as in the “c” for “q” error. In the fourth line of the text, he corrected one of Scribe B’s letter “a”s.20 Scribe B had been making his “a” in a square fashion, probably with three strokes: an “L” shaped down minim hooked to the right at the bottom; a flat top producing temporarily what would look like a minuscule “t”; and a closing minim on the right. The one Aldred noted in *uipera* (fol. 611r14) resembles a ligature “ti” even more so than Scribe B’s other “a”s. Aldred’s pointed “a” added above looks to be made quite deliberately, perhaps even slowly: the first curved stroke sloping left to right downward has an angled turn in it. Nonetheless the result is more like Aldred’s two-stroke rounded “a” found in his insular gloss than the boxy efforts of Scribe B to produce a Latin square minuscule “a.”

Curiously, Aldred himself employs four different styles of “a,” most commonly in his gloss the pointed “a” as here and a somewhat similar open-headed form.21 Although Aldred’s use of a similar (albeit more competent) square form is rare in his gloss, it is common in his Latin texts, visible for example throughout the encyclopedic additions to Quire XI.22 Perhaps his teacher’s own variability in script between and within his Latin and Old English texts confused Scribe B. Following Aldred’s correction, Scribe B attempted to employ a more pointed, or at least less boxy, “a” in subsequent lines, with mixed success. The two remaining “a”s in line 14 are still squarish although it looks as if at least one began with an effort to create a curved bowl (in *rubeta*), or perhaps he had already written them before Aldred came along and corrected the one in *uipera*. But in the next line (fol. 611r15), he got off two curved bowl, pointed “a”s in the first word, *rana*, and of the five “a”s in the next line, he managed four of them, only having to top off the middle one in *uenera* with an extra stroke. Thereafter, the style of “a” varies between the two forms (fol. 611r17–19), finally reverting


21. Ker, “Aldred the Scribe,” 8, notes these four: “the common pointed *a*, an open-headed *a* usual in the combination *æ*, a straight-topped *a*, and an *a* which resembles Caroline *a*.” T. J. Brown, *Durham Ritual*, 25, notes that the open and the pointed are more common in Durham A.IV.19, but the other two do occur.

22. The square “a” in his vernacular gloss is visible in the original collectar at fol. 446r (ondetra glossing *confessorum*) and line 7 (topifyga glossing *adequamur*). T. J. Brown, *Durham Ritual*, 25, notes the “hairline” quality of the sloping top bar (and thus an indication of a pen angle of 30°). Scribe B’s strokes are quite heavy-handed by comparison, suggesting changes in pen angle that create overall a very uneven aspect to his text.
to his more comfortable square “a” in the last three lines (fol. 61rr20–22). Maybe Aldred had walked away or ceased to focus on that particular issue.

Further modification of Scribe B’s letters, whether at Aldred’s instigation or not, occurred with “x” and “s.” Scribe B’s first two letter “x”s in expatues/cit (fol. 61rr13) and in extinguitur (fol. 61rr15) are larger than his standard height and consequently awkward looking, as if he tried to form it from two “c”s back to back, rather than forming one slanted line followed by crossing line(s). The next two “x” letters are smaller and more clearly balanced (noxium, fol. 61rr16 and noxia, fol. 61rr17), although the one at the end of line 18 (exlingue) is less so. The nearest exemplars would have been the manuscript from which he was copying (if that is what he was doing) and the text of Scribe O immediately above, who has a fine insular “x” in lines 4 and 9. But Scribe B never really mastered the insular “x” with its below-the-ground line flourish.

With the letter “s” Scribe B generally used the insular form (minim descending below the ground line, curved finial added top right). But in the first letter of scs (sanctus, fol. 61rr12), the first and last letter of scorpius (fol. 61rr15), and the first in salutis (fol. 61rr18) he used a curved uncial or insular majuscule “s.” Notably, Scribe B did not attempt a majuscule “s” in his opening word Ds (Deus) or in the rest of the line as occurs in other texts, only attempting it in the “s” beginning line 12 (scs). These majuscule “s”s seem to be somewhat random scribal experiments, perhaps modeling on an exemplar in majuscule. In the case of the majuscule “s” in line 18’s salutis, however, it may be related to an error he corrected in the previous word, aduersae. He apparently wrote first aduer followed by salutis, with some possible erasure under the first letter or two of salutis. Then he went back and added to adver an elevated “se.” This corrected error might have an aural cause: if Scribe B heard aduersae salutis slurred, he might have omitted a syllable, which would again indicate a poor grasp of the Latin.

Scribe B’s remaining three orthographic errors corrected by Aldred are all the same: “d” for “t” in words that in Latin could not possibly have a “d”: habed (fol. 61rr20) and ud, twice in line 21. As with qui for cui in line 12, Aldred slashed through the offending letter with his red glossing ink and then added “t” above (although it is not evident above the first ud combined with his gloss abbreviation þ’t(e). Scribe B probably made these errors in sequence, only to be caught when Aldred returned to correct and gloss this passage. However, the

---

23. The letter “x” is often the measure for the letter height (Parkes, *Their Hands before Our Eyes*, 59, 87). Insular minuscule “x” can be two strokes, the first slanting downward left to right, the second proceeding upward from bottom left (below the ground line) to upper right, which is how most of Aldred’s “x”s appear to have been made (unlike Carolingian minuscule, which uses three strokes). I attempted Scribe B’s “x” both ways, as two curved lines back to back and as two intersecting lines, producing similar results either way.

24. Nunaminster uses majuscule “s” except at the end of words; Cerne uses majuscule only in the titles or opening line.

25. The “s” connects to the final stroke of “r,” making it appear to be an “l.”
nature of Scribe B’s error is curious. Either he mistook “d” for “t” in the script of his exemplar, or it is an aural error, hearing “d” for “t” in the voice of someone reciting it aloud or hearing it in his head that way.26 In either case, it indicates a weak grasp of written Latin and begs the question as to why this type of error does not occur elsewhere in the text, except perhaps in the case of qui for cui in the second line. Perhaps toward the end he became careless in copying, evident in both the letter “a” and the “d” for “t,” and lacked Aldred’s oversight until he had finished.

Aldred’s Northumbrian Old English gloss undoubtedly also formed part of the conversation with Scribe B about the Latin text. Indeed, his glossing continues over to the next page of Scribe C’s work for several lines, as if they had kept on with the lesson exploring Latin vocabulary and orthography (QVIII.2). For example, he deployed Old English compounds otherwise unattested, even if that meant ignoring a common Old English word in favor of a calque, in some cases a redundant compound that breaks down the Latin word into its constituent parts. For example, Redemptor glossed with eftlesend (fol. 61v8) combines eft (again) as a literal rendering of re, and lisan (to loose) to produce “release” as implied in redemptor, especially in the sense of manumission of slaves.27 Since Aldred used lesend for redemptor in the original collectar (fols. 10r11, 15r8), the addition of eft here must be to emphasize to Scribe B the meaning of the Latin syllables. In the next line, Auctor vitae glossed with frumwyhrta lifes (fol. 61v9), literally “first-wright” of life, invokes the idea of God as creator, the original craftsman.28 In other cases Aldred liked to vary his gloss with different Old English words for the same Latin, seen in Scribe B’s text (QVIII.1) with subiecta glossed with underbeged (fol. 61r12) and then underðiodded (fol. 61r13), perhaps to teach the student scribe the range of meanings in the Latin.

But the unusual vocabulary in the St. John prayer that Scribe B copied proved particularly challenging for this exercise, perhaps intentionally: Aldred may have deliberately given Scribe B a text containing words even he was hard-pressed to translate in order to improve Scribe B’s copying skills. The names of various poisonous reptiles unknown in the British Isles forced Aldred to gloss with a more limited variation on words for venom and venomous creatures than the Latin. Draco (fol. 61r14) was easy enough, since dræcca (draca) and its compounds occur regularly in Old English. With uipera, he offered a commonly used word, hatt[er]ne (ettern), adding a Northumbrian “h” in the first

26. Chaytor, “Medieval Reader,” 56, notes this effect of aural memory on final consonants; see also Parkes, Their Hands before Our Eyes, 66.
27. DOE eftlesend; cf. alysend, a more commonly used term. Aldred uses a similar compound, onlesende, to gloss one of the alphabet words in QXI.54 (at fol. 88vb3), the panther, allegorized as Christ the Redeemer: Nemar id est christus iesus he glosses onlesend þ’ is crist se hæl’. See note below to Boyd, “Aldrediana XXV,” 51–55.
28. DOE frumwyhrta; Aldred also uses the compound frumcyppend to indicate the creator.
instance (fol. 61r14). In subsequent uses, he dropped the “h” and used variations of *attorn*, with related *attor*, for *uenenosus* and/or *uires* (fol. 61r16, 19, 20). But the Latin terminology for frogs and toads derived from Pliny, Aldred either misunderstood or deliberately used literal translations as calques: Aldred took *rubeta* (fol. 61r14) as the verb to redden (*sceomiende*), though the text goes on to identify it as *rana*, glossed as *tosca*, a poorly attested Old English word, presumably for frog. Frogs appear in the Bible as one of the plagues of Egypt (Exodus 8:1–15) and as unclean spirits emerging from the mouth of the dragon (Revelation 16:13–14); hence they have a primarily demonic reputation in Christian literature.

Similarly, line 17’s *froeciera* *repentia*, Aldred glossed *ða* *rifista* *feerræsenda*, using a participle again as a substantive. In this case, *repentia* (*repens*) for *reptio* (crawling, creeping, and by extension, reptile) is a rare attestation but found in all versions of this prayer, including the apocryphal source. But Aldred employed a unique verbal compound of *fær* (sudden, as in danger) and *ræsan* (to rush, violently), working from the primary meaning of Latin *repens* and *repentinus* as sudden or unexpected action. Whether he was unaware of the rarer reptilian variant, he clearly knew that the word referred to a creature since he prefaced it with *ða*, and picked up on the demonic element. Aldred also used this compound in glossing the *Lindisfarne Gospels*’ Luke 8:33, describing the herd of demonic pigs rushing over the edge of the cliff. In Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 819 (fol. 8r7, on Proverbs 3:25), he glossed *repentino* (“sudden disaster”) with *id est diabolum*, and overall interprets this Proverb in terms of demonic threats. At the very least, these gloss translations show how Aldred was thinking about the sense of the words in context and perhaps using them to teach Scribe B Latin vocabulary and grammar, as well as a Christian worldview.

With other mysterious reptiles, he either reused a common word or transliterated, perhaps as a name. *Scorpius* (fol. 61r15), a continental arachnid not found in Northumbria, was presumably known from scientific and astronomical references, but Aldred took it to be a variation on snake and glossed it with *nedre* (adder). With *spilagius* (end of line 15), he repeated it in an abbreviated

---

29. See DOE, *draca*; *attren*—*attorn*, with note that in Northumbrian glosses (*e.g.*, Aldred), the adjective (poisonous) is used as a substantive for the poisonous creature, as here.


32. DOE, *feerræsan*; Bosworth and Toller, *ræsan*.

33. At the end of the preceding line (16), he has glossed *adbu* with *geet l* with no alternative after the *vel*, perhaps looking ahead to the problematic phrase.

34. There, *ferræs* glosses *impetu* (DOE).

35. Pictures in *herbarium* and *quadripedibus* manuscripts might have given a clue as to the creature’s appearance, if Aldred had access to such texts.
form as spîleg but adds se ætt’ne, perhaps assuming Spilagius was the name of a
snake, similar to rubeta called rana in the previous line. Line 15 is hampered not
only by the omitted quieta modifying torpescit (the evil frog rana put to sleep
quietly) but by the absence of regulus, another poisonous creature found in the
other versions, which might have proved just as mystifying as spilagius.36

Notwithstanding the lack of specific equivalents, the Old English ade-
quately conveys the noxiousness of these threats to human health and well-
being (salutis). Both the Latin and the Old English vocabulary carried double
meanings for both physical and spiritual threats: the dragon as devil, venom
(attor) as the reek of hell, and poisonous elements (ættern) as malevolent and
malignant. Aldred might also have had in mind the Ecclesiastical History’s open-
ing description of snakeless Ireland in what some take to be a joke on Bede’s
part: that not only do reptiles traveling on shipboard to Ireland die on arrival,
but Irish manuscripts can be scraped into water as a cure for snakebite, a tidbit
of information derived from Isidore of Seville.37 Even so, the absence of these
poisonous reptiles does not preclude the possibility of some malefactor import-
ing venom to the isles.

Nonetheless, the low risk of venomous reptiles in Britain and Ireland com-
bined with the insular popularity of this prayer suggests that it was not the
animals that attracted attention, but rather the power of God against demonic
evil, which might of course include human agency in poisoning or spreading
evil, as was the case in the apocryphal story of John challenged to drink a
poisoned cup. However, compared to other versions of this prayer extant in
Anglo-Saxon England, Scribe B’s text stands alone and lacks context. Cop-
ies in prayer books and medical texts include a preface or prologue, some of
which emphasize the medicinal value and others the power of prayer or of
John’s name. Given the liturgical nature of the additions in these quires, the
latter meaning is more likely, although the pedagogical opportunity may be
the dominant motive for the text’s inclusion. If Scribe B was starting out at
the low clerical rung of exorcist, this would be an appropriate text for him
to learn as a liturgical remedy for demonic threats. What discourse Aldred
had with Scribe B about the theology and application of this prayer remains
uncertain, although the gloss if done with Scribe B present, as seems likely,
offered an intriguing opportunity both to teach Latin and Christian apotro-
paic ritual.

36. Regulus, despite its primary meaning as a petty king, is used in the Vulgate to refer to a serpent
(Lewis and Short; Isaiah 30:6; Proverbs 23:32; and Jerome, commentary on Isaiah). Spalagius, spelled in very
different ways, probably because its meaning was unclear, apparently refers to either a venomous fly or spider
and appears in the Old English Herbarium as well as Pliny (Pettit, Anglo-Saxon Remedies, II: 81–82). The omis-
sion of regulus also leaves Aldred glossing two verbs in a row, extinguitur uinctur (gidrysnad f’cvmen).
(University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991), 49–50 and Roger Ray, Bede, Rhetoric, and
Speculative as this scenario is, the inconsistencies in copying from either dictation or an exemplar and the way the corrections and glossing intervened nonetheless demonstrate that one way or another, scribe and master interacted during the copying process. As a consequence, this particular text offers the closest we can come to a conversation between Aldred and a student over a text in Durham A.IV.19. But can we also imagine a student or a communal group of readers for his other glosses and additions? The first part of this chapter examines the nature of Aldred’s glossing in Durham A.IV.19 in terms of his own needs as well as the ways in which it might have drawn in others. The second part examines the so-called educational additions at the end of Quire XI as linguistic exercises done perhaps in the presence of and for the benefit of a group of Chester-le-Street scholars gathered around him.

THINKING AND TEACHING: ALDRED’S GLOSSES

Aldred’s contributions to the Chester-le-Street scriptorium seem to have an eye for the confluence of ritual performance, spiritual reflection, and education: glossing Latin prayers with vernacular, correcting Latin errors here and there, copying practical prayers and encyclopedic texts. The materials he included in the first half of Quire XI before the Cuthbert collects and the unusual field prayers at the beginning of Quire IX fall into the same category as what the other scribes were copying, liturgical supplements for the performance of the daily office, blessings, and other religious services. But only he glossed Latin texts in the vernacular Old English, and this seems to be his particular gift to the community as evidenced in the Lindisfarne Gospels and in Durham A.IV.19. While his Latin was not error-free, the monumental nature of the tasks he set himself in glossing all four Gospels and a large liturgical manuscript may account for occasional lapses and misreadings. He was relatively well educated, with access to other manuscripts, commentaries, and vernacular translations and with an interest in reform ideas and texts. His Northumbrian Old English gloss is word-for-word, not a readable syntactic gloss, suggesting a focus on language itself. Bilingual glossing and macaronic text are evidence of a conversation between Latin and non-Latin based vernacular languages, as found in the Irish tradition carried on by the Anglo-Saxons, in addition to Latin interlinear and marginal glossing of texts also engaged in by Aldred in Bodley 819.38 That

Aldred glossed the older and more venerable *Lindisfarne Gospels*, and not the Durham Gospels held also at Chester-le-Street, suggests that vernacular glossing was a high-status enhancement. As such, his gloss of liturgical and other material in Durham A.IV.19 indicates that the manuscript project was a valuable contribution to the life of the community at Chester-le-Street.

The literature on glosses and glossaries in Anglo-Saxon England is large and expanding, in part building on the Dictionary of Old English and Corpus (DOE). Aldred’s vernacular glosses have been of particular interest to language specialists because they offer a rare glimpse of Northumbrian differences from West Saxon standard and because they anticipate developments in Middle English. The “Aldrediana” series of articles initiated by Alan Ross compares not only the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and Durham A.IV.19 glosses to one another but also to other vernacular glosses and lends insight to Aldred’s environment and achievement. This work on Aldred’s glosses is formidable but still incomplete, so the aspects noted here are examples rather than a comprehensive survey.

What has emerged so far from a comparison of Aldred’s glosses to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and to Durham A.IV.19 shows that he did the former first, not only because many features that he altered over the course of the *Lindisfarne* gloss were consistent by the time he did the Durham gloss, but also because the latter gloss shows his expanded knowledge of Latin vocabulary (while the Bodley 819 gloss was probably done between). Moreover, Aldred’s Northumbrian dialect was modified by West Saxon, Celtic, and some Old Norse linguistic features, hinting at multiple cultural currents in his experience.

---


41. Indeed, an electronic database of his glosses and abbreviations would allow greater statistical analysis.

42. Alan S. C. Ross, “A Point of Comparison between Aldred’s Two Glosses,” *N&Q* 25 (1978): 197–99, compares the only Gospel passage in Durham A.IV.19 to the *Lindisfarne Gospels*, showing different vocabulary, with an unglossed word in Lindisfarne supplied in Durham. See below on Bodley 819.

The contemporary MacRegol Gospels manuscript (formerly Rushworth), a ninth-century manuscript of Irish provenance, illustrates how Chester-le-Street might have served as a central library and scriptorium for the surrounding region, and also highlights the unusual, independent nature of Aldred’s glossing. The MacRegol Gospels were similarly glossed in Old English at Harewood (likely, but not definitively, a dependant house in West Yorkshire) by two scribes, a Northumbrian named Owun and a Mercian priest named Farman, around the same time as, and influenced by, Aldred’s gloss of the Lindisfarne Gospels. The MacRegol Gospels has an original colophon (fol. 169v) recognizing the four evangelists and the scribe in a design of six boxes as well as two colophons by the glossators, one after Matthew and another after John, just as Aldred does in Lindisfarne (discussed in chapter 2). By a complex set of linguistic analyses, Alan Ross and others have shown that Aldred’s gloss influenced both the Northumbrian and the Mercian gloss of the MacRegol, to such a degree that the two manuscripts must have been in physical proximity to one another. Since it is unlikely that the treasured Lindisfarne Gospels would have been transported to a small house like Harewood, it appears that some time in the late tenth century the MacRegol Gospels were brought to Chester-le-Street where Farman and Owun could work with access to Aldred’s Lindisfarne gloss and perhaps other exemplars.

Aldred’s vernacular glosses in the Lindisfarne Gospels and Durham A.IV.19, combined with other evidence, tell us something about what Aldred knew, read, and thought. To gloss the Gospels in Lindisfarne, he utilized variant Latin


versions, not just the Latin on the page in front of him, as well as other vernacular translations.\textsuperscript{46} Moreover, Aldred did not just translate the Latin word for word literally but varied between calques on the Latin and etymological and linguistic reflections to interpretive glosses showing a knowledge of commentaries and allegorical meanings, often offering more than one translation linked with a \textit{vel}.\textsuperscript{47} With place names and personal names, he might offer a literal, a generic, or an allegorical meaning, in place of or in addition to an abbreviated or anglicized version of the name. Thus, for example, Aldred’s glosses on Hebrew names demonstrate knowledge of patristic sources and metaphorical meanings of texts, such as Jerome, either directly or mediated through other sources, like Isidore of Seville.\textsuperscript{48} In another case, his gloss of Christ the Redeemer on “leopard” shows Aldred was familiar with the \textit{Physiologus} typologies.\textsuperscript{49}

Aldred’s knowledge of Bede and some of his work is demonstrated both by his Latin gloss on Bede’s Commentary on Proverbs in Bodley 819 (image 20) and by his possible use of Bede’s translation of John in the \textit{Lindisfarne} gloss of that Gospel.\textsuperscript{50} Between the \textit{Lindisfarne} and Durham A.IV.19 work, Aldred added to Bede’s Commentary on Proverbs Latin expansions of the lemmata (to provide the whole text of the proverbs) and \textit{id est} exegetical comments often of an allegorical nature, but only through fol. 50v.\textsuperscript{51} As with the \textit{Lindisfarne Gospels} gloss, Aldred’s work in Bodley 819 reinforces the significance of this manuscript as part of the community’s heritage and Aldred’s role in enhancing that heritage while passing it on to the next generation.\textsuperscript{52}


\textsuperscript{47} See Alan S. C. Ross, “Rare Words in Old Northumbrian,” \textit{N\&Q} 29 (1982): 196–98, on calques as a source of rare words in Aldred’s work; Boyd, \textit{Aldred’s Marginalia}, 56–57, on his knowledge of Scripture and commentaries based on the \textit{Lindisfarne} gloss; and Hines, “Scandinavian English,” 409–10 on Old Norse variants with \textit{vel}.


\textsuperscript{49} Fol. 88v3 in QXI.54; see Boyd, “Aldrediana XXV,” 51–55.


\textsuperscript{51} The first quire is missing; evidence suggests it was missing in the twelfth century when a copy was made in Harley 4688, which ignores Aldred’s additions. \textit{Cod. Lind.}, Vol. 2, Bk 2, p. 33, notes that the appearance of Aldred’s hand in Bodley 819 from fol. 19v onward is “large and rough,” details the similarities to the \textit{Lindisfarne Gospels} and Durham A.IV.19 to establish Aldred as scribe, and suggests that the first part was done before Durham A.IV.19 and the later part closer to the time of Durham A.IV.19.

\textsuperscript{52} Anne Lawrence-Mathers, \textit{Manuscripts in Northumbria in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries} (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), 21.
Overall, Aldred’s vernacular glosses to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and Durham A.IV.19 illustrate his skill as a translator, but also his esoteric interests.\(^5\) Indeed the esoteric quality of his linguistic interests begs comparison to Alcuin and Aldhelm whose scholarship flourished in much more rich and sustaining environments than Aldred found himself in at Chester-le-Street. R. L. Thompson went so far as to comment: “One cannot but admire the conscientiousness of a glossator who should not merely insist on glossing something so eminently unglossable as proper names, but take counsel with other manuscripts for the purpose!”\(^4\) Despite certain errors and confusions, some of which are more apparent than actual, Aldred was a conscientious and knowledgeable glossator and commentator.\(^5\) Further, his linguistic variations, like the “Littera me pan-dat” marginal verses in the *Lindisfarne* colophon, suggest an interest in bilin-guality itself as a means of reflection on different interpretations; not only does he often prefer abnormal forms but he was also in the habit of writing variant letters above a word, not to mention using the runes for *dæg* and *monn* instead of the spelled words.\(^6\)

Moreover, the idea of glossing service book prayers was unusual if not unique, suggesting a rather lively mind and set of interests at work in Durham A.IV.19 at Chester-le-Street. Three aspects of Aldred’s glosses and the “errors” that he committed in the additions to Durham A.IV.19 reveal something of his educational and reflective aims.

First of all, besides the original collectar, Aldred only glossed his own additions to Durham A.IV.19, with the one exception discussed at the outset of this chapter, Scribe B’s text on fol. 61r and the first few lines of Scribe C’s text on the verso.\(^5\) And, as discussed in chapter 4, of the benedictions copied, Aldred only glossed his own field prayers and Scribe B’s John poison prayer, both texts with Irish roots. Aldred’s habit, therefore, was to gloss what he wrote for his purposes, while the texts copied by his fellow scribes remained their own work designed for their, perhaps different, purposes. The exception of Scribe B thus stands out as a case for Aldred instructing a pupil with a writing exercise.

---


4. Thompson, “Aldrediana V,” 35, n. 51; see also M. Brown, *Lindisfarne*, 100, for a similarly positive assessment.


5. Some of Scribe C’s blessings in Quire IX duplicate materials found in the original collectar that Aldred did gloss there. T. J. Brown, *Durham Ritual*, 26, notes that Aldred’s glossing is “rather better” on his own texts than others, e.g. Scribe O in the original collectar.
Second, Aldred’s ability to gloss every single word but then stop glossing mid-text, evident at fol. 61v and in other parts of the manuscript, suggests that the glossing is related less to textual units and more to vocabulary. Aldred assiduously glossed every word, common or uncommon, repeatedly, even very familiar texts and incipits like the Pater noster. He fully glossed extremely abbreviated Latin, perhaps because the Old English mattered more than the Latin, the latter needing only a couple of words and letters to evoke the full text known by heart. Yet at the same time he did not finish glossing every text. At the opening between quires VII and VIII in the original collectar, where Scribe E copied a duplicate hymn over erasure (fol. 53v), Aldred skipped glossing the unerased facing page (fol. 54r) and picked up mid-sentence on the verso. Aldred’s gloss also changed in Quire XI on the sets of psalm incipits just before the Cuthbert collects and colophon on fol. 84r. While the penitential psalm incipits for Prime were fully glossed except for the title, the section for Tierce beginning at fol. 83rb22 is completely unglossed; meanwhile, the section titles for Sext, None, Vespers, and two all-purpose sets are glossed but not the psalm incipits. These latter glossed section titles are rubrics, red instructions specifying the use to which these psalms may be put, glossed in a contrasting ink than previous glosses. As explained in chapter 4, these glossed titles would aid those who might have already memorized the Latin psalm but needed assistance with reading the Latin instructions. Further evidence of the incompleteness of the gloss as part of an ongoing thought process is the frequency of vel without an alternative word following. Many of these absent words, as well as the cases where an alternative is included, involve reflections on interpretation or places where he was searching for a synonym to vary the translation of two different Latin words.

Third, some revealing oddities show how Aldred’s mind worked while glossing Latin that he may have copied some time before he added the gloss.

---


59. For example, in the Gallican capitella material (QXI.33–36), note the extreme Latin abbreviations while still glossing fully (tenebris shortened to “te” but glossed ðiostro, fol. 78rb18, cf. 78vb4, 79vb23), as well as the glossing of some titles (fol. 78ri) and “amen” (fol. 78r9).

60. See, for example, at fol. 82va13–14 and again at fol. 82va21 (QXI.41), where he glosses tabernaculum with hosincl vel with no alternative both times. In the first instance, it may be because of the redundancy of hus over domus that follows (Ps. 131[132]:3, 3). Or perhaps he was searching for a theological understanding of the tabernacle as something other than literally a small house; at fol. 87ra15–16 in discussing the hostiarium in the ecclesiastical grades, he glosses tabernaculum with hus temple. More examples of vel glosses and vocabulary reflections are discussed below in the section on the encyclopedic additions.
Although not all errors or omissions were rectified, Aldred corrected himself regularly, showing that he read over what he had written. Occasionally he went into the margin to add what he considered important modifications. Sometimes vocabulary interested him so much that he varied his Old English, offered alternative grammar, or committed seeming errors, all of which suggest word-by-word translation rather than sense in context of the passage.

For example, Aldred has several glossing variations involving _ecce_ in relation to _eternus_, a Latin word he clearly knew and understood in most instances. In one of the field prayers (QIX/X.14b), he emended the gloss of Latin _eterne_ from Old English _aces_ to _acres_ with the addition of an “r,” reflecting his concern with fields; the reverse happens on fol. 27v2 when he glossed _sempiterne_ with _ecce_, a line below _sempiterne_ glossed as _ecce_. In another instance, the phrase eternal life is reversed in a way that reflects Old English word order overtaking the Latin: at 78ra9 (QXI.33; image 15), while glossing Latin _in uitam aeternam_ he initially glossed _uitam_ with Old English _ecvum_ and then added Old English _life_ above that. The Old English word _ecce_ seemed to hold a broader or multifarious meaning for Aldred, since he also used it to gloss forms of _hodiernus_ (today); conceivably this reflects an exegetical understanding of “day” as sometimes referring to an “eternal now” in Neoplatonic and Augustinian thought.

61. At fol. 81rb24 (QXI.38n) he added an abbreviation mark to the Latin while doing the Old English gloss in different ink. At fol. 81rb17–20 he added a missing text to the capitella (QXI.38L) with both the Latin and the Old English gloss in black and using similar letter forms, suggesting that it was done in a third pass after the Latin column was finished and after the gloss in red ink was done.

62. See, for example, major additions at fols. 78vbl8 and 79ra11–12, as well as occasions in the Lindisfarne Gospels when he extended his Old English gloss into a virtually a commentary.

63. For example, Old English _duru vel dor for hostia_ (fol. 80v01), _gevæxo vel gibu_ for _proficiet_ (fol. 81vb18–19), _slep vel svefen for sompnum_ (fol. 82v27), _dinnum vel dinna_ for _fæa_ (fol. 80ra25), and _usum vel userne_ for _nostro_ (fol. 81ra) seem to indicate a variation in his Old English vocabulary, orthography, or grammar found throughout his glossing of the Lindisfarne Gospels and Durham A.IV.19. At fol. 81rb2, in a severely abbreviated incipit, he glosses the Latin _cor for cornu_ (horn) with Old English _hearta_, apparently misreading the Latin incipit for what should be a familiar psalm ([111][112]:9). Note also a grammar glitch at fol. 80ra25, a declension pronoun issue at fol. 81ra, and the unusual gloss of _tun for turribus_ at fol. 81ra18–19 (QXI.38f). Other examples are discussed below in the hymns and in the encyclopedic additions.

64. Also in the original collectar (fol. 17v16, Rogation lections from Jeremiah), he glossed _de semitis antiquis_ with Old English _of semen aldom_ mistaking Latin _semitas_, _pit semen_, _seed_ (to be fair, this is on an overrun from line 17 written above it that then continues with a word break in _antiquis_ to line 18). A grammar error involving fields also occurs in the Lindisfarne Gospels where he glosses _upi_ (fol. 7:2 (fol. 38vb2–24) Latin _mens et fuit_. _wibes ge bilon_, mistaking _mens_ for _messis_ and glossed _fuiertis_ as _pur_. _ind_. _pl_; see Henry Sweet and Dorothy Whitelock, _Sweet’s Anglo-Saxon Reader in Prose and Verse_, 15th ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 1967), 216 and note p. 291: he seems to understand Jesus saying that by whatever harvesting or perhaps _mowing_ measure you use, you will be measured.

65. At fol. 79ra2 he glosses it following the Latin word order. The more common word order (DOE) is _ecum life_ versus Latin _vitam aeternam_; another instance of this reversal of the Latin is Lindisfarne Gospels John 6:27 (fol. 223vb2), where _in ece life_ is written above _in uitam_ and nothing above _aeternam_.

66. As for example, “today, if you hear his voice . . .” in Hebrews 3:7–15 and 4:7, quoting Ps. 9:4(95):7. See Augustine’s _Confessions_ 7.13 and discussion in Carlos Eire, _A Very Brief History of Eternity_ (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 60–66. At fols. 170 and 27v10, Aldred glossed _hodiernus_ with _ecce_ or _ecclise dag_, modifying _festivitas_ to indicate a festival day; at 6v2 he corrected Scribe C’s _odiern_ by adding an initial “h” and then glossed it _ecclise_ [dagg]; at 80va15 he glossed _actus nostros hodiernus_ with _dedo vna ecclasa_ [l] with no alternative, as if he were contemplating another interpretation. The _Durham Ritual_ Glossary shows he uses
The glossed hymns provide intriguing examples of Aldred’s habits of mind that we can compare with the glosses found in the other Anglo-Saxon hymnals discussed in chapter 4. Aldred’s gloss of the hymns is independent of the later, primarily West Saxon, glossed hymnals. His “one off” vernacularization emerged as part of his glossing habit in his distinctive Northumbrian dialect, whatever educational function it may have also served in his community. The glosses found in other hymnals are primarily instructional, as for example the vernacular and construe glosses in the Durham Hymnal, which is clearly a school book given its subsequent compilation with Ælfric’s Grammar. But Aldred’s lexical gloss appears to do more and also less than school books: he persisted in doggedly offering a grammatical Old English translation of almost every word, simple or not; yet he did not offer any word order hints, such as construe glosses, useful for highlighting the significant differences in word order between the two languages, particularly with a Latin poetic text.

One example of his thinking visible in an error occurs in a line in Hy 7 for Prime (QXI.26). Instead of sors (glossed blot, fate, in the New Hymnal), Aldred wrote sol, appropriately glossed sunne, although someone altered both this word and the next (reduxerit). The initial “s” of sol shows some erasure and correction as if it were previously another letter altered to an “s.” A final, unidentifiable letter after “sol” was also erased, while the next word, reduxerit, was added over erasure in red in a hand that is probably Aldred’s. It appears Aldred endeavored to fix the line while glossing in red, although it would have been a different quill with a wider nib than could be used in the gloss. The resulting line reads:

todæg or the dag-rune for hodiernus and dag or its rune for dies; but for hodiernus he preferred ece-dæg. Likewise in the Lindisfarne Gospels he reflected on the concept of day: at Matt. 27:8 (fol. 8r12), he glossed in hodiernum diesm as done longu dæge l wih diosne on duord/dæg, extending into the margin to add the alternative (“to this very day”) referring to Judas’ Field of Blood; elsewhere (Matt 28:15, fol. 89rb6) the same phrase is glossed only with longe dæge.


68. Keefer, ASM 14, pp. 59–60; Milfull, Hymns, 39.

69. On syntactical glosses and educational texts, see Fred C. Robinson, “Syntactical Glosses in Latin Manuscripts of Anglo-Saxon Provenance,” Speculum 48 (1973): 443–75; he points out (462–63) the pedagogically useful Latin prose paraphrases of hymns in the Expositio hymnorum and the Latin notes in the Durham Hymnal. The absence of construe marks in Aldred’s glosses is particularly notable given the Irish use of such systems (Robinson, 464–68) and Aldred’s frequent use of Irish textual traditions, as well as abbreviations (T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 40).

70. Milfull thinks the “s” was originally an “r” but if so it would not have been the uncial style “r” used by Aldred on this page but an insular “r” that could easily be made into an insular “s” by erasing the right descender (Aldred’s uncial “r” starts to give way to insular on fol. 77v). However, in this case, it appears that the corrector has not only erased a minim stroke on the right, but also extended the left minuscule down below the groundline, and may have also redone the curved part of the “s” to a final spot. The letter underneath may therefore have been an “n.” Also, the final “l” with an erasure after it might have been a “b.” The word underneath sol, therefore, was clearly not sors but some other error that continued to the word after it. This could be either a visual or an auditory error.

71. That the red gloss and titles were done at the same time, although with different nibs, is suggested by the title on Hy 10 at the top of fol. 77v (image 15), where the title is offset to the right, nicely accommodating
This alters the sense from “in order that, when day is departed and _fate_ has brought night back again” to something less clear about the sun.\textsuperscript{74} Aldred may have read it that the sun was departing as well, causing the return of night; or, that the sun’s return will banish night. If Aldred was glossing the hymn with a Latin exemplar no longer at hand, he might very well have experienced some confusion, although one wonders about his familiarity with what is one of the older Latin hymns used regularly in the office.\textsuperscript{75} But since he evidently knew the word _sors_ in the context of the casting of lots, perhaps he was avoiding the pagan and negative connotations.\textsuperscript{76}

Likewise, a theological understanding of the Holy Spirit emerges in the common doxology of HY 7, HY 8, and HY 10 (QXI.26, 27, 29), and in the _Lindisfarne Gospels_. Aldred glossed _paraclito_ with _rummode_ (-um), although _rummode_ is usually used to gloss _clemens_ or _clementissime_ (as Aldred did in HY 72, QXI.30, fol. 77v10 [image 14] and at 82r15, QXI.40).\textsuperscript{77} The Durham Hymnal and other Old English Gospels gloss _paraclito_ with _frofer_, comfort, a literal translation of this Greek loanword.\textsuperscript{78} Aldred may have been unfamiliar with the etymology of Greek παράκλητος as helper, one called alongside in a legal sense of intercessor or counselor. Nonetheless, his translation to _rummode_, gracious, is in line with early medieval exegesis on the Holy Spirit as grace.\textsuperscript{79}

These “errors” and alterations, combined with his glossing gaps, suggest Aldred was more concerned with word units than textual units. His apparent

\textsuperscript{74} A “vel” gloss added above the regular gloss (Rerum, glossed _dīnga _l _giscæfia_) and barred to separate it from the title. Probably the gloss was done first, then the title, although it could have been the other way around.

\textsuperscript{75} Milfull trans., _Hymns_, 128. The rest of the line describing the close of day refers to being cleansed as the result of daily abstinence described in the earlier verses of the hymn.

\textsuperscript{76} Milfull, _Hymns_, 128, notes that it is cited by Cassiodorus and was probably in the Old Hymnal.

\textsuperscript{77} Aldred glossed _sors_ with _blot_ in the _Lindisfarne Gospels_, as for example in Mark 15:24 and John 19:24, both referring to the lots cast for Jesus’ clothing, the latter glossed _blot vel tān_ (a stick used for divination) (Bosworth and Toller). E. G. Stanley argues that Aldred consciously resists Scandinavian linguistic influence because of its heathen associations, in “Linguistic Self-Awareness at Various Times in the History of English from Old English Onwards,” in _Lexis and Texts in Early English: Studies presented to Jane Roberts_, ed. Christian J. Kay and Louise M. Sylvester (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2001), 237–53, at 246–47.

\textsuperscript{78} See John 14:16, 15:26, 16:7 in Skeat, ed., _The Holy Gospels in Anglo-Saxon_. In two instances (John 15:16 and 16:26) Aldred offered an empty “vel” as if he considered an alternative but never included one. In the other Old English translations that Skeat prints, _paraclitus_ is rendered either as _frefriend_ or _frofer_, while in the _Lindisfarne Gospels_ as well as its glossed relative, the _MacRegol Gospels_, it is consistently glossed _rummode_, another proof of the relationship between these two glossed Gospel books. In the _Lindisfarne Gospels_, Aldred also used _rummod_ to gloss _benignus_; see _Cod. Lind._ index verborum under ru(m)-mod.

\textsuperscript{79} Pons Sanz, “Aldredian Glosses to Proper Names in the _Lindisfarne Gospels_,” 183–84.
aim was to build up the vocabulary of Christian history and worship in his community. This curious combination of learned knowledge amidst Latin errors suggests that Aldred was not so much incompetent in Latin but that he was a well-read scholar making errors because his primary focus lay elsewhere than creating an accurate script for performance purposes. Because Aldred’s gloss is not syntactic Old English that would provide a free-standing translation of the Latin, it can only be read in conjunction with the Latin. So, one cannot imagine someone singing the hymn, for example, while looking at this text. Rather, a reader would either be learning the hymn, prayer, or psalm and encouraged to consider the meaning of perhaps unfamiliar Latin words; or the reader already knows the text and is using the gloss as an aid to meditation, in effect a commentary. His corrections to Scribe B and the glossed instructions on the psalms also point to an educational function, as do Scribe E’s contributions of a duplicate hymn, two basic generic prayers, and the Advent readings added in Aldred’s Quire XI. On the other hand, the work of Scribes C, D, and probably F, seem to be a different enterprise, more to enhance the service book materials, to which Aldred also contributed with daily office and other rituals.

It may be that Aldred’s first purpose in glossing was as a devotional act of worship, similar to his gloss of the Lindisfarne Gospels. The process of glossing is a form of contemplation for the glossator that could simultaneously serve as an instructional tool and subsequently become a source of inspiration for individual and communal readers. Because we often picture writing and reading as primarily individual rather than corporate enterprises, it is hard for us to reconstruct the performative aspects involved in the contemplative and instructional setting of a religious community. Every “vel,” for example, was an opportunity for an extended conversation, perhaps even more so on the “empty” ones, which might have provided exactly that pause (“or . . .”) needed for reflection and discussion of the exegetical meaning. Further, Aldred’s pedagogical philosophy may have been distinctly different than his counterparts in the south. Although possibly like them relying on standard school book types—Psalters, Bede’s writings—he also developed his own glossing technique with an eye toward inculcating an understanding of the ideas behind the words he glossed. To see the full impact of Aldred’s glossing as pedagogical and linguistic study, we can turn to his “educational” additions in Durham A.IV.19.

In the second half of Quire XI, Aldred copied a number of texts classified as “educational,” but “encyclopedic” is a better designation suggesting scholarly as well as pedagogical functions. F. Wormald in his index for the EEMF volume designated them “educational,” probably for want of a better label since they do not fall into any category of liturgy or synaxis relevant to a service book. The earlier Lindelöf edition introduced by Thompson categorized them as miscellaneous, casual, and unrelated to the rest of the manuscript, copied either from several sources or from some now lost compilation. The difficulties in sourcing them have not yet been overcome, although electronic searching holds out some promise for tracking them in the future as more materials are digitized.

However, although the type of text seems significantly different from the office materials in the first part of Quire XI, the common use of glossing suggests they were part of Aldred’s larger linguistic purposes in the Chester-le-Street community, where they may have been studied corporately or perused privately as reference works. Some of them are reminiscent of glossaries, colloquies, and pedagogical dialogues derived from older encyclopedic works by Isidore of Seville, Raban Maur, Amalarius of Metz, Alcuin, and Bede (or Pseudo-Alcuin and Pseudo-Bede), or in the popular insular versions of the Dialogue of Solomon and Saturn. Most of them exhibit numerical interests reminiscent of the Irish Liber numeris and the Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae, as well as Irish philological interests in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin magnified by the vernacular gloss. The didactic purpose of these texts needs to be placed into a larger, more complex, and changing manuscript contexts for encyclopedic as well as devotional and contemplative texts, as argued for example by Elaine Treharne for the twelfth-century Dicts of Cato. In a closely similar context,
Kees Dekker examined the genealogy of a set of encyclopedic texts in circulation in late Anglo-Saxon England found in four manuscripts, for which he coins the term “micropaedia.” Although Aldred’s set appears unrelated, some of the same traits Dekker identifies in these late tenth- and eleventh-century collections are found in Durham A.IV.19’s lists: the Irish associations, the variable educational and scholarly purposes, and their location in empty folios at the end of a manuscript. Moreover, one of the four manuscripts in Dekker’s study is Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 183, the manuscript donated to Chester-le-Street by King Athelstan containing Cuthbert hagiography and liturgy, along with these encyclopedic texts that seem to be of the same type as Aldred’s, yet none of them are duplicates. Conceivably, Aldred was copying additional encyclopedic materials to complement the set found in CCCC 183.

Aldred’s collection thus fits with a growing interest in the tenth and especially the eleventh centuries in Latin as part of a reform of schools, manifested in the creation of glossaries and encyclopedic compendiums. In the surviving glossarial and encyclopedic manuscripts whose genealogies we can trace, Aldred’s is a one-off, which may speak to the conditions in Northumbria and the ambiguous legacy of Chester-le-Street. Yet although Aldred’s unique compilation at the end of Quire XI is not part of an identifiable copying tradition, it may very well be a response to this educational reform impulse and a desire to supply necessary historical and linguistic information for readers in his community. If these materials can be interpreted as evidence for what they might have had to read in their library for which they would need these guides, then they would primarily be useful for reading the Old Testament and patristic commentaries—including, and maybe especially, the works of Bede—as well as apocryphal literature of that sort that turns up in Irish literature.

The materials are identified as follows:

QXI.48. notae juris: ha sunt notae predestinatas (fols. 85ra1–86rb9) (image 16).
A list of abbreviations and suspensions of legal and ecclesiastical terms, alphabetical.

QXI.49. De octo pondera de quibus factus est adam (fol. 86rb10–86va16) (image 16). On the eight pounds of material from which Adam was made [a], followed by two related questions [b].

QXI.50. Ancient titles and offices (fols. 86va16–87ra10). [a] De dignitatibus

---

87. See T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 51; Thompson, Rituale, xi, xix–xx.
romanorum (fol. 86va16–vb16), an explanation of eleven Roman imperial offices; [b] the names for kings in different ancient or Biblical cultures (86vb17–23); and [c] the magistratus sive tristatus in Egypt (87ra1–10).


QXI.52. Interpretatio nominis sacerdotium (fol. 87va16–b15). Explanation of priestly names and titles, followed by an explanation of eight Greek words (fol. 87vb2–15).


QXI.54. Alphabet of words (fol. 88va1–24, b1–21). Biblical world history emphasizing redemption.


The context for their copying suggests that Aldred grouped these texts here with a common theme, if not a common source. They are included after the break at fol. 84, where Aldred had copied the Cuthbert collects with colophon and memorandum on the recto; on the verso, Scribe E had copied antiphons and versicles for the first four Sundays in Advent. The encyclopedic materials on fols. 85r–88v end the quire and the manuscript, as it is currently bound and has been since at least the early eighteenth century. The last page, 88v, is extremely worn, as is the beginning of the quire (fol. 77r), further evidence that quire XI stood apart as a separate booklet that would have made it easily portable on Aldred’s 970 journey with Bishop Ælfsige commemorated in the colophon. Although these encyclopedic texts in theory could have been acquired on the same journey at some point when he had access to a library, two factors suggest but cannot prove a Northumbrian context. First, Scribe E’s addition on the back of the Cuthbert collects and colophon (fol. 84v) implies a return to Chester-le-Street before Aldred commenced on fol. 85r with the educational additions, unless he left 84v blank and Scribe E filled it in later or was with them on the journey. Second, many if not all of these lists have Irish associations that would more likely have been acquired in Northumbria, although other sites, such as Glastonbury, were transmission sites for Irish materials as well. In any case, “Irish” texts came into Anglo-Saxon England over a long period, both from Ireland and from Irish-founded continental missions, so at a certain point they became part of the Anglo-Saxon intellectual community and their Irishness subliminal.

Aldred’s “micropaedia” in Quire XI is double columned and glossed, similar to the liturgical material he copied before the break at fol. 84 (after the

88. See Wright, Irish Tradition, 270.
single-column wide text format of the hymns on fol. 77r–v). The texts themselves (fol. 85r–88v) appear to have been written in at least two stints, first folios 85–87, leaving fol. 88 a separate writing campaign. Blank lines at the end of fol. 87 v suggest a writing break, supported by the increasing messiness of fol. 87 compared to the return to neatness on fol. 88r. Thus, while the first five items (QXI.48–52) are written continuously, overlapping folios (85r–87v), QXI.53 stands by itself on fol. 88r, with QXI.54–55 on the verso.

All of the items are lists; in that sense they are reference works but with a linguistic “turn.” Some of them are of a similar type. QXI.50–52 are lists of offices. QXI.48 is referential, to look up abbreviations of terms, either when reading a text with abbreviations or to write one, although it could also serve as a vocabulary list. QXI.53 and QXI.55 offer factual information on the resting places of the apostles and on Old Testament citations in the New Testament. QXI.49 and QXI.54 might have a more reflective function, meditating on the allegorical meaning of Adam’s material composition or pondering issues of the cross and redemption in the alphabetic list. A. Hamilton Thompson, in his introduction to Lindelöf’s 1927 edition, speculated that Aldred was either copying from an encyclopedic compendium of some type or was making notes from such a text or set of texts; he also suggested that the alphabetic reflections on sin and redemption in QXI.54 may be an original composition.89

Yet with no known direct source of identification for most of them, the composite nature of some of them, and the variations throughout in style and abbreviations, Aldred himself may have been the compiler, borrowing from several manuscript exemplars to which he had access. The common feature uniting all of them, whether for educational purposes or not, is an interest in the insights to be gained from multiple languages translated into the Anglo-Saxon vernacular. As with the Lindisfarne Gospel’s gloss and colophon, Aldred may have seen himself adding value to the three sacred languages of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin by a fourth language to complete them, Old English. The vernacular offered not just literal comprehension but added interpretive breadth to bring about greater devotional understanding in the heart. This applied not just to the glossed prayers but to any of the vocabulary of Scripture and Christian tradition into which Aldred wanted his community to be acculturated. These seemingly random and tedious lists provided that challenge.

QXI.48 NOTAE JURIS: HÆ SUNT NOTAS PREDISTINATAS

This first list gives abbreviations of 225 Latin words, one quarter of them legal, and eleven of them ecclesiastical.90 For each, Aldred gave the abbreviation fol-

89. Thompson, Rituale, xx.
lowed by the Latin word written out, with an Old English gloss above. He did make some errors, many of them corrected.91 The formatting suggests that Aldred was initially copying a text following a pattern that he abandoned as he sped up (image 16).92 If this copy was merely for the purpose of transport to another context, then it makes sense to copy with speed and accuracy for the words but not necessarily the format. But then why gloss it, unless the true purpose was to add the Old English and create a vocabulary list?

No exact exemplar for Aldred’s notae juris has been found. The closest is apparently in an eighth-century continental list, Notae lindenbrogianae [Lindenbrog.] but the two are significantly different in terms of the abbreviations, the words listed, and the sequence.93 However, such lists were fairly common in earlier ages and Aldred’s may be an artifact of an older system disappearing in the tenth century.94 Eight of Aldred’s eleven ecclesiastical terms (affectus, beatus, egressus, lapis, lapsus, omnipotens, salus, spei) appear in Lindenbrog., while zabulus, zelus, and zeloes occur in Aldred’s list only.95 Boyd takes particular interest in zabulus as a rare variant on diabolus and Aldred’s gloss nið æfest as a meaningful understanding of Satan as adversary.96 Nonetheless, he concludes from this example and others that Aldred’s Latin in Durham A.IV.19 shows a predilection for the exotic and rare, a trait also noted in the vocabulary of the John poison prayer copied by Scribe B (QVIII.1).

The kinds of additions and corrections Aldred made to the list tell us something about his working habits and interests. Aldred employed a certain amount of variation, offering alternatives and not glossing words the same way. The use of vel (or), for example, shows him thinking about the meaning of words. At fol. 85ra4, an odd abbreviation for actionem (ai–m or aii–n) is glossed

91. For example, at fol. 85ra6, he adds in black “en” to contra but at fol. 85ra8, crimen for crimen stands uncorrected; at fol. 85va23, he later adds the first “a” below the “m” to mandatum; at fol. 86ra5 he adds the “i” to quia (the abbreviation was qu–a); and at fol. 86rb8, zl abbreviation for zabulus was added.

92. The title, in red and unglossed as is usual, is made to fit on one line (85ra1), forcing the last two letters of predistinatas to be written above. Aldred began copying these entries using a hanging indent format, although the text runs continuously rather than each headword abbreviation starting on a fresh line. Thus on fol. 85r, almost every other line he started with a new abbreviation with a large capital offset left, but by 85v he abandoned this hanging indent format to the end of the text (the spacing overall gets tighter as well). He seems to use periods to break between each set, but is inconsistent in their use (sometimes between the abbreviation and the word or between two words that are part of the same abbreviation). The list is alphabetical by first, but not subsequent, letters.


94. See W. M. Lindsay, Notae Latinae: An Account of Abbreviation in Latin MSS. of the Early Minuscule Period (c. 700–850), with a Supplement by Doris Bain (Abbreviations in Latin MSS. of 850–1050) (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1963), 413–43; although unfortunately Aldred’s notae juris are not included in the manuscripts they examined, his materials seem to resonate with Irish traditions they describe.

95. T. J. Brown, Durham Ritual, 51.

96. Boyd, “Aldrediana XXV,” 39–45. Also noteworthy at fol. 86rb8, the abbreviation zl for zabulus has been added above the period, small. The gloss of the previous word goes above it, thus showing the gloss was done after the Latin.
with *gescir vel* but with no alternative gloss given (he does this more than occasionally). Moreover, *gescir* as a gloss for *actio* has no parallel and is otherwise unattested, although he uses *gesciran* to gloss *vilicare* in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*, Luke 16:2 (to act as a steward or manager).  

In other cases, Aldred glossed *actio* with Old English *ded* (deed) or with *u(o)erc* (work). With the abbreviation list, Aldred may have been using the prompt from the word *actio* to have some kind of discussion of various forms of action or service, even to expound a Gospel passage or commentary that the word brought to mind.

In another instance (fol. 86ra6), he used *vel* in the Latin for two different abbreviations of *qui* but did not spell out the word. He did however gloss both with two Old English words, *ða* and *ðas*, both plural demonstratives serving as relative pronouns (those or these who or which) perhaps as a springboard for a grammatical discussion with someone like Scribe B. At fol. 86ra14, *res* is glossed not with *ding* but with *aebt*, although above in line 13 *rum* (res) has been glossed with *ding*, perhaps because of an impulse to show greater variance of meaning in Old English than Latin. Fol. 86ra22 and 86rb4 both have *tempus* but with two different abbreviations (T- and tp-), both glossed *tiid*. This may be evidence that Aldred was merging more than one source.

Aldred corrected himself in ways that show him thinking as he wrote. For example at fol. 85va14, he may have suffered eye skip and wrote for the abbreviation *m~m manu misa* instead of *manu mittit* (the abbreviation for *manu misa* does occur on line 17); so he put deletion lines around *misa* and then wrote the correct word *mittit* at the beginning of the next line. At fol. 86ra6 he glossed the abbreviation *qs~ quasi* with *we biddas sue*. The *we biddas* gloss assumes “qs” is an abbreviation for *quaesumus*; while the *sue* was then added as the correct gloss of *quasi*. This means that he was glossing as he read the Latin he had already written, and suggests, along with the occasional *vel* lacking an alternative word, that he was thinking while he glossed rather than complet-

---

97. Bosworth and Toller, *gesciran*. An earlier editor, Stevenson, preferred to read it as *gestir*, which does yield the meaning action if based on the verb *gestynan*, to steer, rather than *gestiran*, to correct (Bosworth and Toller’s dictionary has only this instance of *gestir*, based on Stevenson’s reading).

98. T. J. Brown, *Durham Ritual Glossary*, 62 lists for *ded* fols. 20v18, 24v19, 3v14, 7v20, 15v16; p. 90 for *u(orec)* lists only fol. 4v17.

99. Aldred writes first “q” with a minim above it, followed by a *vel* sign and then the alternative “q” with a colon. Lindenbrog, has *qui* abbreviated as the “q” with a minim over it; Cappelli has “q:” for *qui*, tenth century. My thanks to Sarah Larratt Keefer, personal correspondence, for grammatical insights on this mystery.

100. Thin lines above and below the word *misa* (*manu misa*), indicate recognition of an error for the abbreviation for *mittit*, written on next line; the two words are glossed *honde sendeð* but the mistaken word is not glossed. Fol. 85va17 has *manu misa* (*manu corrected with an “a” added*) and glossed *honde gesende*. The Lindenbrog, list has both together “mn~m” for *manumitti* and “mn~s” for *manu misus*. Note also the periods between the two words, where normally the periods are between sets.

101. The *sue* is hard to read, a bit faint or smudged, written into the center margin. *Quaesumus*, a common word in a liturgical context, is one he has abbreviated elsewhere as “qs” (see fol. 79vb4) and which he glossed in the original collectar as *we biddas*, fol. 1v2. DOE notes *we biddas* in the gloss is of *quaesumus*. See Parkes, *Their Hands before Our Eyes*, 68 on this type of error by a religious scribe copying a secular text.
ing the work or copying it. In this case, he copied out the Latin abbreviations and texts, and then went back through at some later point adding the gloss. Cruising along, he saw *qs*-, thought in his liturgical mind, *quaesumus*, wrote the gloss, then realized, that is *quasi*, hence *svae*.

If his intentions were educational and he was glossing word by word, then leaving both here served his purposes for explaining both *quaesumus* and *quasi* to his pupils.

Some errors Aldred apparently did not catch or did not recognize. At fol. 85ra13 for the abbreviation *cri-*m he wrote *crinem* instead of *crimen*, but correctly glossed it as *hehsyn* (crime). So he knew the word, but must have been working hastily and did not catch the inversion of “m” and “n.” At fol. 85rb16–17 for the (second) abbreviation “G.” he wrote *gauisetus* and glossed it *gigladade*. The participle *gavisus* from *gaudere* can hardly be declined with an extra –*et* in it. But since he clearly understood the meaning in Old English here and elsewhere, that may be the ultimate point, to use the vernacular as a way into the Latin. If he was instructing pupils orally, then he probably pronounced the Latin appropriately while giving the definition in Old English.

The *notae juris* text may therefore have served multiple purposes as a linguistic exercise. It could conceivably have been used for its original purpose, to understand Latin abbreviations while reading legal texts. However, it appears to have no direct effect on or relation to the abbreviations used in other parts of Durham A.IV.19, which tend to vary depending on the source. For example, the next text, *De octo pondera* (QXI.49) uses different abbreviations for est and *enim*. So Aldred may have copied the *notae juris* from some older manuscript(s) less for the abbreviations and more for the opportunity to flex his own vocabulary muscles as well as those of his community, almost like flash cards.

---

102. According to the *Durham Ritual Glossary* he used *bid(eth)* for *deprecari*, *exorare*, *implorare*, *obiscare*, *orare*, *posere*, *precare*, *quaere*, *rogare*, *suplicare*, *comperete*, and *deponere*. The “-as” ending on *biddas* occurs several times, including right on fol. 102v “we biddas” glossing *qs*–; “ve biddas” (“v” not “win”) also occurs, as well as “ve biddath” for *exoramus*. In other cases, he abbreviates to *se bidd* or *bid*. The “-as” ending on *biddan* for a first person plural is unusual; all of the instances in DOE are from Aldred, either the *Lindisfarne Gospels* gloss or here in Durham A.IV.19. The Aldrediana group discusses Aldred’s gloss as the major early evidence for the switch from -Δ to –s endings in the plural as well as 3rd singular, although these articles predate the identification of Aldred as the sole glossator of Lindisfarne and of Durham: see A. S. C. Ross, “The Origin of the s-Endings of the Present Indicative in English,” *JEGP* 33 (1934): 68–70; L. Blakeley, “The Lindisfarne s/Δ Problem,” *Studia neophilologica* 22 (1950): 15–47; and Ross, “Supposed Use of the 2nd Singular for the 3rd Singular in ‘Tocharian A,’ Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Hittite,” *Archivum Linguisticum* 6 (1954): 112–21, who summarizes Blakeley. Blakeley argues that the-s form spread (first in verbs with stem ending in δ, d, t and less so those ending in–s or–m, or the verb *dōa*) from 2nd person singular to plural and thence to other plurals and then from 3rd plural to 3rd singular. These authors, working primarily before Ker’s article, assume that the switching between the–Δ and–s forms is further evidence confirming two scribes in *Lindisfarne*, now discredited, but the mixing of forms remains unexplained: see Ross, “Aldrediana XVII: Ritual Supplement,” *English Philological Studies* 11 (1968): 13 on the “Variation Problem.”

103. He glossed *crimen* also in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*, Matthew (Bosworth and Toller, *hehsyn*).

104. Lindenbrog, has after *Gaius* (which Aldred transliterated as a proper name) another proper name Gaius Seius abbreviated GS and does not have *gavisus*, *gauisetus* or *gaudere*; the *Notae Papianae*, p. 320 does have *gauustum* abbreviated G. similar to *Gaius* right above it (the Notae Papianae is another of the *notarum lataculi* ed. by Mommsen in Keil, *Grammatici latinii*, iv, pp. 315–30).
Continuing after the notae juris and seemingly in the same writing campaign, Aldred wrote out a text titled “on the eight pounds from which Adam was made” [a], followed by two related questions about the nature of breath and wind [b]. These allegorical texts have Irish roots as well as unique spiritual insights from a linguistic point of view.

The text is clearly written and glossed (image 16), although the verso of folio 86, especially the “a” column, shows some wear, rendering the gloss hard to read. Aldred made some corrections both to the Latin (fol. 86rb16) and to the Old English gloss (fol. 86rb21). At the page turn, he repeated the last two words at the top of the next, both the Latin inde est and its gloss, of don is, although he had not habitually done this on page turns. Perhaps it reflects an interest in keeping a syntactically whole phrase started on the next page, which he doggedly glossed over again—or possibly he took a short break in writing at the bottom of 86r.

De octo pondera (QXI.49a), and similar companion texts on Adam’s name, is derived from Enochian apocrypha and was popular in insular literature. A comparison of variants on this text by Charles Wright reveals that Aldred’s version belongs to a strand containing an apparent scribal error that developed a life of its own: instead of “solis” for the eyes, this version has “floris,” flower or blossom, which some modify to indicate “variety” to explain eye color while others change it to plural “flowers.”

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 326 (s. x/xi Canterbury) has the more common “solis” version that includes allegorical and spiritual interpretations and applications: earth = flesh; sea = blood; sun = eyes; clouds of the sky = thoughts; wind = pant/desire (anhela) or breath/soul (flatus); stones of the earth = bones; holy spirit = placed in man; light of the world = interpreted as Christ. An earlier text in CCCC 326, labeled On Perias Lector Litteras tam Grécas, shows similar linguistic interests to Aldred’s educational additions.
The “floris” variant is found in Hiberno-Latin texts such as the *Liber de numeris* and in two Anglo-Saxon versions, Aldred’s Latin text glossed in Old English here and a twelfth-century Old English Dialogue of Solomon and Saturn. These two vernacular versions, however, differ in their vocabulary and sequence as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALDRED</th>
<th>SOLOMON AND SATURN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. earth (<em>limi / lames</em>) &gt; flesh (<em>caro / flæsc</em>)</td>
<td>1. earth (<em>foldan</em>) &gt; flesh (<em>flesc</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. fire (<em>ignis / fyres</em>) &gt; blood (<em>rubeus sanguis calidus / read blod hat</em>)</td>
<td>2. fire (<em>fyres</em>) &gt; blood (<em>blod read et hat</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. salt (<em>salis / saltes</em>) &gt; tears (<em>salsa lacrime / salto tehero</em>)</td>
<td>3. wind (<em>windes</em>) &gt; breath (<em>œðung</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. dew (<em>roris / deawes</em>) &gt; sweat (<em>sudor / svat</em>)</td>
<td>4. cloud (<em>volvenes</em>) &gt; unstable mind (<em>modes unstaðelfæstnes</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. blossom (<em>floris / blostmes</em>) &gt; eyes (<em>uarietas oculorum / fængeng egena</em>)</td>
<td>5. grace (<em>gyfe</em>) &gt; understanding and thought (<em>sefa ond gedang</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. clouds (<em>nubis / volcnes</em>) &gt; unstable thought (<em>instabilitas mentium / unstydfelhniise l unstaðolfæstnis' dohta</em>)</td>
<td>6. blossoms (<em>blosmena</em>) &gt; eyes (<em>eagena mysentlicnys</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. wind (<em>uenti / winde</em>) &gt; cold breath (<em>anhela frigida / oroð cald</em>)</td>
<td>7. dew (<em>deaues</em>) &gt; sweat (<em>svat</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. grace (<em>gratia / gefe</em>) &gt; thought (<em>sensus homini / doht vel . . . monnes</em>)</td>
<td>8. salt (<em>sealtes</em>) &gt; tears (<em>tearas sealte</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of these associations are familiar enough from Biblical creation accounts and the classical humors—earth associated with flesh, fire with blood, and breath with wind—while others are common associations, salt with tears, dew with sweat.

But in Aldred’s last three, clouds, wind, and grace, more of human nature is contemplated as derived from the more ethereal ingredients, in a way similar to the exegesis in the CCCC 326 variant: the inherent instability of clouds as a mental condition; the cold breath of wind (which the questions that follow will explore); and the seemingly non-material component of grace associated with the senses or thought. Similar to the gloss of *rummode* on *paraclete* for the Holy Spirit, Aldred seemed interested in exploring the theological and spiritual in his gloss, an aspect of monastic *devotio*.

For example, in two places Aldred’s gloss offered a *vel*, the second one unfulfilled. At fol. 86va he went into the margin to offer an alternative for

*Bella Parisiacae urbis* selections; *On Perias Lector Litteras tam Gręcas*, pp. 133–34. See QXI.49x for a transcription of the *De acto* in CCCC 326, pp. 135–36.

110. QXI.49x, from London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius A.xv, fol. 87v (Ker 215, Gneuss 399); in *The Prose Solomon and Saturn* ed. Cross and Hill, 26. 67–70.
instabilitas: unstedyfullnisse l unstadeolfastnis'. The first word, unstededefull, appears to be a Northumbrianism, while the second option is a more commonly used Old English root, unstadol.111 At fol. 86v4, he glossed sensus with dohta l with no word following. Perhaps because he had just glossed mentium two lines above (unsteady mind) with dohta', he was considering whether another Old English word might make a distinction here between mentium and sensus, indicating his interest in words for human thought and speech in a devotional context.112 Aldred’s two vels suggest that he may have pondered the relationship between the cloudy unstable mind (instabilitas mentium; unstedyfullnisse l unstadeolfastnis' dohta) and the grace-given human sense or thought (pondus gratiae inde est sensus hominis; pond gefe of don is doht l . . . monnes). If the mentium (mood, mindset) is unstable, does grace counterbalance with sense and thoughtfulness, or at least self-awareness? This question, implicit in Aldred’s gloss alternatives, invokes the Benedictine notion in the Regularis concordia of reading or singing with both the mind and with the spirit, noted at the outset of this chapter.113

Similarly, the question of wind (QXI./four.oldstyle/nine.oldstyleb) led into further discussion of human nature. Aldred’s text has “cold breath,” while the later Solomon and Saturn version does not give the temperature of breath. The two questions pick up on this aspect and ask: “Tell me why the two breaths are not equal, whereby one is hot and the other is cold” and “Tell me whence the wind blows.” The first question addresses the temperature of the breath (inhaling and exhaling, presumably). The answer draws in another element: “It is that the one is of fire and the other is of wind. And this signifies that from these are made the spirit.”

A complex physiognomy and psychology is implied here with Aldred’s use of getacnadh (significat). The human spirit is made up of both fire and wind, hot and cold paralleled in the previous list. The fire of the blood heats the exhaled breath, which the inhaled cold wind counterbalances; between the two, the human lives by the breath, external and internal interacting in this vital act. The CCCC 326 variant defined wind (uente) with anhela vel flatus, each of which has both a literal and spiritual meaning in Biblical terms: anhela as panting or desire and flatus as breath or spirit. Likewise, Aldred seemed to read this text allegorically for its spiritual significance.

111. The twelfth-century Solomon and Saturn uses the more common unstadeolfastnes, which Aldred also uses elsewhere in the positive: gistabolad glossing stabilire at fol. 39113; gistabolastanad glossing solidare at fol. 10v18; and stabolastanad glossingstatus at fol. 52111 (see Durham Ritual Glossary, 85). Aldred’s apparently unique attestation of “unsteadfast” (Bosworth and Toller, on- and unstededefullness) occurs elsewhere in his gloss: stydfast glossing constantia at fol. 24v11; unstededefull glossing apostasicus at fol. 5913 and infestatio at fol. 59v9 (Durham Ritual Glossary, 84).

112. Durham Ritual Glossary, 87 shows Aldred used doht to gloss cogitatio (once), mens (9), sensus (3), and anima (2); but the glossary does not list the doht glossing sensus at fol. 88v4, just the dohta glossing mens at 88v2. See also gedisced (gedohste) glossing cogitare and excogitare. At fol. 78vb18–19 (QXI.33), he glosses in cogitazione et in locutione et in operatione with in smeavne 7 in giriorde 7 l in spré 7 in wyringe l [no alternative given].

113. It also echoes the insular tradition of the trea mutes (three mute things) for wisdom: mens, oculus, littera. See Wright, “Why Sight Holds Flowers,” 184.
The answer to the second question, “tell me whence the wind blows,” goes further into the spiritual realm: “It is from the seraphim, hence it is said seraphim of the winds.” Aldred’s interest in angelology is noted in other places, but here the angelic order of seraphim is explained in terms of the winds that blow (or vice versa), although without the detailed angelic roles given in other creation of Adam texts. The seraphim are known as the angels of love, light, and fire who perform the trisagion (holy, holy, holy) before the presence of God, a performance echoed in the liturgy. Their number is four, according to 3 Enoch (26:9), because they correspond to the four winds. Their dual association with fire and wind as spirits mirrors the spiritual nature of humans as described in the first question and in Adam’s composition of both fire and cold wind. Both questions demonstrate Aldred’s interest in this text as a source of spiritual inspiration more in keeping with the CCCC 326 variant than the twelfth-century Solomon and Saturn version.

Where did Aldred find this text and why did he choose to copy the eight pounds of Adam here? Given Aldred’s interest in copying other Irish-rooted texts with apocryphal and numerical significance, such as the five field prayers, it is unsurprising to find insular precedents for this text as well. All the extant versions show considerable variation, making it difficult to ascertain what dependence, if any, they had on each other. As part of Aldred’s educational campaign and vocabulary exercises in the later part of Quire XI, this text is comparable to dialogue pedagogy in the Joca monachorum tradition found prominently in Irish texts and Carolingian educational tracts. The premise, evident in Alcuin’s dialogue with the young prince Pepin, is that vocabulary understood allegorically is the basis of thought. Arguably, this was one of Aldred’s larger purposes in assembling this collection of texts and overall in his glossing enterprise.

115. See James Charlesworth, ed., The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol. 1 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1983), 281. See also A Dictionary of Angels, Including the Fallen Angels, ed. Gustav Davidson (New York: Free Press, 1967), 267 and David Keck, Angels and Angelology in the Middle Ages (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 54. The only canonical references are in Isaiah 6, where they have four faces and six wings and Revelation 4:8 where the name is not used, but they are described in similar terms. Anglo-Saxon iconography does not show a strong correlation between seraphs and wind. Seraphs are indicated in other ways, while personified winds are not necessarily seraphs; see index in Thomas H. Ohlgren, Insular and Anglo-Saxon Illuminated Manuscripts: An Iconographic Catalogue, c. A.D. 625 to 1100 (New York: Garland, 1986). Nor does the Irish Saltair na Rann have Seraphim associated with winds; see John Carey, “Cosmology in Saltair na Rann,” Celtica (1987): 1–8.
QXI.50–52 OFFICIAL LISTS

The next three items form a group of explanations of titles and names that function as reference works for a religious community, aids to understanding Biblical and church history, particularly in relation to ecclesiastical organization. These reference works imply the existence of reading material for which they would be useful, not only the Bible, but also writings of the church fathers, various commentaries, and ecclesiastical histories. But like the notae juris (QXI.48), Aldred’s gloss added another layer of interest in vocabulary and linguistic reflection. The first of the three lists (QXI.50) is concerned with secular titles, with an eye toward the royalty of Christ, while the other two are religious lists (QXI.51–52), with some overlapping terminology.\footnote{For example, princeps glossed aldorman occurs in all three (fols. 86vb16, 87rb22, 87vb4).} What joins these three together is a concern for language—Hebrew, Latin, and Greek, accompanied by the vernacular Old English gloss. That is, these Latin lists were designed to explain terminology in its cultural context, whether ancient Hebrew society, Egyptian, Greek, or Roman. The three sacred languages of Scripture in particular—the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin found in Pilate’s inscription above Jesus’ cross—became the source of a peculiarly Irish tradition of philological exegesis evident in Aldred’s lists.\footnote{Robert E. McNally, “The ‘Tres Linguae Sacrae’ in Early Irish Bible Exegesis,” Theological Studies 19 (1958): 395–401.} However, Aldred extended that cultural translation project to include the vernacular Old English. Like his macaronic colophon to the Lindisfarne Gospels, Aldred’s primary interest was in words, their variable meanings, and the effort it takes to understand them in context. Just as he was the fourth maker of the Lindisfarne Gospels by adding his gloss, so here his gloss to language lists in the Durham A.IV.19 additions shows him acting as the next generation of translator taking the texts into another culture.

The list of ruler titles in QXI.50 can be subdivided into three sections: [a] De dignitatibus romanorum (fol. 86va16–86vb16) explains eleven Roman imperial offices, followed second by [b] names of Hebrew and other kings (fol. 86vb17–23), and then third [c] the magistratus sive tristatus in Egypt (fol. 87ra1–10), known from Jerome’s commentary on Ezekiel.

With the Roman titles (QXI.50a), Aldred endeavored to give an Old English translation or equivalent. Thus imperator, emperor, is hæsere, a commander who has command (imperium, hæs), over many people. Second to the emperor, the consul is herges larwv (lareow), master teacher of a host, a curious label for this officer, for which Aldred sought an alternative using vel but did not fill in, although in the next line he gives a seemingly superfluous alternative to secundus as either “after” or “next.” For proconsul in the next line, he used forelatwa under herges larwu, apparently preferring the more straightforward Old English word for commander, lad-teów, for this underling or sub-
commander, but retaining larwu, master teacher, for consul. A patrician is a heh aldormenn, high elder over the army (here), and second to him but less worthy, a dux is heretoga, army leader, while comes is heghgeroefa (high steward, officer) or, repeating the dux title with a vel, heretoga over thirty thousand men. Procurator is hehsciremenn (more or less a high business official) and tribune is a landowner (londhebbende) or, Aldred offered this alternative, latwu of his people. Centurion, quinquagenarius, and decanus are latwu defined primarily by the number of troops they command, although decanus also is taken to mean an official over a kin-group (megscire, from mægscir, as a gloss on decurio as two words, de curio), while princeps is an alderman’ over his ten. Throughout, Aldred seemed to be using Old English equivalents that varied between an emphasis on military command and rule over people groups, not unlike their Latin Roman counterparts. However, the Anglo-Saxon social organization seems more oriented toward kin groups and warbands, using terms for local leaders (aldormann, larwu, lad-teów, sciremann, geroefa) prefaced with “high” (or “under”) in order to indicate hierarchies of rank or distinctions beyond that which would be familiar to the Anglo-Saxons. Presumably an understanding of the Roman hierarchy was necessary in order to understand New Testament texts, saints’ lives, and church histories.

On the names of Hebrew and other kings (QXI.50b, fol. 86vbt7–23) that follows, the primary interest was in the various words for king in other cultures. Many of these Latin titles or royal names, Aldred glossed as cyning: Egyptian Pharaoh, Syrian “Antiochus,” Persian “Arridi,” Philistine “Mei.” However, the Hebrew and Roman entries are different. The Latin for the Hebrew entry, which comes first in this list, notes that their name for king (rex/cyning) is called Christ, which Aldred glossed as gecoreno (chosen). The Old English gloss above Apud romanos cessares / et cuiu[?] reads mið romæniscv’ casaras et rics[arda]. Aldred transliterated caesar, presumably as a recognized loanword, and offered over the unclear Latin cuiu or ciui in the gutter an Old English word with a common root for rule, ric. Aldred elsewhere used ricsere and other derivations to gloss dominatio primarily but also gubernatio and regnare. Like the list of Roman titles, this list also allowed Aldred to explore vernacular cultural equivalents for titles, with some relevance to Biblical exegesis, as does the third section.

119. Bosworth and Toller note the gloss seems to read decurio as two words.
120. See Boyd, “Aldrediana XXV,” 45–49 for a discussion of this section and each name. In the case of the Syrians and Philistines, “each” king has this name, implying that Aldred recognized these as personal names used in a dynasty (“Antiochus” but “Mei” is an unknown derivation). Isidore, Etymologies XVI.14 (trans. Barney, et. al., p. 302) discusses how Antioch was named after Selucus’ father Anthiochus. The origin of “Arridi” as the title of “all” Persian kings is likewise a possible use of a personal name.
121. Durham Ritual Glossary, 78. The Roman entry is more difficult because both the Latin and the gloss run into the gutter. The Latin reads Apud romanos cessares / et cuiu[?], with the “et” sign and the last word below and almost illegible. Possibly cuiu? is an attempt at some form of ciuis.
The last section (QXI.50c, fol. 87ra1–10) in these lists of titles is derived from Jerome’s *Commentaria in Ezechielem*.

Jerome explained the rulers Ezekiel prophesied would come up against the people, and noted the meaning given to *magistratus sive tristatus*, referring back to Exodus 15 and the list of pharaoh’s leaders who were thrown into the sea. The section copied by Aldred fits here with his lists in the sense that it explains a Greek-derived word, *tristatus*, for three high-ranking officials or attendants for a magistrate (*ternos statores*). But the gloss shows some confusion, at least initially, about the word *tristatus* in relation to the role of magistrate. Aldred glossed *magistratus* at fol. 87ra1 with *aldordom vel lardom* but on the next line glossed *tristatus* with *vel rotnisse*, “or gladness,” a seeming antonym to a misreading of *tristatus* as *tristitia*, sadness; perhaps “un-” is missing in front of *rotnisse*. Curiously, Aldred had glossed with *rotnisse* before in this way: although he used *unrotnise* once to gloss *maeror*, grief (fol. 50r19), he used *rotnise* without the negative prefix to gloss *maeror* at fol. 20r7 and again to gloss *tristitia* at fol. 33v9. So his use of *rotnisse* to gloss is consistent enough with these other instances to show he initially at least read *tristatus* as indicating an emotion of sadness, not, as the entry later explains “three magistrate’s attendants,” *ternos statores*, which Aldred glossed accurately enough as ðriﬀaldo stondendo. The *tristatus/tristitia* confusion is a logical one, similar to the *quaesumus* error noted above, if the gloss was done some time after he copied the Latin and if he was translating a word or short phrase at a time, perhaps stopping to expound to an audience.

Aldred may have copied all three parts of QXI.50 from a single source, which seems likely given the similarity of content and the continuous copying format. But his gloss shows us an interesting aspect of his mind at work as he contemplated ways to translate cultures and make Christian history intelligible to an Anglo-Saxon audience. It also presumes that he not only had access to these reference lists but also to books for which they would be useful beyond just the Bible, such as commentaries from the Church Fathers and other histories.

QXI.51–52 explain ecclesiastical ranks and priestly titles, more immediately useful for an understanding of the church hierarchy historical and contemporary, but similarly used as a vocabulary exercise linking the three sacred languages. QXI.51 gives the Latin ecclesiastical hierarchy from bottom to top with their Greek or Hebrew origins, while QXI.52 explains the Greek origins of certain ecclesiastical titles and then several other Greek words.

---

122. Jerome, *Commentaria in Ezechielem* VII, xxiii (PL 25: 219) commenting on Ezekiel 23:23–27 (QXI.50x); see Thompson, *Rituale*, xx. Raban Maur (PL 110: 743C) repeats Jerome’s description and Fridegodus (PL 133: 1007) also discusses *tristatus*. This type of list must have been fairly common and could have been transmitted into Anglo-Saxon England through a variety of sources.

123. See *Durham Ritual* Glossary, 79, and Bosworth and Toller, who surmise a missing “un-.”

124. Folio 87 where these two lists occur exhibits some material differences. Besides the bottom edge cut at an angle (leaving an indentation on fol. 86), Aldred’s writing has slightly more errors (not all corrected).
The *De gradibus ecclesiae* (QXI.51, fol. 87ra11–87va15) appears from its title to be one of a garden variety of such lists numbering off the ecclesiastical grades, albeit a much confused tradition varying in number and order. However, Aldred’s list overall differs in several significant ways from the competing traditions outlined by Roger Reynolds and may indicate an effort by Aldred and/or his sources to resolve some of their inherent difficulties, as well as provide a linguistic exercise for himself and his readers.¹²⁵

First, Aldred avoided the numerical problem created in the common label *De vii gradibus ecclesiasticis* found in many sources by simply omitting the number altogether in the title.¹²⁶ Unlike many of these lists of “seven grades” that have eight or nine orders, Aldred numbered his to ten, a rarer variant not similar to his list in any case: *hostiarus, lector, exorcista, subdiaconus, diaconus, presbyter, episcopus, archepiscopus, pontifex, choriepiscopus,* and then, unnumbered, *papa.*¹²⁷ The first seven are fairly close to the Irish Ordinals of Christ (doorkeeper, lector, exorcist, subdeacon, deacon, presbyter, bishop), although lector and exorcist are reversed in the Irish and in many of the other lists.¹²⁸ Unlike most early medieval lists, for example in the Carolingian traditions represented by Alcuin and Raban Maur, Aldred did not include psalmist, even under lector, but neither did he add acolyte, although he discussed the term acolyte along with some other words in the next treatise, QXI.52. Perhaps Aldred was dealing with some older texts and anticipating the future trend of eliminating the psalmist and adding the acolyte as part of an effort to reconcile the numbers, evident for example in the later pastoral letters of Ælfric with a definitive seven (*hostiarus, lector, exorcista, acolitus, subdiaconus, diaconus,* and *presbiter/ episcopus*).¹²⁹ In any case, Aldred’s list predates Ælfric’s letters to Wulfstan and the need the reformers perceived to define clearly the secular clerical hierarchy.

---


¹²⁷ The numbers are in a lighter ink with circles or boxes around them; variation in their style may indicate that they were added later.


Second, his list is made up of *excerptiones* from various sources, with a stronger interest in the Old Testament and linguistic origins of the clerical offices than in the New or in their function. Further evidence that Aldred is compiling disparate sources is evident in the fact that the entry for priest in the QXI.51 list of ecclesiastical grades (fol. 87rvii–13) offers only the Greek and not the Hebrew derivation as was the pattern with the lower grades, but in QXI.52 the entry for priest (fol. 87va17–87vb1) makes up for that by giving the Old Testament background.

The Ordinals of Christ, a dominant tradition focused on Christ’s establishment of each rank, is not represented here. Rather, the majority of Aldred’s phrases can be found in Isidore of Seville’s *De ecclesiasticis officiis* or his Etymologies (Origine), Raban Maur’s *De clericorum institutione*, Pseudo-Alcuin’s *Liber de divinis officiis* and the *disputatio puerorum*, and the *Collectanea Pseudo-Bede*.\(^{130}\) The latter two are similar in format to Aldred’s text, in that they are *excerptiones*, but the excerpts do not line up with Aldred’s selections, which draw more on Isidore, Raban, and Pseudo-Alcuin, although none are an exact match. The *disputatio puerorum* attributed to Alcuin is in the pedagogical *quaestiones* format found in the *Joca monachorum* tradition, *Dic mihi*, used by Aldred with the two questions about wind above. Although Aldred was not using the question and answer format here, the pedagogical function may be implicit: these are answer sheets to questions or references for linguistic study.

Third, the episcopal offices, where he has gone off the numbered lists and drawn on different treatises to describe these positions within the sacerdotal ranks, reflects historical and geographic shifts in terminology that may be relevant to Chester-le-Street. The rather long explanation of *chorepiscopus* (fol. 87va5–13), using some information from Isidore of Seville’s *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, endeavors to explain the origins of this Greek term for an assistant bishop who oversaw rural areas outside of a city-centered bishopric, a position legislated against in the Carolingian empire despite a defense from Raban Maur and gradually supplanted by the archdeacon in the tenth and eleventh centuries.\(^{131}\) QXI.52 elaborates on the sacerdotal order as including both *presbyter* and *episcopus* within it, the latter with higher authority, as Aldred’s text explains.\(^{132}\)

---


131. Isidore of Seville, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, ch. 6 (PL 83:786–87); Synods of Paris in 829, Aachen in 836, Meaux in 845; Raban Maur, “De chorepiscopis” (PL 110: 1195–1206); see “chorepiscopi,” *New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia* ([http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/16024c.htm](http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/16024c.htm)).

These explanations may extend beyond an interest in the vocabulary to practical aspects of rank within the Northumbrian bishopric. Aldred as provost may have seen himself as a type of assistant bishop overseeing the rural areas around Chester-le-Street under Bishop Ælfsige.

Fourth, a few items from his gloss demonstrate Aldred’s pattern of thought and perhaps some of his other information sources. The Hebrew roots for the roles of deacons as Levites and subdeacons as “nathinnaei” from the book of Ezra (fol. 8\textit{r} b3–10) demonstrate a knowledge of Jerome, Isidore, Bede, or other patristic commentators.\textsuperscript{135} Although the Latin Aldred included for subdeacon does not have the full explanation found in Isidore of “nathinnaei” as servants, Aldred clearly knew the meaning because he glossed it (although above the word Ezra) as \textit{dēgning menn} (serving men). For the role of bishop (fol. 8\textit{r} b16–19), Greek \textit{episcopus} is explained as “inspector” (\textit{speculator} in Isidore) because he has oversight. Aldred gave the etymology of the syllables in Roman characters (lines 16–17) but with an error: “epis super/ scopus inspector.”\textsuperscript{134} Over the “s” of “epis” he placed a dot to indicate the error, and put correctly on the next line “scopus.” The Old English gloss on \textit{superinspectores} is \textit{ofor insecawre} (plural \textit{ofer insecawras}), emphasizing the role of sight in the bishop’s duties, which Wright discusses in his exploration of sight metaphors relevant to the Alfred Jewel and the Pastoral Care.\textsuperscript{135}

QXI.52, under the rubricated title \textit{Interpretatio nominis sacerdotum} (fol. 87va16-b15), draws on similar sources to supplement the previous list. The first section explains the relationship of \textit{sacerdos} and \textit{episcopus}, as noted above, then defines patriarch, metropolitan, acolyte, \textit{pisteuus} (\textit{fidelis}), martyr (\textit{testis}), \textit{epiphania} (\textit{manifestatio}) and \textit{ypapante} (\textit{ob[v]iatio}). The Old English gloss uses ecclesiastical loanwords as well.\textsuperscript{136} \textit{Sacerdos} remains \textit{sacerd} (or abbreviated to \textit{sac}), while \textit{sacerdotalen} [sic] becomes \textit{sacerdlichad} (priesthood). Presbyter is abbreviated to \textit{meas’} for Old English \textit{messepreóst}, while \textit{episcopus} is \textit{bisco’} (these terms were in the previous list with different explanations). From fol. 87vb2, the text offers a

\textsuperscript{133} See Boyd, “\textit{Aldrediana VII},” 14–16, on Aldred’s \textit{Lindisfarne gloss of levita with se diacon}, referencing Jerome’s \textit{De septem ordinibus ecclesiae} that makes this identification of Levites as deacons, rooted in the Hebrew root sense of function, as attendant; followed and developed by Isidore, Bede, Alcuin, and Raban Maur. Boyd also cites ordination rites for deacons, such as the \textit{Eghert Pontifical}, hence common liturgical usage presumably familiar to Aldred. On subdeacons as “nathinnaei” see Ezra 2:43 and Nehemiah 12:21 (see also 1 Chronicles 9:2); Boyd, “\textit{Aldrediana XXV},” 49–50 discusses this passage in relation to Isidore and cites Bede, Comm. in Ezram et Neemiam I, on Ezra 2:43–58 (CCSL 119.235.532–4) as evidence that this is a “common liturgical description of the role of sub-deacons” (p. 50).

\textsuperscript{134} Isidore, Raban Maur, and Pseudo-Alcuin use \textit{superintendere} as the Latin explanation of \textit{episcopus}, while Aldred has \textit{superinspectores}, which does occur as a definition of \textit{episcopus} in Bede’s commentary on Acts (Bede, PL 92: 986A) and a treatise of Pope Nicholas I (PL 119: 973A).

\textsuperscript{135} Wright, “\textit{Why Sight},” 185 and see discussion above of the \textit{de octo pondera} text; on sight and rulership, see also David Pratt, \textit{The Political Thought of King Alfred the Great} (Cambridge University Press, 2007), 187–92, 317–27 and passim.

\textsuperscript{136} T. J. Brown, \textit{Durham Ritual}, 51 sets apart the last section (fol. 87vb2–15) as an additional explanation of “eight Greek words” but Aldred treats it as part of the same text.
Latin explanation of a Greek title, which Aldred then glossed in Old English. Curiously in this section, he has copied the abbreviated Greek and Latin g. and l., but glossed them fully every time with Old English crecisc and lædin (hebraice is spelled out in the Latin and glossed in Old English with ebresc).

Similar to the earlier list of titles (QXI.50), sometimes he transliterated the Greek with a recognized ecclesiastical loanword and other times he offered an Old English equivalent, but in both cases giving a different Old English translation above the Latin explanation of the term. Greek patriarch is glossed with behfæder and its Latin counterpart pater with fæder, while the Hebrew abba is glossed with an abbreviation for Latin pater, an ecclesiastical loanword in any case. Greek archus is glossed with an abbreviation of the word (ar′) with the Old English gloss aldormann appearing over its Latin equivalent princeps. Similarly with metropolitan (glossed with the abbreviation metro′) Aldred offered Old English glosses of its explanation: Greek polis is Old English hehfæstnung, Latin urbs is Old English burg and its alternative civitas is Old English ceaster. This pattern continues with accoluthus (acolyte) and pisteus, but Greek martyr, he glossed δrow′ (Old English δrouere) and Latin testis as giwitnisse. However, the last two items, epiphania and ypapante, do not seem to be from the same type of list of names or titles and may be from a different source given the different abbreviation for Latin he used here (“lat” in lines 12 and 14).

Aldred ended this section and writing stint with a line possibly summarizing the whole enterprise: “id est antiqui plebi[u?]s” glossed þ′ is ða aldo folcum, as if to say, this is an explanation of the people of antiquity, but by extension also their languages, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. But these lists of secular as well as ecclesiastical offices may have also served a practical purpose for the mixed community of St. Cuthbert, if taken in light of the categories of persons found in the Durham Liber vitae, for whom ostensibly the community continued to pray. The ninth-century core of the Liber vitae divides into Nomina regum uel ducum, Nomina reginarum et abbatissarum, Nomina anchoritarum, Nomina abbatum gradus praesbyteratus, Nomina abbatum gradus diaconatus, Nomina abbatum, Nomina praesbyterorum, Nomina diaconorum, and Nomina clericorum. Aldred’s list is more specific in delineating the lexical origins of different offices, yet it would serve to shed light on these persons for whom they prayed and their ranks.

137. Acolythus, glossed accol′ is given the explanation of candle bearer at the recitation of the Gospel. His gloss of the Latin as væx biornende, “wax burner,” is an overly literal translation of Latin cerarius or Greek akolouthos (note this use of biornende is not in DOE).

138. “Epiphany in Greek, in Latin manifestation (yppe, bring to light). Ypapante in Greek, in Latin obviate (go up against).”

139. A letter resembling either a “u” or an “i” is inserted in the same dark ink and hand above and between the “i” and the “s” of plebis. The grammar differs between the two languages: antiqui plebis is presumably genitive, while aldo folcum may be dative plural.

Reynolds also suggests that the ordinals texts served various purposes filling space in manuscripts, for practice or instruction, or even as “wit sharpeners or puzzles.” Aldred’s combined lists of ecclesiastical offices may have been experiments in merging texts and reconciling different traditions (Northumbrian/Irish with continental/southern English), sharpening his own wits and those of his community in the process. What in effect Aldred was doing was offering a translation of a translation, an intriguing cultural project. Taken together, these three lists in QXI.50–52 reveal much about Aldred as glossator. His quest for understanding was not simply that of a struggling Latinist seeking to shore up a Latin-deficient priesthood in his community but that of a scholar reflecting on the nature of language and culture. Despite the errors—most of them attributable to haste or tiredness rather than ignorance—Aldred demonstrates an impressive knowledge of textual traditions that lie behind these lists, suggesting they served as far more than reference works.

QXI.53–55 Places in Christian History

The last three items in this “encyclopedic” section, and the last of the manuscript as it now stands, are part of a single writing stint done on folio 88 recto and verso. As with the material that preceded, though, these are Christian vocabulary lists: locations, an alphabet poem, and a Biblical citation index. The first item on the recto is more accessible, if not easier to source, than the two barely legible on the verso. All three, however, share a concern for understanding the Biblical heritage in the context of Christian ritual practice.

QXI.53, the list of places where the apostles are buried (Nomina locorum in quo apostoli requiescunt) starts fresh on fol. 88r, forgoing the one-third blank column on fol. 87vb. The text finishes on the same page (fol. 88ra1-b24) and thus stands alone. In fact, Aldred made an effort to get the text all on this single page, using abbreviations and some line overruns so that he could start each apostle on a new line, but barely squeezing in Stephen on an extra line in the b column. This format suggests an exclusive focus on this text, either copied from a single source or compiled from several sources. Nonetheless, it is of an encyclopedic type similar to the preceding lists offering names and places glossed in Old English. The absence of an identical source for this narrowly conceived list, amidst a wide array of similar types of traditional and apocryphal material on the apostles, combined with some anomalies in the place names and the gloss, point again to both Aldred’s peculiar interests in vocabulary as well as his access to Irish or Northumbrian sources no longer extant.

141. Reynolds, Ordinals, 69.
The information the list provides derives from a larger group of popular materials on the lives and deaths of Biblical and early Christian saints, and a particular subset on the apostles from canonical and apocryphal Acts, as well as patristic sources such as Jerome’s martyrology. Distilled versions of these lives converged in the early Middle Ages in encyclopedic collections like Isidore of Seville’s de ortu et obitu patrum, continental histories such as Freculf of Liseux’s Chronicon, and extracts like the Breviariurn apostolorum and Notitia de locis apostolorum, attached to Jerome’s martyrology. Irish tradition adapted these texts in a variety of ways: the Pseudo-Isidore de ortu et obitu patrum, Pseudo-Abdias’ Virtutes apostolorum, the Leabhar Breac, the Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae, the Irish Liber Hymnorum, and the Irish “Reference Bible” include lists of the apostles with various details on their lives. Most notably, the Leabhar Breac includes their genealogies, appearance (with an interest in hair and beard), and places of death. Innsular texts overall reveal a particular devotion to the apostles and their geographic place in a Rome-centered landscape. The locations vary slightly from one another in these insular texts, but none is a match for Aldred’s compilation, which is unique in only offering the burial places with both the city and the province or land.

Aldred’s list has a more problematic relationship to Bede, who had a considerable interest in the geography of holy places and drew on Irish sources, but was more selective about the apostolic traditions. Bede’s De locis sanctis is based


on that of Adomnán, which passed into Anglo-Saxon in the seventh century.145 His *Expositio actuum apostolorum* with *Retractatio* works its way in sequence through the canonical book of Acts, but the extra-Biblical and patristic traditions included are carefully chosen.146 In particular, Bede object to certain elements for Philip, Matthew, Simon, and Thaddeus found in Pseudo-Abdias, and possibly for John and Thomas in pseudo-Melitus.147 Bede also produced an alphabetically arranged list of regions, the *Nomina regionum atque locorum de actibus apostolorum*, but Aldred’s geographical designations do not seem to rely on its information.148

However, the development of the historical martyrlogy, initiated by Bede, provides a broader liturgical context for Aldred’s list of the apostles’ burial places.149 Following Bede’s leading and in response to Carolingian reform rules, historical martyrlogies in the ninth century compiled data on saints and apostles for use in the chapter meeting.150 A strong Irish tradition is evident in the collated edition of manuscripts from Metz, Cologne, Dublin, and Lund.151 The Old English Martyrology likewise offers in the vernacular, similar to hagi-
graphies and homilies, information on the apostles that would have been well-known in religious communities where they were regularly commemorated.\(^{152}\)

How Aldred’s list drew on these continental and insular traditions—or not, given the variations—is puzzling, but another Old English text provides an analogous source puzzle: Cynewulf’s Fates of the Apostles in the Vercelli Book.\(^{153}\) James Cross makes the argument that rather than borrowing from intermediary lists derived from texts like the Breviarium apostolorum, Notitia de locis apostolorum, or a version of Isidore’s De ortu et obitu patrum, Cynewulf as a religious would have known the apostles’ features well from liturgical celebrations that included readings from full accounts of their lives.\(^{154}\) A similar argument could explain Aldred’s list and its anomalies, that he was excerpting from martyrologies and hagiographies read on their feast days. Thus he—or his source if this is a verbatim copy—may have worked from memory, rather than consulting an encyclopedic source like Bede or Isidore. This would account for some of the geographic variations that are otherwise untraceable to a single, or even multiple, sources.

The starting point for his list may have been liturgical, but his focus on these particular apostles and only their burial locations points also to study and reference. The variations in Aldred’s list stand out in contrast with, rather than traceable to, the encyclopedic and martyrological sources. His fifteen names include ten original apostles (Matthias substituted for Judas), as well as the evangelists Mark and Luke, John the Baptist, Paul, and Stephen the first martyr. The sequence of the names is neither chronological, as in Isidore’s De ortu et obitu patrum surveying Old and New Testament figures, calendrical, as would occur in a martyrology, nor alphabetical, as with apostolic histories or Bede’s Nomina regionum. Rather, it is more like—but not exactly like—a litany.\(^{155}\) Aldred places the four evangelists first (matching a section in the Collectanea


\(^{154}\) Cross, “Cynewulf’s Traditions,” 164d.

\(^{155}\) Allen and Calder, Sources and Analogues, 36, note the same argument for Cynewulf’s Fates of the Apostles, while Cross, “Cynewulf’s Traditions,” 164, 175, suggests that he worked from a full account in a collection of lives. Thacker, “In Search of Saints,” in Early Medieval Rome, ed. Smith, 266, compares insular lists to the order of the apostles in the canon of the mass, and also (p. 268) notes the lack of a clear ordering for what was a relatively late development of liturgical commemoration listing the apostles as a group. Freculf’s Chronicon (PL 106: 1149), Isidore’s de ortu (Fraga 57.2), and the Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae, ed. Bayless and Lapidge, 170–171 (pp. 140–41) have summary passages listing the places in which the apostles preached, but the sequence starts with Peter and the cities or regions, similar to the Breviarium apostolorum (Allen and Calder, p. 38). For litanies, see Anglo-Saxon Litanies, Michael Lapidge, HBS 106 (London: Boydell, 1991).
*Pseudo-Bedae* and then omits the apostles Matthew and John from the subsequent list.\(^{156}\) After the evangelists, Aldred starts a common litany sequence of John the Baptist, Peter, Paul, Andrew; skips John the evangelist already named; proceeds with James; then reorders the usual sequence with Bartholomew, Thomas, Philip, and Simon the Zealot; and finally ends with Matthias, Judas’ substitute, and Stephen the first martyr from the Acts of the Apostles. However, he omits the apostle Thaddeus (Jude) and the other James.\(^{157}\) The wooden coffin of St. Cuthbert has incised on its lid the four evangelists and on one side the apostles, with both runic and Roman inscriptions, not all of them legible, in a sequence reminiscent of a litany.\(^{158}\) The coffin may have served as a source of inspiration and a way of linking the apostles’ burial locations to Cuthbert’s resting place at Chester-le-Street, relating the local saint to the universal church. Nonetheless, Aldred’s list does not exactly match any of these apostolic litanies, leading to the suspicion that he ordered the list according to his own peculiar interests rather than in accordance with a particular type of source.

Two examples demonstrate the variability of insular source traditions on which Aldred may have drawn. First, the one Jacob (James) Aldred lists is buried in Jerusalem, the location associated usually with James the Lesser, son of Alpheus and “brother” of Jesus.\(^{159}\) According to most sources that follow Isidore of Seville’s *de ortu*, James the Greater, son of Zebedee and brother of John the Beloved, preached in Spain and was buried in Achaia Marmarica; but most of the martyrologies focus on his beheading by Herod, presumably in Judea, and do not give a burial place.\(^{160}\) Moreover, the insular *Notitia de locis apostolorum* and the Irish *Leabhar Breac* locate James the Greater in Jerusalem.\(^{161}\) If Aldred
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156. *Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae*, ed. Bayless and Lapidge, 301 (pp. 164–65): Matthew in Judæa (confusion with Matthias?); Mark in Rome, Luke in India, John in Asia; these locations do not align with the earlier list in the *Collectanea* (170–71) or Aldred’s list of cities and provinces, except John in Asia. Bede, *Nomina Regionum*, XVIII, 24 entry on Alexandria, Egypt confirms Aldred’s identification of the location as Mark’s resting place.

157. The *Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae*, ed. Bayless and Lapidge, 170 (pp. 140–41) also omits Jude at the end of its list, compared to the summary passages in Isidore and Freculf.

158. R. I. Page, “Roman and Runic on St Cuthbert’s Coffin,” in *St. Cuthbert, His Cult and Community to A.D. 1200*, ed. Gerald Bonner, et al. (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1989), 357–65, at 261–62, who gives the sequence in pairs from right to left: Peter, Paul, Andrew, Jacob?, John, Thomas, Jacob?, Philip?, Bartholomew (or Barnabus), Matthias, Simon of Chana?, a lost name, presumed to be Thaddeus.

159. Bede (*Beda Venerabilis Expositio actuum apostolorum*, I.13, p. 10) weighed in on the confusion of three possible apostles named James, arguing that James son of Alpheaus was one and the same with James the so-called brother of Jesus, actually a cousin through Mary of Clopas, and celebrated as the first bishop of Jerusalem.

160. Those listing Achaia Marmarica include Isidore, *de ortu*, Fraga 47; Freculf, *Chronicon*, PL 106:1147; and the *Breviarium apostolorum* (Allen and Calder, 38). James the Greater’s feast day is 25 July (viii Kal. Augustas), but the *Old English Martyrology* (pp. 128–29) only notes that he was killed by Herod.

161. The *Notitia de locis apostolorum* (Allen and Calder, 37) has insular roots according to Thacker, “In Search of Saints,” in *Early Medieval Rome*, ed. Smith, 276–77; Thacker also notes that Willibrord’s calendar from eighth-century Echternach betrays his Hiberno-Northumbrian roots in its treatment of the apostles, and assigns separate dates for James the brother of Jesus on 27 December and James Alpheaus on 22 June. The Irish *Leabhar Breac* (p. 180, col. 2), in Stokes, “The Irish verses, notes, and glosses in Harl. 1802,” 362–65. However, the *Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae*, ed Bayless and Lapidge, 170 (pp. 140–41) locates James the Greater in Spain.
followed this insular tradition, the James he lists as buried in Jerusalem could be either one, the son of Zebedee or the brother of Jesus, although given his place in the litany-like sequence it is more likely to be the James the Greater, son of Zebedee. Second, Aldred identifies Thomas’ location as India of the Saracens (\textit{india saracenorum}, glossed \textit{india saricina}), a peculiar association found also in the \textit{Leabhar Breac}; this is a pre-Islamic meaning of the term Saracen, but conjoining it with Thomas and India is unusual.\textsuperscript{162} These two oddities suggest access to, and modification of, no longer extant insular materials for which Aldred is a unique witness.

What sets Aldred’s list even further apart from the more common source texts is his linguistic preoccupation with these place names, evident in the vernacular gloss, where he assiduously translated every word even though the formula settles into a pattern after the first couple of entries: \textit{Beatus N. requiescit [in civitate] in provincia}. . . \textsuperscript{165} All but three entries use the present tense \textit{requiescit} (or abbreviation \textit{requies’}) glossed with variations on \textit{geresteð}, but at the outset Matthew, Luke, and John have the past tense \textit{requievit}, glossed with OE \textit{gi-} or \textit{gereste}, although Matthew has an anomalous abbreviation mark over the final \textit{e}. Similarly, with Thomas buried in “Emina,” he not only omitted the first syllable of the city’s name as found in other sources (\textit{Calamina}) but also added a \textit{vel} glossing the present tense \textit{requies[cit]} with \textit{gerestad l gireste æt frvm} (rested at first), a possible indication that Aldred was aware of the third-century translation of Thomas’ relics elsewhere, to Edessa in Mesopotamia. A similar story might lie behind the three past tense verbs in the evangelists.

In addition to this tense variation in the initial evangelists, the first entry on Matthew is a bit more elaborate:

\begin{center}
\textit{se eadga mathe’ ap’ 7 godspellere gireste’ on earðe armenia on londe āmanito’ ďara lioda}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
Beatus matheus apostolus et euangelista requieuit in terra armenia in terra amanitorum
\end{center}

Two lands are given, with Aldred glossing the first \textit{terra} as OE \textit{eard(e)} and the second with \textit{lond(e)}, as if he sought to distinguish two different territorial meanings, or perhaps just two different ways of translating Latin \textit{terra} into Old English. Armenia is repeated in the gloss, but when he comes to \textit{terra amanitorum}, he shortens it in the gloss to \textit{āmanito’} with abbreviation marks above both the first and last letters, perhaps thinking that it referenced the Armenian


\textsuperscript{163} Although inconsistent, Aldred’s gloss favors \textit{in} for cities and \textit{on} for province or land/earth. See analysis by Thomas Miller, \textit{The Old English Version of Bede’s Ecclesiastical History of the English People}, EETS 95, pp. xli–xlii.
people. He then added for clarification in Old English the genitive phrase “of the people” (ðara lioda). Neither term lines up with the Isidorean traditions or the martyrlogies, which locate Matthew variably in Macedonia, the Parthian mountains, or in Ethiopia.

The inclusion of both the city and province renders the list closer to encyclopedic traditions than the historical martyrlogies, where a city name first is given as the place of commemoration, then descriptions of places they traveled, died and were buried, or moved later. Further, Aldred’s place names are sometimes anomalous, not only the Thomas example above, but also Peter and Paul are both listed as resting in Rome, but Peter’s Rome is in the province, rightly, of Tuscia and Paul’s Rome is in the province of Campania. He generally transliterated the province name into the Old English gloss (megðe mesopotamia), and at first the city name, but eventually he glossed city names with ðær byrig, his translation of urbs in the previous list (fol. 87v66), referring the reader down to the Latin name below the gloss. In the cases of Matthew, John the Baptist, Thomas, and Simon of Chana, the use of the genitive indicates a territory defined by a people rather than a geographic boundary. This suggests that the province name was of some interest as demonstrating the spread of the gospel to all peoples through apostolic authority in each province. That concept could extend to include the territory and community under the authority of St. Cuthbert, whose body rested at Chester-le-Street in a coffin decorated with the apostles.

What this text, in the context of the other lists, tells us is more about Aldred: that he was interested in sacred geography in terms of Biblical literacy; that he thought his textual community needed to be able to identify these traditional sites while honoring the apostles in their liturgy at the site of their own saint; and that the multiple languages assist one another in comprehension and

164. It probably refers to people living in the mountain range Amanus between Cilicia and Syria (Lewis and Short).
165. Isidore, de ortu, Fraga 53,3; Martyrology, 21 Sept (A Martyrology of Four Cities, 160).
166. These province names do not occur with Peter and Paul in Rome in Isidore or the historical martyrlogies, although Tuscia and Campania are referenced in other contexts. According to Isidore (de ortu, Fraga, 44,3), Peter is "sepultus in Vaticano ab urbe Roma ad Orientem milliarios" and according to the martyrlogy for 29 June (A Martyrology of Four Cities, p. 113), "sepultus est in eadem urbe in Vaticano, iuxta viam Triumphalem, qui totius orbis ueneratione celebratur," while Paul in Isidore "in via Ostensi truncatur ibique est cum honore sepultus," the papal basilica of Saint Paul Outside the Walls. Conceivably, Aldred or his source attempted to identify the Roman roads with the provinces, placing Peter in the city of Rome itself, properly in Tuscia, and locating Paul outside the city westward on the via Ostia; although that coastal town is not in the province of Campania (further to the south), one of the Roman roads between Ostia and Rome is called the via Campana (map at http://www.ostia-antica.org/intro.htm).
167. Mark in the second entry receives both the transliteration of the city, Alexandria, as well as the explanation, in ðær byrig. In the case of John the Baptist, the Latin identifies the place as in ciuitate nomine sabusta.
168. Thacker, “In Search of Saints,” in Early Medieval Rome, ed. Smith, 274–75, suggests an insular interest in the Isidorean notion that each province has an apostle, and that the expanding definition of an apostle represents not only a need to establish Rome’s apostolic authority in England, but also local apostolic authority in provincial saints like St. Cuthbert.
remembrance. This latter point is an important one for understanding the vernacular gloss throughout Durham A.IV.19. Rather than simply dismissing it as a crib for Latin-deficient readers, we ought to recognize the power Aldred perceived to reside in multiple languages interacting, whether in liturgy or pedagogy. Indeed, for Aldred the bilingual text was crucial to the performance of rituals, so that it may be best to treat these encyclopedic additions not as separate from other service book materials, but as vital to the community’s apprehension of their prayer labor.

In that context, it is unfortunate that the verso of fol. 88 is hard to read, since it also contains texts relevant to the devotional life of the community, particularly the alphabet poem that fills most of the page (QXI.54, fol. 88va1–24, b1–21). Almost illegible due to wear as the end page of this quire and of the manuscript, the poem is laid out with the alphabet letters in the left margin of each column and with an effort to keep each entry to two lines, even if some had to wrap around above or below. The gloss is even harder to read.

As with the other lists in this section, the poem is difficult to trace to a single source and is unique to Aldred, conceivably even an original composition. However, its overall tenor makes it likely another Irish-derived text. For example, the letter “a” for Adam alludes to the allegorical interpretation of the four letters of Adam’s name, while the letter “e” for Eve at fol. 88va12–13 is similar to a discussion of the age of Adam in the Dialogue of Solomon and Saturn that follows the eight pounds of Adam and is found in other insular literature. The poem’s theme is redemptive, contrasting the work of the devil and the work of Christ, and interpreting Biblical characters and animals allegorically. For example, N for nemar, the panther, is identified as Christ, which Boyd links to a knowledge of the allegorical interpretations in the Physiologus (88vb3). In the entry for the letter R (fol. 88vb9), Raguel is identified with strength and with “Satahel,” both apocryphal angelic names; curiously, Aldred glossed Raguel with nama (name) rather than retaining the name as he did with Satahel. At fol. 88vb5, for the Latin christus crucem (cross) Aldred glossed hroda, an unusual spelling even for Aldred, who on this same page spelled it more normally (rod-). It may be that Aldred’s exemplars included Old English or other glosses affecting his orthography, or conceivably the spelling anomalies reflect an oral dialogue taking place with students while he glossed. That bilingual

---

169. Generally Aldred tried to start each new alphabet letter on a new line; most take two lines. For a couple, he added a word from the first line to an empty half line above; in two cases, he overran to the next line and then started the next letter midline (“n” and “u/v” in column b).

170. Cross and Hill, The Prose Solomon and Saturn, 26, 70–72; Thompson, Rituale, xx.


172. See discussion of angels in Jolly, “Prayers from the Field,” and Boyd, “Aldrediana XXV,” 55–56, who works out the etymological twists that lie behind the idea of strength in Raguel and Satahel. As for the curious gloss of Raguel as nama, Boyd, 55, notes that “nama merely recognizes that Raguel is a personal name.”

173. Hrode was also used in the gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels only at Mark 15:30 (see Cod. Lind. index verborum). At lines 11 and 14 on fol. 88vb, he glossed derh rod, which has a preceding “h.”
dialogue would introduce students to the allegorical interpretation of Scripture, bringing redemptive meaning to nature.

The poem is in effect a world history, from Adam the first man’s name lettered by God at the Creation to world’s end and the last judgment, told as a battle between good and evil. In between, Christ is revealed in Old Testament figures and then Incarnate, conquering the devil through the cross. The crux of the poem, occurring not coincidentally at the top of the b column, is light: \( \text{Lumen id est uerum lumen (leht \( p \) is sod leht \( l \))} \), the vel alternative left incomplete. Although Aldred fails to gloss further what he thought this light meant, the poem’s emphasis on the person and work of Christ is clear. P stands for \( \text{Portauit id est christus crucem suam portauit (gebær \( p \) is crist hroda his gebær).} \) That Christ carried his own cross is explained further in the letters “s” for \( \text{Saluator} \) who saves the world through the cross and and “t” for \( \text{tenuit}, \) that he holds and carries the world through the cross. In some ways, the poem transmits the same spiritual vision and ritual celebration as the Dream of the Rood and the Ruthwell Cross.

The canon table below similarly unites Old and New Testament exegesis in Christian interpretation. Below the alphabet poem in both columns is the last text, at least in the surviving folios of the manuscript (QXI.55; fol. 88vb22–26, a25–26), only partially legible. Its presence in both columns at the bottom suggests that it was not planned as an addition until after the alphabet poem had filled both columns and seemingly the page. The text consists of a summary of Old Testament citations (\textit{testimonia}) in the Gospels and Ammonian sections (\textit{canones}) of the Gospels. Matthew and Mark are in the \( b \) column and Luke and John in the \( a \) column. This type of material is fairly common, but what is legible here does not clearly match referenced sources. The content, however, seems to fit with the other material Aldred copied in these last few pages, as a reference work for understanding Biblical texts and history, a cross-reference that connects Old and New Testaments. The listing of the four Gospels on the last page of Durham A.IV.19’s Quire XI brings us back to his gloss and colophon in the \textit{Lindisfarne Gospels} marking his entry into the community of St.

---

174. “\( \text{Adam primus homo factus est a domino de prima litera id est de iiiii litteris. de quibus nominatum est nomen eius} \) glossed \( \text{se f'na mon aworht fro' drihtne of ðæm f'na staf of f' ver staf of ðæm . . . . . . . . . . . . ad ves noma his.} \)

175. “\( \text{Saluator id est christus iesus. qui saluauit mundum per crvcem. Tenuit fortitudinem magnam chris tus qui portauit mundum per crucem,} \) glossed \( \text{hælend \( h \) is crist hæl' se ðe gehælde middang' ðerh rod giheald strengo micel crist se ðe gebær middang' ðerh rode.} \)

176. For the ritual connection between the Dream of the Rood and Ruthwell Cross, see \( \text{Éamonn Ó Carragáin, } \text{Ritual and the Rood} \text{ (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005).} \)

177. Thompson, \( \text{Rituale, xi, calls it } \text{“a summary of the numbers of the canons of the four Gospels.” } \) T. J. Brown, \( \text{Durham Ritual,} \) 51 cites the \textit{testimonia} in D. de Bruyne, \textit{Préfaces de la bible latine} (Namur, 1920), 186–88 from Paris BN, Lt. 6 and Paris BN Lat. 268. De Bruyne, however, is not very helpful: the four lists, one for each Gospel, have an opening line different from these and then gives each Old Testament book and its citations, lacking here.
Cuthbert. It serves as a pertinent reminder that the Biblical texts were never far from his mind while glossing, and the Gospels in particular were probably deeply embedded in his psyche through the extraordinary vernacular gloss he performed as an act of worship in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*.

Thus Aldred’s interests, while seemingly eclectic, do illustrate a scholarly mindset belied by the label “educational” or even “encyclopedic.” In particular, his penchant for glossing suggests an active engagement with the material for the purpose of considering the relationship between the local and the global, between Anglo-Saxon language and culture and that of the Roman Christian tradition. More prosaic than the legendary work of Caedmon or the great Old English Biblical poems of Junius 11, and less highly placed and centralized than King Alfred’s educational enterprise, nonetheless, Aldred was also a cultural translator as all good philologists are.\(^\text{178}\)

Aldred’s glossing is more than incidental in understanding the textual additions made in Durham A.IV.19’s constituent parts. Arguably Aldred’s primary purpose as sole compiler and glossator of the encyclopedic materials was to explore the multilingual heritage of the Christian tradition and to add Old English to that heritage in the same way as the Old English enhanced the Gospels in *Lindisfarne* and the liturgy in the original collectar. While Aldred’s gloss to the liturgical texts in the main collectar and in his own additions may appear to be a secondary, or even tertiary, use of service book materials whose primary purpose is performance, the gloss may have been for Aldred the main thing, comparable in some ways to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* gloss which he valued so highly as to place himself with the original creators of the manuscript. As a wordsmith—a philological craftsman—Aldred committed a significant amount of time and resources to this linguistic enterprise.

The question remains, why this intense effort in the additions to Durham A.IV.19, particularly the glossing of liturgical materials and the encyclopedic texts. The texts probably served multiple purposes for Aldred and his community, both as they were written and later when they were read by others. The examples discussed in this chapter suggest at least three: vocabulary study, teaching Latin, and theological reflection. The analyses of the scriptorium in chapter 3 and of the liturgical additions in chapter 4 support this interconnection of writing, reading, and teaching as central to understanding this manuscript. For although the primary function of a service book is the performance of the liturgy, in the case of Durham A.IV.19, the eclectic texts found in the manuscript may have been “performed” while writing, reading, and teaching in locations other than the church.