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The years since I completed the study entitled Texts and Their Traditions in the Medieval Library of Rochester Cathedral Library have seen impressive developments in scholarship on the manuscripts, texts, scribes, and regional scriptoria associated with the post-Conquest Benedictine foundation at Rochester.¹ These topics have merited attention for many reasons, but several are especially prominent. First, the contemporary documentation of the medieval library is exceptional, offering insight into the assembly and organization of a post-Conquest collection. Second, the percentage of surviving books is high, giving crucial evidence for the extent of Norman influence on this process. Third, certain Old English texts reflect important traditions, helping to demonstrate the collaborative relationships among scriptoria in southeast England. Publications on these and other topics have appeared in a variety of forms: books, chapters, articles, notes, reviews, and pamphlets to accompany microfiches. To present their findings most usefully, I have organized the present essay into three parts. It will begin with a review of new findings, moving from works treating larger topics such as the medieval catalogues to those concerning individual manuscripts. Then using this evidence and my own fresh research, I will present annotations to Andrew G. Watson's 1996 edition of the library records published in volume 4 of the Corpus of Medieval Library Catalogues.² The essay will conclude with a select bibliography of works published from 1987-2006 dealing with the Rochester foundation and its books.

Indeed, as an ambitious reassessment of all of the extant documentation up to 1500, Watson's is the most fundamental study of the Rochester library to appear in the period covered here. In the introduction, Watson notes that, according to the evidence of the will of a former bishop, published in 1500, Rochester seems never to have built a separate library room.³ This conjecture
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helps to explain the several locations for parts of the collection specified in the various catalogues. He also reviews the extensive number of *ex libris* inscriptions in Rochester books and classifies them according to probable accuracy. Finally, he describes the three scanty series of pressmarks and concludes, as have previous scholars, that they provide less information about the arrangement of the books than do the catalogues.

In his edition, Watson proceeds through the catalogues, including donation lists and loan records, by date. He introduces each piece with a physical description and provides more extensive information about the two major booklists compiled in 1122-23 and 1202. The first of these (B77), written into the cartulary of the *Textus Roffensis*, is, as he says, 'certainly the earliest booklist known from England to be organized by author and is also arguably the earliest extant catalogue from an English institution designed from the outset as an inventory of the book collection as a whole'. Watson deduces that the first leaf, listing bibles and related materials such as commentaries, followed by a few works of Augustine, has been lost. The item at the top of the first surviving folio (224r) supports this argument: 'Expositionem eiusdem super psalterium in .iii. voluminibus', a reference to Augustine's *Enarrationes in psalmos*.

Watson's annotations to the first and subsequent catalogues include a complete itemization of the texts from each book (where known), the hand of each entry, citations for the latest editions of these texts, and cross-references to the same (or similar) books in the other Rochester booklists. For the item from Augustine quoted above, for example, he cites the surviving manuscript, the donor inscriptions, the CPL number, and the corresponding item in the 1202 catalogue.

In the fragmentary catalogue (B78), also from the early twelfth century, Watson identifies two new volumes of saints' lives, one of four abbots from Cluny, the other of the three sisters from Ely; the former survives in a later copy probably from another Kentish house, while the latter is recorded again in the 1202 catalogue. Moving on to this second major catalogue (B79), dated 1202, entered in London, British Library, MS Royal 5 B. XII, Watson gives a close analysis of the scribal hands and relates them to the dating phrase added at the top of the list. He also makes some editorial decisions regarding the deletion of entries and combining of others. Specific comments on these changes will follow in my annotations to the edition.

Soon after the completion of the 1202 catalogue, a separate list (B80) was made in BL MS Royal 10 A. XII of the books copied or acquired by one
Alexander 'quondam cantor.' Watson here does an admirable job of elucidating some very cramped entries. Next, he lists the entries referring to books from an early thirteenth-century donation list in the Rochester register (B81), BL Cotton Vespasian A. xxii, and links these to a number of items mentioned in the two full catalogues. Lastly, Watson prints two fourteenth-century documents, one recording a gift to Rochester of ten volumes (B82) by Bishop Haimo Hethe in 1346 and the second an indenture (B83), dated 1 June 1390, listing a loan of thirteen books from the prior and convent of Rochester to the rector of Southfleet (possibly five manuscripts identified). With the incorporation of these additional documents into his presentation of the Rochester catalogues, Watson develops a more complete picture of the medieval library than has previously been available.

Although not devoted exclusively to Rochester, Richard Gameson's Postdoctoral Fellowship Monograph, The Manuscripts of Early Norman England (c. 1066-1130), necessarily has much to say about the library and its surviving books. In a lengthy introductory essay drawing upon booklists and manuscripts, Gameson surveys the nature of library growth in England during the period covered by his study and notes the dramatic acceleration of that rate in the early twelfth century. The evidence from Rochester is useful particularly in documenting the role that Norman scribes and artists played in this process. For example, Gameson is able to identify at least three manuscripts in which Normans hands and an early version of the 'prickly' script adopted from Canterbury appear together. Furthermore, he demonstrates that Rochester participated in a 'chain' of copying that included Durham and Christ Church, Canterbury that sometimes began with a continental book. As Gameson reminds us, the earliest Rochester catalogue reinforces the priority given to collecting and copying patristic texts in the decades after the Conquest. It also demonstrates what a community 'with sufficient determination and good connections' could accomplish in its library by the 1120s. Again, the happy coincidence of thorough documentation and a high percentage of surviving books ensures Rochester's status as a case-study for the growth of a collection in the post-Conquest period.

Prior to his Inventory of Manuscripts, Gameson offers three appendices presenting information about texts surviving from the period in the most copies and about authors whose work is represented. These he follows with an Inventory of Texts Included in Book-Lists, by author and title, which also includes references to extant manuscripts. From an examination of the entries under 'A' only, including pseudo-Augustine, the comprehensiveness of the Rochester collection by 1130 becomes clear: of the 'A' items specified in the booklists,
excluding antiphoners, 72 are represented in the Rochester collection, while only 12 do not appear there. Turning to Gameson's Inventory of Manuscripts, we find some variation between his judgments and those of Watson, but, for the most part, these are minor. By working from the manuscripts as well as the booklists, Gameson is able to present a fuller picture of the scope of Rochester's library than emerges from a study of the catalogues alone.

Another recently-published resource, Helmut Gneuss's Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts, also helps with descriptive information and dating, though it must be consulted for specific manuscripts since the items are not indexed by provenance, and its utility for the Rochester library is limited by the cut-off date of 1100. As many readers will know, the Handlist is organized by repository, collection, and shelf-mark. Each entry offers information about contents, date, and provenance. There is a handy index to authors and works that allows one to check, say, whether a copy of Usuard's Martyrologium linked to Rochester survives from this period. The answer is probably not, though the copy in the Durham Cantor's Book might have some connection to Rochester (see below). Using Gneuss's Handlist and other resources, Michael Lapidge has published an updated version of J. D. A. Ogilvy's Books Known to the English 597-1066. Entitled 'Catalogue of Classical and Patristic Authors and Works Composed before AD 700 and Known in Anglo-Saxon England', Lapidge's work includes some eight Rochester manuscripts from the late eleventh/early twelfth century that are also listed in Gneuss. These are copies of three works by Augustine, two by Gregory, and one each by Jerome, Isidore, and Julius Pomerius. For later items, A. G. Watson's Supplement to the second edition of Ker's Medieval Libraries of Great Britain adds five manuscripts and fragments from the twelfth and fourteenth centuries to the list of Rochester books.

Rochester manuscripts have also been described in a variety of other catalogues. In P. R. Robinson's Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c. 737-1600 in Cambridge Libraries, see items 34, 152, 364, and 376 and plates 48-51. Robinson notes that Matthew Parker bequeathed her item 152, now Corpus Christi College MS 332, to that library in 1575. In her Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c. 888-1600 in London Libraries, Robinson includes one item (53 and plate 10) from Rochester. In the description of the latter, she reviews the issues regarding the date of the earliest catalogue of the Rochester library and accepts Wormald's suggestion of 1124. Ralph Hanna provides a thorough description of a late thirteenth-century Vulgate, Oxford, St. John's College 4, inscribed with the name Stephani De cranbroke de claustro Roffensis.
The Gundulf Bible (Pasadena, Huntington Library, MS HM 62) is covered in the 1989 catalogue of that library's manuscript holdings. New work on the history of Rochester Cathedral, which necessarily relates to the development of its library, has been collected and published in *Faith and Fabric: A History of Rochester Cathedral 604-1994*. In chapter 1, Martin Brett covers the church at Rochester from 604-1185. Noting that pre-Conquest sources are skimpy, Brett focuses on the accomplishments of Bishop Gundulf and his successors, along with the continuing tensions arising from Rochester's role as dependency of Canterbury. In chapter 2, Anne Oakley details the daily life, administrative structure, acquisition of lands, and population of monks at Rochester Priory from 1185 to 1540. Oakley's account draws upon the extensive archival records surviving from the Cathedral Priory and described by Nigel Yates in Appendix B. Paul A. Welsby gives an overview of the Cathedral Library in Appendix A and describes the five medieval volumes still housed at Rochester. The remainder of *Faith and Fabric* covers the architectural history of the foundation as well as developments up to the twentieth century. In a separate study, Brett highlights the close relationship between Gundulf and Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury. The two prelates worked together for twenty years to transform the Rochester community into a thriving, well-endowed Benedictine house. Brett points out that Lanfranc also played a leading role in the conversion of the cathedral community at Durham, which may help to explain the circulation of texts among Canterbury, Rochester, and Durham that continues to be explored by Gameson and others.

In a related article, Marylou Ruud returns to the sources for Gundulf's life to argue that he was an aggressive and successful administrator of his diocese, both in acquiring extensive lands and in adjudicating disputes on behalf of the king. His efforts helped to set the stage for Rochester's future prosperity. Julie Potter's searching analysis of the *Vita Gundulfi* notes the emphasis there on Gundulf's dual roles as monk and bishop and connects this to the crisis faced by Rochester's monks in 1123-24, when they feared the appointment of a secular bishop. Potter suggests that the anonymous *Vita* served as part of an effort to persuade the monks of Canterbury to support a monastic appointment for their brethren.

James P. Carley has published several indispensable studies of the fates of Rochester manuscripts after the Dissolution. Most important is his volume, *The Libraries of King Henry VIII*, in which he edits the 1542 inventory of the Upper Library at Westminster. For each entry, Carley identifies and describes the
manuscript or printed book, where extant, and provides references for the texts in question. In his introduction, he observes that more than 100 books from this collection derive from Rochester, over three times as many as from any other monastic house. He surmises that the books were seized from the library of John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, who was executed in 1535. Because this inventory aids in the identification of Rochester manuscripts, I have added cross references to it in my annotations to Watson's edition of the medieval catalogues. It is worth noting, however, that many of the Rochester volumes surviving from the Westminster collection are too late (thirteenth and fourteenth centuries) for inclusion in the medieval booklists. These are primarily theological treatises and commentaries by authors such as Thomas Aquinas, Peter of Cornwall, and William Peraldus.

In 'John Leland and the Foundations of the Royal Library: The Westminster Inventory of 1542', Carley notes that items acquired for Henry VIII could have entered one of three separate collections (at Westminster, Hampton Court, or Greenwich). As he analyses the Westminster inventory, Carley identifies a number of volumes marked, presumably, for the royal collection, which survive from the (separate) Old Royal Library itself. In a subsequent article, Carley traces a number of books from the royal collection to the ownership of Sir Robert Cotton in the early seventeenth century. Carley identifies the now destroyed MS Cotton Otho A. xv, fols. 1-80, with entries in the Westminster inventory ('Acta gestorum pontificum') and the 1202 catalogue ('Acta beatorum pontificum in i vol') of the Rochester library. He also describes two examples of Rochester volumes still in the Royal Library from which Cotton excised copies of pseudo-Nennius's Historia Brittonum for his own collection: MS Cotton Vespasian D. xxi, fols. 1-17 from MS Royal 15 A. XXII, and MS Cotton Vitellius A. xiii, fols. 91-100 from MS Royal 15 B. XI. In all cases, there is evidence to illustrate Cotton's well-known tampering with books in his possession. Part I of Vespasian D. xxi is described, along with the rest of the composite manuscript, in ASMMF, 7, and reproduced on the accompanying fiche. Another manuscript from Cotton's collection that has undergone reorganization, MS Nero D. ii, preserves a number of chronicles written at Rochester in the early fourteenth century. A related study is Andrew Watson's 'The Manuscript Collection of Sir Walter Cope (d. 1614)'. Here Watson surveys the life and collecting habits, as they can be deduced, of a founding donor of the Bodleian Library. He presented a two-volume homiliary by Ælfric, now Oxford MSS Bodley 340 and 342, to the library in 1602.
Arguably the most important Rochester book to survive, the *Textus Roffensis*, has attracted enormous scholarly attention over the past twenty years. The most influential reassessment of the structure and purpose of this two-volume collection of laws and charters from early twelfth-century Rochester is the work of Patrick Wormald, first in an essay, 'Laga Eadwardi: The Textus Roffensis in its Context', and subsequently in his comprehensive study, *The Making of English Law: King Alfred to the Twelfth Century: Volume I: Legislation and its Limits*. In both, Wormald presents a detailed analysis of the assembly of the legal portion of the manuscript which, he argues, was copied in a number of self-contained units from a variety of sources by a scribe/editor. It was a bishop's book for Rochester, with no mention of archiepiscopal status as would be expected for Canterbury. As a legal compendium beginning with the earliest Kentish royal codes and including the post-Conquest Latin compilation known as the *Instituta Cnuti*, the *Textus* was both memorial to the past and instrument of its adaptation in a new world.

Building upon Wormald's findings, Carole Hough investigates the letter-forms of the main scribe of the *Textus Roffensis* in both the charters and the lawcodes. By comparing cartulary texts to the five surviving single-sheet originals containing Old English, she is able to demonstrate that the scribe was strongly influenced by the handwriting of his sources. From there Hough analyses the variant letter-forms in the Old English law codes and concludes, as did Wormald, that the codes were drawn from a number of exemplars, that more than one source was used for the laws of Alfred and Ine, and that many of the rubrics may be original to the *Textus* scribe. In short, she uses palaeography to confirm the scribe's editorial role in the assembly and organization of his material. Further, her method reveals that the earliest Kentish laws of Æthelberht may have a textual history separate from those of his successors Wihtred and Hlothhere and Eadric. These Kentish royal codes have been re-edited by Lisi Oliver. Based upon an examination of linguistic features such as archaisms and dialectal variants, Oliver posits a separate line of transmission for the laws of Hlothhere and Eadric but finds insufficient evidence to determine whether those of Æthelberht and Wihtred travelled together or separately. It seems clear, at least, that the earliest English codes did not circulate as a group until much later in their history.

The Norman influence at work in the legal collection is explored in two important articles. In 'Ernulf of Rochester and Early-Norman Canon Law', Peter Cramer gives the fullest picture to date of the scholarly interests and activities of Bishop Ernulf (1114-24), the individual traditionally credited with inspiring the
Textus Roffensis. Although his education and writings were influenced by canon law, Cramer cites reasons to believe that, under Henry I, Ernulf might have turned his attention as well to secular law. Bruce O'Brien focuses on the Norman translation of certain Old English laws into Latin known as the Instituta Cnuti, whose earliest copy appears in the Textus Roffensis in place of the Old English codes of Cnut. Citing evidence for the work's composition in Worcester, O'Brien analyses the translator's method and purpose as he worked to bring this material to a post-Conquest audience. Of particular interest to the study of Rochester manuscripts is O'Brien's argument that the version of the Instituta Cnuti in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson C. 641 (twelfth century, origin and provenance unknown) is a direct copy of that in the Textus Roffensis and that, as a pair, they represent an independent branch of the stemma. As part of his evidence, O'Brien shows the shortcomings in Liebermann's transcriptions of these texts and also answers Wormald's objections to his position. If he is correct, as seems to be the case, Rawlinson C. 641 would bear further consideration for its possible Rochester connections.

The cartulary in the Textus Roffensis and surviving sheet charters from Rochester have also been the subject of several editions and studies. In a recently published article, Nicholas Brooks draws upon Rochester's Anglo-Saxon documents to show how the bishop and cathedral community extended their control of properties within the Roman walls from the seventh to the ninth centuries. He finds that in the 860s, during the Viking occupation of the area, the West Saxon kings actually ceded control of the ceaster to the bishop of Rochester. Brooks also discusses the late Anglo-Saxon bridge-work list recorded in the Textus Roffensis, which offers detailed information about the Roman bridge across the Medway, including aspects of its construction and the allotment of responsibility for maintaining it. Eight items from Rochester, including two from the Textus Roffensis, are described with full bibliographical information in David A. E. Pelteret's Catalogue of English Post-Conquest Vernacular Documents. Using surviving documents recorded in the Textus Roffensis and on single sheets, Colin Flight reconstructs the history, from the tenth to twelfth centuries, of certain disputed properties ultimately retained by Rochester. As Flight observes, it is remarkable that the agreements recounting the disputes were put into writing at all. It is to be supposed that this happened only when the outcome favoured the church, and that statements in the documents would be made only from Rochester's point of view. On the other hand, these types of materials demonstrate just how vexed the process of bequests and
donations to the church could be. Further on this point, Patrick Wormald includes seven lawsuits recorded in Rochester materials in his 'Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Lawsuits'. One particular case, that regarding ownership of an estate at Snodland, Kent, is analysed in detail by Wormald in the context of dispute settlement in Anglo-Saxon England. On the other hand, as Peter Kitson shows, at least one individual who wrote the boundary clause in a Rochester land charter amused himself by putting both the Old English and Latin versions in verse. The cartulary in the Textus Roffensis also serves as the major source of H. Tsurushima's study, 'The Fraternity of Rochester Cathedral Priory about 1100'. Here the author examines the background to selected gifts by wealthy laymen in exchange for entry into the society of monks at Rochester. The donors were both English and Norman, and they secured entry for themselves or for male family members, especially sons.

In the attached list of annotations I have added such identifications as I and other scholars have made recently for items in the Rochester catalogues; no doubt more progress will be made in the coming decades. One important discovery that bears further attention is the several links between Durham, Dean and Chapter Library, MS B. IV. 24 (the Durham Cantor's Book), late eleventh century, and Rochester. The major texts included in the book are copies of the Benedictine Rule in Latin and Old English, a copy of Usuard's Martyrologium, and a copy of Lanfranc's Constitutiones. A. J. Piper first noted two Kentish supplements in the martyrology, the passio sancti Alfeagi (Archbishop of Canterbury, d. 1012) for April 19 and the death of Paulinus (Bishop of Rochester, d. 644) with the supplement ciuitate Rofensi. Furthermore, Piper finds evidence in the idiosyncrasies of the Latin text that could be linked to a foundation which had, until recently, housed an order of canons, as was the case with Rochester, and may then have been revised for an order of nuns, such as Gundulf had recently founded at Malling.

As scholars of Ælfrician materials know, a number of surviving manuscripts from the eleventh and twelfth centuries containing his works have been associated with Rochester. Although there is general agreement that these compilations originated in southeast England and probably reflect the close association of scriptoria at Canterbury (both Christ Church and St Augustine's) and Rochester, issues of precise origin and provenance remain unresolved. The standard editions of the two series of Ælfric's Catholic Homilies, with full descriptions of these manuscripts and their stemma, provide a starting point for our review. In his work on the First Series, Peter Clemoes follows N. R. Ker in
recounting the links of two early manuscripts, Oxford, Bodleian Library MSS. 340 and 342 to Rochester, the provenance if not the origin of the collection. In his edition of Ælfric's prefaces, Jonathan Wilcox recapitulates the links among three collections of the Catholic Homilies, MSS Bodley 340-342 and Cambridge MSS Corpus Christi College 162 and 303, presented by Malcolm Godden in his 1979 edition of the Second Series. D. G. Scragg demonstrates the relationship between the homilies in the Vercelli Book and this group of south-eastern manuscripts and suggests that the Vercelli manuscript may have been at Rochester at some time in the eleventh century, though its sources were more likely to have come from Canterbury, possibly St Augustine's. Additionally, a number of surveys and inventories of hagiographic material appearing in these and related collections have been published in recent years. The two-part article by Alex Nicholls contains a description of the corpus followed by a full list of all hagiographic items in each manuscript. More details about individual pieces are provided by D. G. Scragg in 'The Corpus of Anonymous Lives and Their Manuscript Context', where, for example, he describes items added to collections apparently destined for Rochester. The distribution of selections from Ælfric's Lives of Saints in homiletic as well as predominantly hagiographic collections is analysed by Joyce Hill in an article covering the same group of south-eastern manuscripts.

Studies of individual manuscripts associated with Rochester and the nexus of south-eastern scriptoria have provided many new details about the nature and circulation of vernacular materials in the area. Although they are often mentioned, MSS Bodley 340-342 have received more attention in the editions and surveys described above than in individual articles. A closely-related collection from the beginning of the eleventh century, CCCC 162, has been analysed, however, in recent publications, with the result that more detail is now available about its sources, organization, and idiosyncratic readings. D. G. Scragg shows how the scribe uses but alters a Bodley-type homiliary to produce an expanded temporale especially in the Septuagesima sequence leading up to Easter. Franz Wenisch analyses the structure of CCCC 162 to show the relationship among Ælfrician and anonymous pieces, and edits a previously unpublished piece on penance. Scragg examines another anonymous piece, item 38 for Ascension Day, and argues that it was written originally to complete a Rogation set in the Vercelli Book, probably by the author of Vercelli IX, XX and XXI, probably in Canterbury during Dunstan's pontificate, 959-988. Lastly, in her catalogue of illustrated manuscripts from Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Mildred Budny provides a
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new physical description of MS 162 and synthesizes much of the recent scholarship about its textual affiliations. Most importantly, she offers an inventory of decoration and illumination in the manuscript, enhanced by numerous plates illustrating these features.63

Elaine M. Treharne has published a number of studies ranging from overviews of Old English manuscripts in the post-Conquest period to examinations of individual manuscripts and texts.64 For example, she has made an important discovery of palaeographic affinities between Cambridge, MS Corpus Christi College 367, fols. 3-6 and 11-29, and the Textus Roffensis, as well as two other manuscripts written at Rochester in the first quarter of the twelfth century.65 Treharne also connects fols. 1-2 and 7-10 from CCCC 367 to the scribe of fols. 2-36v and 120v-227v of Cambridge, University Library MS Li. 1. 33.66 This is scribe 1 of CUL Li. 1. 33 as identified by Oliver Traxel in his recent monograph, who therefore seems to have worked in one of the closely allied south-eastern scriptoria, possibly at Rochester.67

Treharne has also provided the most comprehensive descriptions of Cambridge, MS Corpus Christi College 303, a collection of vernacular homilies for the Temporale and the second half of the Sanctorale concluding with some miscellaneous items, including further confirmation of its origin at Rochester. In her edition of the Old English lives of St. Nicholas and St. Giles, two of the three unique saints' lives appearing in the manuscript, Treharne argues for dating the manuscript in the second half of the twelfth century.68 In her description for Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile, vol. 11, Treharne offers a full inventory of the contents keyed to the most recent editions of the texts.69 She also analyses and edits the Latin and Old English versions of a formula for excommunication added to fill blank space between two Ælfrician prose selections.70 An edition of a unique life of St Margaret from CCCC 303 is provided by Mary Clayton and Hugh Magennis.71 Additionally, Mary Swan argues that one Ælfrician/composite homily in CCCC 303, article 18 on the Finding of the True Cross, shows evidence of memorialised transmission, part of a wider phenomenon apparent in homilies from late Anglo-Saxon England.72

Another twelfth-century collection of late Old English prose texts, London, British Library MS Cotton Vespasian D. xiv, has generated even more debate and analysis in recent years. A new description of the manuscript is provided in Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile, vol. 8 by Jonathan Wilcox.73 Additional descriptive work on the palaeography of the manuscript by Elaine Treharne, and on its compilation and use by Susan Irvine, has advanced our
understanding of this unusual collection. Trehame highlights the problem of assigning an origin to Vespasian D. xiv owing to the fact that its script does not provide sufficient evidence to place it definitely at Canterbury or Rochester. Irvine notes that the textual transmission of the Ælfrician materials in the manuscript descends from that found in earlier collections with a Rochester origin and/or provenance, while these and other items in the collection witness the purposeful editing that has shaped it. Furthermore, annotations indicate that the manuscript was read by a woman, presumably a nun, in the late twelfth century.

Turning to individual texts in Vespasian D. xiv, one is struck by the unique character of many of these, as pointed out by scholars in recent years. Looking first at works from the Ælfrician tradition, Mary Swan shows how two pieces, one assembled from Catholic Homilies II and a topical sermon, the other from Catholic Homilies I, have been edited in significant ways from the originals. The former, Ker article 15 in Vespasian D. xiv, combines almost all of Ælfric's homily Dominica XII post Pentecosten with an extract and a concluding summary from his De Falsis Diis, leading to a muddled message on humility and paganism. The second piece, Ker article 36 as drawn from Ælfric's Natale Sancti dementis, omits the entire account of Clement's life and instead recounts Biblical stories of God saving people from heathen persecutors. This material is quoted, and partly summarized, from the second half of the homily. Joyce Hill discusses three saints' lives, including that of St Clement, from Vespasian D. xiv, in her essay on the preservation and transmission of Ælfric's hagiographic materials. In addition to Clement, she covers Ker articles 16, 17, and 18, a composite homily on the Assumption of the Virgin. As Hill shows, the compiler drew on the first portion of the homily for that occasion in Catholic Homilies I, the entire homily in Catholic Homilies II omitting only the conclusion, and returned to a coda from the CH I homily for a concluding story. Hill also describes the substitution of an anonymous version of James the brother of John for the Ælfrician text that normally follows his Seven Sleepers homily in other collections such as Bodley 340 and 342. The Swan and Hill essays thus provide evidence for the range of Ælfrician adaptations found in this twelfth-century collection, from cutting and pasting, to summarizing, and even to outright substitution of unrelated material.

Another, now missing, Ælfrician piece from Vespasian D. xiv is the subject of Jonathan Wilcox's study, 'The Transmission of Ælfric's Letter to Sigeýrth and the Mutilation of MS Cotton Vespasian D. xiv'. As Wilcox describes it, the text is 'a tract on virginity in general and a polemic against clerical marriage in particular' that has been mostly excised from the
manuscript. The piece survives in a sixteenth-century transcript by John Joscelyn in London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius D. vii, fols. 10r-12r. Although it was reworked by Ælfric into an addition to CH I for the assumption of the Virgin Mary and adapted into two other versions as well, the text in Vespasian D. xiv seems to represent the only surviving copy of the original, most polemic tract, there entitled 'Emb Clænnysse þe gehadede mæn healden scylen'. Archbishop Matthew Parker, among others, knew this tract and was especially interested in the topic of clerical marriage since he himself was married. However, on the basis of the date and manner of the excision, Wilcox attributes the removal to Sir Robert Cotton. Cotton's habit of rearranging manuscripts in his possession is well known, but his motive for removing this particular tract remains unclear. Wilcox prints and discusses the preface to the tract in his edition of Ælfric's prefaces.

Cotton Vespasian D. xiv originally began with the Old English *Dicts of Cato*, now the third item in the collection. Elaine Treharne's recent study of this text in all three extant copies points to certain unique features of the Vespasian version, including an opening that 'emphasizes the responsibility of the individual in the pursuit of wisdom' and the addition of seven moralistic and hortatory items, two derived from the Old English *Deuteronomy*. Thus this version provides evidence, as indeed does the entire collection, of the adaptation of source texts for a contemporary readership, in this case monks and *conversi* seeking didactic Christian and moral information.

Two short weather-related prognostics in English, relatively unusual within a homiletic context such as we find in Vespasian D. xiv, are described by Roy Liuzza in a recent inventory of such material. The eclectic nature of this collection is further illuminated by several other unusual items included there. An abridged version of the Old English *Evangelium Nichodemi*, entitled 'De Resurrectio Domini' and treated as a sermon, appears on fols. 87v-100r. There follows a severely edited text of the Old English version of the *Vindicta Salvatoris*, in which all sections of the narrative involving Veronica have been removed. The text here complicates our attempts to reconstruct the transmission of the Latin version to England and, moreover, suggests that the original intended audience for Vespasian D. xiv was not female, despite indications of later female involvement.

The compiler includes another surprise with translated materials from two near-contemporary writers: two excerpts from the *Elucidarium* by Honorius of Autun (d. about 1140) and a homily on the Virgin Mary by Ralph d'Escures,
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Bishop of Rochester and later Archbishop of Canterbury (d. 1122). The latter work is the subject of a recent essay by Elaine Treharne, who considers the homily in the context of the literary relevance and cultural usefulness of English during the post-Conquest period. This is one of five English pieces for Marian feast-days in Vespasian D. xiv, a feature that may provide some clue to the circumstances under which it was assembled. As Treharne shows, the translator made a number of changes from the original Latin version, most notably by drawing upon Ælfric's homily on the Assumption of the Virgin from CH II, and by substituting a vernacular rendition of the Trinubium Annae for the laudatory verse to Mary at the end of Ralph's homily. Further on this point, Thomas N. Hall discusses the growing devotion to Mary and Anne in England after the Conquest at several English centres, including Canterbury. Although the Latin source for the Old English version may have originated at Bury, it could have easily been transmitted to Canterbury or Rochester through a number of shared connections. Hall notes that the emphasis in the text on Anne's right to remarry after the death of each of her husbands, as sanctioned by Mosaic law, reflects English law in the eleventh century. This coincidence links, of course, with the documented interest in legal materials at Rochester and, presumably, at Canterbury during the post-Conquest period.

As the foregoing survey makes clear, vernacular texts of many sorts continued to be copied, updated, and created from Latin sources in south-eastern England during the twelfth century. In this regard, one additional short but interesting collection, known as the Vespasian homilies, deserves mention. A small group of late Old English homilies on fols. 52-59 of British Library MS Cotton Vespasian A. xxii appears between Latin materials associated with Rochester. A full description of the manuscript has been made recently by Jonathan Wilcox. In their study of the first of the four pieces, Ælfric's De Initio Creaturae, Robert McColl Millar and Alex Nicholls remind us that this is one of the latest copies of an Old English text extant. They argue that the poor quality of the copying indicates its purpose as a private booklet. The text has been simplified significantly, with focus upon the narrative at the expense of analysis. The vocabulary has been modernised even as some aspects of the grammar have deteriorated. In a forthcoming essay on two post-Conquest Old English homiletic collections copies c. 1200, Mary Swan offers new information about the codex containing the Vespasian homilies and links the text in several ways to some of the pieces in London, Lambeth Palace Library 487 (West Midlands). The double-column ruling, unusual for Old English texts, plus evidence of Rochester
origin in the Latin materials (parts, 1, 2, and 4) as well as the Old English, leads to the suggestion that the latter texts were copied on a spare quire roughly contemporary with the rest of the codex. The Old English scribe left room to complete these works but never returned to the task; given their brevity, the purpose and intended audience of the pieces remain unclear, though intriguing.

To conclude, the Vespasian Homilies along with the previous Old English homiletic manuscripts under discussion have clearly not been copied as artefacts, a point made cogently by Elaine M. Treharne in numerous studies. Most recently, Treharne has pursued questions about the nature of the audience and the use for these texts, and has argued that they, and their language, should be taken seriously as evidence of a small but living tradition within the literature of the Anglo-Norman period.91 Whereas some of these productions have been assigned a Rochester origin and/or provenance, the evidence for others is ambiguous, but certainly bespeaks a circle of renewing Old English materials in southeast England after the Conquest in which Rochester took an active role even as the foundation continued to expand its monastic library.
Annotations to English Benedictine Libraries: The Shorter Catalogues, CBMLC, v. 4: The Documents for Rochester Cathedral Priory, B77-B83

Note: The following series of corrections, additions, and annotations to Watson's edition of the catalogues are provided for those entries where the published transcriptions and references are inaccurate or questionable. Corrections are made to inaccuracies; additions present material that was inadvertently omitted in the course of publication; all entries not designated as corrections or additions represent my annotations made upon examination of the relevant evidence, as indicated. Omissions are indicated by brackets. Since the use of capitals and punctuation is editorial, these matters are not considered here. Additionally, three works covering the Rochester library, which have appeared since the publication of the catalogues, are cross-referenced with Watson's edition: Gneuss for Anglo-Saxon manuscripts dating before 1100; Gameson for manuscripts of early Norman England c. 1066-1130; and Carley (H2) for the Westminster Library of Henry VIII compiled in 1542. Each of these scholars adds important information about individual books while also providing a comparative view of the range, development, and survival of Rochester materials. Full citations of works mentioned in the annotations are provided in the Bibliography.

Rochester B77 (Textus Roffensis, fols. 224-230)

1. The three volumes (BL Royal 5 D. I-III) may have been copied sequentially over a period of perhaps twenty years. Gneuss 457.4; Gameson 489-91; H2, 612.
2. Gameson 496; H2, 583.
3. Correction: ... epistolam ... cantica canticorum. Gneuss 456.6; Gameson 478; H2, 849.
5. Correction: ... Berengerium .... Gameson 474; H2, 764.
8. Correction: ... quaestiones ... Solomonis ... expositionem .... Gameson 479; H2, 594.
11. Correction: ... Caelestinianos ... et regula ....
16. Correction: ... *quidam* ... *catalogus Ysidori*... reci[fol.225r]piendis ... *diuinarum* ... *Ysidori* [episcopi] .... Gameson 584.
17. Omission: ... *concupiscientia* [et responsio eiusdem sancti augustini] .... Gameson 637.
18. Gameson 81.
21. Correction: ... *Danihelem* ....
22. Gameson 292.
23. Correction: Probably=B 79.80. Gneuss 453.2; Gameson 461; H2, 727.
25. Correction: ... *Hilarionis et aliorum* ... *appellatur*....
26. Correction: ... *quam* ... *hebreo* [in latinum] ... *Iesum* ... *In alio uero volumine* ... *[Liber] Tobie* ... *Libri* [prophetarum omnes. Actus apostolorum.] *Epistolae Pauli* ... *Apocalypsis*.
29. Correction: ... *distantiis* ... *Paralipomenon* ... Gameson 167; H2, 791.
30. Correction: ... *tratus* ... *perfidiam* [et] *libri duo* .... Gameson 667.
32. Correction: 'This volume cannot be B81.10 ...' H2, 755?
33. Correction: *Iesum* .... Perhaps now BL MS Royal I C. VII if Gameson's dating to the first quarter of the 12th century is accepted. Gameson 459.
35. Correction: ... *aecclesiastem* ... *improperium* ....
37. Gameson 509; H2, 689.
42. Gameson 524; H2, 578.
43. Correction: ... *nouatianos* ... *credendi* ... *Paulinam* ....
44. Gameson 515; H2, 796.
45. Correction: 'Now BL MS Royal 3 C.iv (vol. 1) "per R. precentorem" and Royal 6 C. vi (vol. 2) "per Radulphum archiepiscopum (s. xii )"'. Gneuss 453.6 and 469.3; Gameson 463 and 525; H2, 703 and 776.
46. H2, 1430.
48. Gneuss 469.5; Gameson 527; H2, 841.
50. Correction: 'The second volume is BL MS Royal 4 B. 1 ...'. Gameson 465; H2, 712.
52. Gneuss 457.8; Gameson 499; H2, 805.
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53. Gameson 286.

55. Correction: ... hystoriam .... Gameson 929. Gameson suggests that this volume may have been copied from Cambridge, MS Corpus Christi College 187, origin and provenance probably Christ Church, Canterbury (Gneuss 57).


59. Correction: ... reparatione ... [scriptum] Fulberti de sacerdote ... accipit .... Gameson 511; H2, 736.

65. Possibly BL MS Harley 3680 (s. xii). Gameson 449. This work may have been divided originally at Book IV. It opens at the top of fol. 100r with several unique features: The large initial I extends along the left margin and does not intrude into the text block; the first line is written in red, green, and purple block letters, whereas normally there are two such lines at the beginning of a new book; fols. 99v and 100r appear more discoloured and worn than the surrounding leaves, with some staining that is not shared; and, most importantly, a new style of quire-numbering on the last verso (approximately 5.2 cm. below the text block) replaces the system of numbering on the first recto (approximately 4.5 cm. below). Whereas Incipit Liber Quartus is written at the bottom of fol. 99v, this may have happened when the two were joined because there is no room to do so appropriately at the top of fol. 100r.

67. Correction: ... Alcuinum/ ... versificae ... quaestiones .... Gameson 163; H2, 752.

70. Correction: Commentarium ....

71. On a possible relationship of this item to the so-called Durham Cantor's Book (Durham, Dean and Chapter Library, MS B.IV.24), see Piper, esp. pp. 81-83 and Appendix, and Jayatilaka, p. 167.

72. Gameson 537; H2, 835.

73. Gameson 541-43: the manuscript was originally written as three separate volumes; H2, 728.

74. Gameson 9. This is a rare example of a surviving work listed in B77 but not included in later catalogues.

77. Correction: ... Aelphaegi ... aecclesiae .... Gameson 908.

78. Correction: ... glosatae .... Gameson 604. Although there are two surviving copies, Gameson implies, by excluding Cambridge, St John's College, MS 70 from his list, that this manuscript is too late to be equated with the entry.
79. Gneuss 342.2 and 342.3. The attribution to Rochester is questioned as well by Gneuss and Gameson 389 and 390.

80. Gameson 540; H2, 836.

82. Gameson 807. See also Love, pp. clxxvii-viii.

83. Gneuss 569.

84. Correction: ... Sermones diuersarum solenitatum .... Gameson 910.

85. For BL MS Royal 2 C. III, see Gneuss 452 and Gameson 460; H2, 719. For Edinburgh NLS MS Adv. 18.2.4, see Gameson 285; H2, 715. The Royal manuscript is the earlier of the two, but it is a mixed collection and so, strictly speaking, does not fit the description of the second volume. But, indeed, the entries for the various collections of homilies/sermons in Latin and Old English are so general as to defy confirmed attributions to extant books.

86. Few, if any, service books survive from the Rochester library.

90. Correction: =B79.75.


95. Gameson 7.

97. Correction: ... Ysidorum ... creaturae ....

99. Correction: ... regularum ....

Rochester B78 (Rochester, Dean and Chapter Muniments, MS B. 854)

6. Correction: [ ]rti et librum ....


11. Correction: ... et interp[ ] et de decem ....

12. Correction: ... et liber unus de mendacio ... et liber eius ... duo libri d[ ]e et sermo ... sancti Aug[ ]legis ....

13. Correction: Ex [ ]m ....

15. Correction: [ ]ogus ....

19. Correction: ... aequinoctio ....

20. Correction: ... et lx [ ]domini et ....

22. See also Lapidge, p. 623 and notes 74-77.

24. Correction: [ ]alia sancti ... in [ ].
25. H2, 574.
28. This is the earliest known reference to the arca cantoris at Rochester.
32. Correction: Jogiarum .ii.
35. Correction: ... regist[ ]

Rochester B79 (BL MS Royal 5 B. XII, fols. 2r-3r)

3. Gneuss 453.8; Gameson 464; H2, 582.
5. Gameson 488; H2, 848.
13. H2, 593.
16. Correction: De nupcijs et concupiscencia et contra Iulianum ....
21. Correction: Libri ....
23-24. Correction to intervening rubric: ... Gregorij papa.
33. Correction: ... in i uolumne.
45. Correction: ... in i uolumne.
49. H2, 763.
72. H2, 852.
81. H2, 887.
89. H2, 718.
94. H2, 804.
111. Correction: This item, added in darker ink by the same scribe, refers to a second copy of 110 located in the arca Cantoris, and hence should be listed with 110. Cf. B79.165 and 167, where the works are cited as being in duobus locis.
117. H2, 823.
125. Correction: De diuinis is indeed an entry because the D is rubricated. It may refer to BL MS Royal 6 A. XI, a miscellany that opens with Ambrose's De diuinis officiis, in which the word diuinis is in rubrics on the first line. H2, 710.
128. H2, 775.
129. H2, 774.
132. Another partly completed copy from Rochester is BL MS Royal 1 B. IV (12th/13th).
141. Correction: ?=B78.35.
142. Correction: ... Diligendo deo ....
143. Correction: =B78.30.
152. Possibly BL MS Royal 4 B. II (H2, 693). This entry is unique in describing the binding of the book, covered in deer hide.
163. Correction: Scribe γ.
180. Possibly Maidstone, Kent County Archives, MS U 1121 M2B, pp. 103-06. Gameson 603.
182. Correction: iii. 
197. Gneuss 497; H2, 869.
209. Correction: Rethoria ....
216. There is no obvious reason within the context of the list of books associated with Alexander to assume that items 216a and 216b constitute one entry. Where works are combined, the cataloguer normally uses a conjunction (cum or et), as in 219 and 221. As entry 222 indicates, the number of volumes is not always indicated with an entry.
218. There is a stronger case for associating 218a and 218b because both works were attributed to Hippocrates in the Middle Ages, but the entry is ambiguous.
226. Correction: Dioscorides ....
236. H2, 666.
237. H2, 816.
239. H2, 808.
240. H2, 709.

Rochester B80 (BL MS Royal 10 A. XII, fol. 111vb)
7. H2, 897.

Rochester B81 (BL MS Cotton Vespasian A. xxii, fols. 86-90)
20. Gneuss 446; H2, 643.
Mary P. Richards

Rochester B82 (Rochester, Dean and Chapter Muniments, MS s.n., fol. 223)

No annotations.

Rochester B83 (BL MS Cotton Faustina C.v, fol. 50r)

1. Probably Oxford, MS St John's College 4; see Hanna, pp. 4-5.
2. H2, 642.
6. H2, 621.
Note: The following list includes the most important works treating aspects of the Rochester scriptorium and library between 1987 and 2005. The author wishes to thank Professor Thomas Hall and Professor James Carley for their suggestions. Any omissions, however, are solely her responsibility. Most, but not all, of the items listed below are discussed in the foregoing review of research.


*Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile: Volume 8: Wulfstan Texts and Other Homiletic Materials,* described by Jonathan Wilcox (Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2000), 8.6, 8.7

*Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile: Volume 9: Deluxe and Illustrated Manuscripts Containing Technical and Literary Texts,* described by A. N. Doane and Tiffany J. Grade (Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2001), 9.4


Brooks, Nicholas. 'Rochester, A. D. 400-1066', in *Rochester: Medieval Art, Architecture and Archaeology,* ed. by Ayers and Tatton-Brown, pp. 6-21
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(Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University, 1997) I, 463-73; II, pls 332-81


Clark, Cecily, 'Spelling and Grammaticality in the Vespasian Homilies: A Reassessment', Manuscripta, 31 (1987), 7-10


Clemoes, Peter, ed., Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The First Series: Text, EETS, s.s. 17 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)


Gneuss, Helmut, 'Addenda and Corrigenda to the *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*’, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 32 (2003), 293-305

Gneuss, Helmut, *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A List of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100* (Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2001)


Hahn, Thomas, 'Early Middle English', in *The Cambridge History of Medieval Literature*, ed. by David Wallace (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 61-91 (pp. 81-83)


Hall, Thomas N., 'The *Euangelium Nichodemi* and *Vindicta Salvatoris* in Anglo-Saxon England', in *Two Old English Apocrypha and Their Manuscript Source*,
Mary P. Richards


Hanna, Ralph, A Descriptive Catalogue of the Western Medieval Manuscripts of St Johns College, Oxford (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), no. 4, pp. 4-5


Hough, Carole, 'Palaeographic Evidence for the Compilation of Textus Roffensis', Scriptorium, 55 (2001), 57-79


Irvine, Susan, Old English Homilies from MS Bodley 343, EETS, o.s. 302 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, for the EETS, 1993)


Kauffman, C. M., Biblical Imagery in Medieval England 700-1550 (London: Miller, 2003), pl. 62 and Appendix 2


Lawrence, Anne, 'Anglo-Norman Book Production', in *England and Normandy in the Middle Ages*, ed. by David Bates and Anne Curry (London: Hambledon, 1994), pp. 79-93


O'Brien, Bruce, 'The Instituta Cnuti and the Translation of English Law', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 25 (2003), 177-97


Swan, Mary, 'Ælfric's Catholic Homilies in the Twelfth Century', in *Rewriting Old English*, ed. by Swan and Treharne, pp. 62-82

Swan, Mary, 'Memorialised Readings: Manuscript Evidence for Old English Homiletic Composition', in *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts and Their Heritage*, ed. by Pulsiano and Treharne, pp. 205-17
Swan, Mary, 'Preaching Past the Conquest: Lambeth Palace 487 and Cotton Vespasian A.xxii', in *Precedence, Practice, and Appropriation: The Old English Homily*, ed. by Aaron J. Kleist (Brepols, forthcoming)


Treharne, Elaine M., 'Reading from the Margins: The Uses of Old English in the Post-Conquest Period', in *Beatus Vir: Essays in Memory of Phillip Pulsiano*, ed. by A. N. Doane and Kirsten Wolf (Tempe, AZ: forthcoming)

Treharne, Elaine M. 'A Unique Old English Formula for Excommunication from Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 303', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 24 (1995), 185-211
Mary P. Richards


Webber, Teresa, 'Script and Manuscript Production at Christ Church, Canterbury, after the Norman Conquest', in *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest*, ed. by Eales and Sharpe, pp. 145-56


Medieval West: Law as Text, Image, and Experience (London: Hambledon, 1999), pp. 253-87
Wormald, Patrick, 'Quadripartitus', in Wormald, Legal Culture, pp. 81-114
NOTES

1 This essay is dedicated to Joyce Hill, who took an early and much-appreciated interest in my work on Rochester.


3 Watson, p. 464.

4 Watson, p. 470.

5 Maidstone, Kent County Archives Office, MS DRc/Z18/1-2.


7 Gameson, p. 8. See also p., 17 and n. 102, which lists three related pairs of texts from Christ Church, Canterbury, and Rochester. Norman influence on the shape of the collection is described by Katharine Waller in 'Rochester Cathedral Library: An English Book Collection Based on Norman Models', in Les Mutations socio-culturelles au tournant des xi-xii siècles: Colloque international du CNRS, ed. by Raymond Foureville, Études Anselmiennes, 4 session (Paris: CNRS, 1984), pp. 237-50.

8 Gameson, p. 10 and n. 52. Further evidence of connection among the three scriptoria may be seen in Durham, Dean and Chapter Library, MS B. IV. 24, the so-called Durham Cantor's Book, to be discussed below.

9 Gameson, p. 41.


14 Robinson, Catalogue, p. 56.

The Rochester Cathedral Library: A Review of Scholarship 1987-2005


27. Carley, 'Royal Library', pp. 56-57. However, he notes mistakenly that this item appears in the first Rochester booklist recorded in the Textus Roffensis.


30. Description in Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile: Volume 9: Deluxe and Illustrated Manuscripts Containing Technical and Literary Texts, described by A. N. Doane and Tiffany J. Grade (Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2001), pp. 52-64.


Mary P. Richards


35 Wormald, Legal Culture, p. 253.


38 Oliver, English Law, pp. 120-23.


44 Brooks, 'Rochester', p. 15.

45 Brooks, 'Rochester', pp. 16-17.


The piece in question was edited by Hildegard Tristram as her number III, in 'Vier altenglische Predigten aus der heterodoxen Tradition' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1970).


Treharne, 'The Dates and Origins', pp. 240-44.


The Rochester Cathedral Library: A Review of Scholarship 1987-2005


73 *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile: Volume 8: Wulfstan Texts and Other Homiletic Materials*, described by Jonathan Wilcox (Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2000), pp. 52-64.


76 See note 58 above for the full reference. The items discussed here are on pp. 416-18.


85 Thomas Hahn, 'Early Middle English', in *The Cambridge History of Medieval Literature*, ed. by David Wallace (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 61-
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91 (esp. pp. 82-83). Hahn refers to the collection in Cotton Vespasian D. xiv as the *Rochester Anthology*, and states that these two translations are noteworthy specimens of early Middle English.


90 Mary Swan, 'Preaching Past the Conquest: Lambeth Palace 487 and Cotton Vespasian A.xxii', in *Precedence, Practice, and Appropriation: The Old English Homily*, ed. by Aaron J. Kleist (Brepols, forthcoming). My thanks to the author for a pre-publication copy of this essay.

91 Treharne, 'Reading from the Margins'. My thanks again to Professor Treharne for an advance copy of this essay.