

Worcester and Wales: Copies of the *Regula Pastoralis* in the Early Middle Ages

Kathryn A. Lowe

Michael Lapidge concludes his magisterial survey of books in Anglo-Saxon England with the observation that the average monastic library during that period likely contained a body of patristic texts that scarcely exceeded twenty titles.¹ One of those staples was Gregory the Great's *Regula pastoralis*, a key text in the Anglo-Saxon period, cited by Aldhelm, Ælfric, and Bede amongst others on multiple occasions.² King Alfred, of course, considered the text to be the foremost of 'bec ða ðe niedbeðearfosta sien eallum monnum to wiotonne',³ 'books most necessary for all men to know', and its translation spearheaded the ninth-century Alfredian educational programme. Copies of the Latin version of the *Regula pastoralis* survive in whole or in fragmentary form in twelve manuscripts produced in England or Wales before the end of the Anglo-Saxon period.⁴

One of these copies, Glasgow, UL, Hunter 431, begun in the early eleventh century, is of particular interest to those concerned with the use to which some manuscripts were put after the Conquest. It is well known that this manuscript was used as a crib by the thirteenth-century scribe, the so-called 'Tremulous' hand of Worcester, as he worked his way through two of the surviving copies of the Alfredian translation of the *Regula pastoralis*: Oxford, Bodleian, Hatton 20, and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 12. This article traces the reading and copying of texts of the *Regula pastoralis* at the cathedral church of Worcester in the early Middle Ages, focusing on Hunter 431 and the interventions made to it over this period. I first consider the annotations and corrections made to Hunter 431 by the

¹ Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Library*, 127.

² See Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Library*, Appendix E.

³ Sweet, ed., *West-Saxon Version*, i. 7 ll. 6-7

⁴ Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Library*, 306-07. Another two, according to Lapidge's list, were produced on the Continent (both from Normandy) but are known to have arrived in England before the end of the pre-Conquest period.

Tremulous hand and other readers. I then turn to the question of its exemplar, related manuscripts, and the circumstances of its production. This study provides insights into the use and textual affiliations of a key work during the Middle Ages, and offers a corrective to the notion that Worcester priory as a centre of learning remained largely unaffected by the viking onslaught.

The *Regula pastoralis* in Anglo-Saxon England

Begun in 590, the *Regula pastoralis*, Gregory the Great's treatise on the duties and responsibilities of the clergy, was enthusiastically received, and copies were quickly disseminated, in Clement's phrase, 'to the extreme edges of the Latin-speaking world' during Gregory's own lifetime.⁵ At some point before Gregory's death in 604, some errors in the text were corrected, additions made, and Vulgate Latin replaced most of the Old Latin quotations, perhaps under Gregory's direct supervision.⁶ This second recension was quickly preferred on the Continent, but not until after the Conquest in Anglo-Saxon England. Clement surmises this may have been because of the association by the Anglo-Saxons of the first recension with Augustine who had very probably brought a copy of the text with him to England during the mission of 597.⁷ The work's influence, focus on pastoral instruction and responsibility, and blend of the pragmatic and the spiritual made it obviously relevant to King Alfred given his own concerns and interests, and it was the first text to be translated into the vernacular as part of the Alfredian educational reform programme. The text of the *Regula pastoralis* used by the translators was certainly a first-recension version.⁸

For Alfred, of course, the vernacular was the fall-back position. If the standard of latinity had dropped to the extent that priests had trouble translating something

⁵ Clement, 'Handlist', 34.

⁶ Clement, 'Two Gregorian Editions', 96.

⁷ Clement, 'King Alfred', 9.

⁸ Clement, 'King Alfred', 3; 'Two Gregorian Editions', 96. On the authorship of this and other translations traditionally credited to Alfred himself, see Godden, 'Did King Alfred Write Anything?'

extremely straightforward (even an ‘ærendgewrit’,⁹ ‘a letter’), they were unlikely to profit from the unmediated wisdom of Gregory the Great. And, while the literal accuracy of some of Alfred’s prefatory remarks has been debated, there is little doubt from the overall picture of charter and book production during the ninth century that the situation was grim.¹⁰

***The Regula pastoralis* at Worcester: Hunter 431**

Hunter 431 is a manuscript of the *Regula pastoralis* with a curious history. It seems to have been begun in the early eleventh century by (at least) three separate scribes,¹¹ but the copying endeavour was broken off at the bottom of fol. 102r towards the start of chapter 40 (III. 16) in the edited text. The opening and final leaf of this part of the manuscript are soiled, suggesting the book lay unbound for some time. It was completed early in the twelfth century, when the rest of the work (amounting to over 50 folios) was copied by, in Ker’s phrase, ‘an excellent small round hand’,¹² a missing leaf (fol. 6) supplied, and extensive corrections undertaken to the original text, the significance and extent of which are discussed further below.

At the same time, coloured initials heading chapters and sections, almost all in red and green, were supplied to the text. However, many were missed, particularly as the work progresses, with the last appearing on fol. 139v, almost twenty folios before the end. Most of these initials are rather plain productions, but some are slightly more elaborate. A few, such as the **A** on fol. 64v (Fig. 1) and 104v, and the **T** on fol. 20v, boast a motif that Gullick describes as ‘a solid roundel or disc enclosed by bars with pronounced serifs’ on their finials.¹³ He links this decorative feature to manuscripts produced at Worcester from the late-eleventh until well into the twelfth century.

⁹ Sweet, ed., *West-Saxon Version*, I. 3 l.15.

¹⁰ Lapidge, ‘Latin Learning’; Gneuss, ‘King Alfred’; Dumville, ‘English Script’. Despite her efforts, Morrish, ‘Dated and Datable’ and, earlier, ‘King Alfred’s Letter’ does little to dissipate the overall feeling of gloom.

¹¹ Ker, *English Manuscripts*, 52-53.

¹² Ker, *English Manuscripts*, 53. An example of this scribe’s hand appears as Plate 2 below.

¹³ Gullick, ‘Origin and Date’, 90.

The manuscript may also be associated with the priory by virtue of its script which shares some characteristics of Worcester books as described by Ker:

At Worcester the scribes, when writing Latin, tended to make the belly of *a* fat and the neck short, and to finish off the end of a descender (*p*, *q*) with a heavy, short cross-stroke. The top of the ascender is much thicker than the shaft and forms a sort of blob; it is not split, as it often is in Exeter and Canterbury manuscripts.¹⁴

We can see all of these features on the first line of the excerpt from fol. 133r (Plate 1) below: fat-bodied **a** and thickened tops of the ascenders for example in ‘*prœcellas*’, and a cross-stroke at the base of **p** in ‘*temptationum*’.¹⁵ Worcester seems to have had a particular interest in the works of Gregory, perhaps because, as McIntyre has argued, of his focus on the links between the pastoral and the monastic, a theme reflected in other texts copied at the time there. Alongside the two copies of the vernacular translation of *Regula pastoralis* with a Worcester provenance are a pair of the *Dialogues*.¹⁶ Although Richard Gameson rightly notes that it is difficult to attribute books securely to a particular scriptorium,¹⁷ these separate pieces of evidence considered together makes it relatively certain that at the very least the text was completed at Worcester.

As I have observed above, copies of the Latin text of the *Regula pastoralis* produced in Anglo-Saxon England were generally of the first-recension type: of the six second-recension variants noted by Clement which represent alterations to the

¹⁴ Ker, ‘Provenance’, 132.

¹⁵ McIntyre, ‘Early-Twelfth-Century Manuscripts’ notes the twelfth-century script of the manuscript along with the appearance of the Tremulous hand gloss as being evidence of Worcester provenance in her appendix A (203), and uses the manuscript to illustrate types of correction found there (57-59).

¹⁶ McIntyre, ‘Early-Twelfth-Century Manuscripts’, 94-98.

¹⁷ Lapidge, ‘Surviving Booklists’, 63. It is potentially significant that the two Latin manuscripts of the *Dialogues* listed by Lapidge with a likely Worcester provenance are not earlier than the early eleventh century (*Anglo-Saxon Library*, 304).

first-recension text,¹⁸ the original eleventh-century text of Hunter 431, which the Tremulous scribe demonstrably used, has only one second-recension reading. Two others are subsequently corrected to second-recension readings. However, the text differs from that used to produce the Alfredian translation in terms of two structural features. The first, discussed further below, concerns where a chapter division falls. Another difference is the absence of chapter headings to Hunter 431 (which are provided in the Alfredian translation), an absence which Clement claims is a feature of all but one of the Insular manuscripts of the text.

The Tremulous Worcester Scribe and Hunter 431

The Tremulous scribe's work, identified in at least twenty manuscripts, was the subject of a groundbreaking monograph by Christine Franzen in 1991.¹⁹ She identifies several phases of his endeavour based on the state of his hand and the degree of tremor his writing exhibited, a condition that has recently been diagnosed by neurologists as likely to have been 'essential tremor'.²⁰ Franzen's careful work demonstrates that the thirteenth-century scribe's study of Old English was methodical, and that his interest in this material might best be described as 'both antiquarian and pragmatic'.²¹ She characterises the Tremulous scribe as a man who had perhaps begun by working to update vernacular texts for preaching purposes, but who had then become fascinated by the language itself.

At Worcester, the Tremulous scribe was fortunate in general to have had access to a library that allowed him to further his interest in Old English. In relation to the *Regula pastoralis*, he was fortunate specifically to have had translations and an exemplar that broadly matched each other textually, as Richard Clement (with useful clarification and correction of detail by Carolin Schreiber)²² has

¹⁸ Clement, 'King Alfred', 5. Schreiber (*King Alfred's Old English Translation*, 27) notes that three of the six variants identified by Clement could have been made independent of any tradition. None of these appear in Hunter 431.

¹⁹ Franzen summarises the scribe's output in *Tremulous Hand*, 1.

²⁰ See Thorpe and Alty, 'What Kind of Tremor'.

²¹ Franzen, *Tremulous Hand*, 190.

²² Clement, 'King Alfred'; Schreiber, *King Alfred's Old English Translation*, 23-35.

demonstrated. His hand may be found in three manuscripts associated with Worcester: the Latin text of the *Regula pastoralis* in Hunter 431, and two of the six surviving manuscripts of the Old English translation, Hatton 20 and Corpus 12, both of which may be linked to Worcester. Hatton 20 is the celebrated manuscript of the Old English translation of the *Regula pastoralis* produced for Bishop Wærferth of Worcester (as the preface makes explicit), and is the only complete contemporary copy of the text.²³ It seems to have been sent to Worcester soon after its production; in any case a colophon places it there in the tenth century. The preface contains a series of annotations by the homilist Wulfstan (bishop of Worcester and archbishop of York) at the beginning of the eleventh century.²⁴ The glossing by the Tremulous hand breaks off abruptly in the copy of Hatton 20 part way through chapter 33 of the edited text.²⁵ Corpus 12, which dates to the second half of the tenth century, is described by Ker as a 'de-luxe' copy of the Old English text.²⁶ The prose preface omits the name of the addressee, as did the now almost completely destroyed London, BL, Cotton Tiberius B. xi, believed to have been the copy of the translation retained centrally,²⁷ and other forms link the two manuscripts.²⁸ Although it cannot be established that the manuscript was written at Worcester,²⁹ it is probably one of the 'ii. pastorales englisce' (the other being Hatton 20) mentioned in a late eleventh-century booklist with strong Worcester connections,³⁰ and the use made of the text by the Tremulous hand supports this supposition.

²³ The manuscript is described by Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 324 and by Schreiber (*King Alfred's Old English Translation*, 53-54). See also Gneuss and Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*, no. 626 for updated bibliography.

²⁴ On the interventions on the opening folio, see Graham, 'The Opening to King Alfred's Preface'.

²⁵ Franzen, *Tremulous Hand*, 60.

²⁶ The manuscript is described by Ker, *Catalogue*, 41 (no. 30) and by Schreiber (*King Alfred's Old English Translation*, 55-57). See also Gneuss and Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*, no. 37 for updated bibliography.

²⁷ Schreiber, however, notes that the addressee in Hatton 20 is copied in a script slightly smaller than what precedes or follows, and therefore argues that perhaps all prefaces originally left a blank for the name (*King Alfred's Old English Translation*, 76).

²⁸ See Sisam, 'Publication', 146.

²⁹ Horgan, 'OE Pastoral Care', 116; Sisam, 'Addendum', 228; Gameson, 'Book Production', 237.

³⁰ Lapidge, 'Surviving Booklists', 63.

Hunter 431 contains a small number of annotations by the Tremulous hand himself. They have been briefly discussed by Wendy Collier, who characterises them as largely consisting of extraction of words and phrases as an aide-memoire, and some tidying work to the text.³¹ She also identifies further hands working on the text, one of which seems contemporary with the Tremulous hand. This hand ‘notes in the margins the authors or sources of many biblical quotations ... in the same way that the Tremulous Hand does in Old English manuscripts’.³² Another hand, which Collier associates with one of the twelfth-century correctors to the manuscript, notes corrections to be made, and also supplies chapter headings.

We can see much of this activity on fol. 16v (Plate 2), where the twelfth-century corrector adds a heading of his own devising to the chapter, ‘Ne uitiosus ad culmen regiminis accedat’ (He who is full of fault should not accede to the top of leadership), a marginal note of approval (‘uerba legis competenter exposita’) fronted by an elaborate *nota* sign, and the word *cecus*, ‘blind,’ in the margin next to its occurrence in the text. Another correcting hand writing with rather darker ink, who looks to be responsible for the insertion of *dampnabiliter* to the main text, adds the comment ‘Bonum capitulum’. The hand identified by Collier as contemporary with the Tremulous Worcester hand writes *Moyses* next to the quotation from Hebrews.

The page itself opens with a large coloured initial and a line of mixed majuscules to signal a new chapter, beginning (in the edited text) ‘Solertur ergo se quisque metiatur ne locum regiminis assumere audeat, si adhuc in se uitium dampnabiliter regnat, ne is quem crimen deprauat proprium, intercessor fieri appetat pro culpis aliorum’³³ (‘Accordingly, everyone should gauge himself so that he dare not assume the place of spiritual leadership, while vice that leads to damnation continues to reign in him, or else the one who is corrupted by his own crimes will strive to become an intercessor for the sins of others’³⁴). The Old English text

³¹ Collier, ‘Tremulous Worcester Hand’.

³² Collier, ‘Tremulous Worcester Hand’, 200.

³³ Judic and Rommel, eds., *Règle pastorale*, 164 ll. 1-5.

³⁴ Demacopoulos, *Pastoral Rule*, 44-45.

instead has the translation of this sentence at the end of the previous chapter (book 1, chapter 10).³⁵ The capital 'S' in Hunter 431 has therefore been roughly crossed out, probably by the Tremulous hand himself, who makes the marginal note *Capitulum* next to the following sentence which starts chapter 11 in the Old English translation.

This note (and others like it in the manuscript) is identified by Franzen as being in the L state, 'large and dark text with a pronounced tremble',³⁶ although the ink to my eye certainly here seems much lighter and might be better assigned to the M state, 'large leftward-leaning glosses, which often have a noticeable tremble and disjointed look. The ink colour is light brown'.³⁷ Elsewhere in the manuscript (for example, on fol. 130r), the *Capitulum* markers were initially done in pencil and subsequently overwritten.³⁸ The Tremulous hand also occasionally pencils the number of the new chapter at the head of those folios where one begins and the other ends, for example, on fol. 26r.

Hunter 431 and its Exemplar

As I have noted above, extensive emendations were undertaken to the existing text of Hunter 431 in the early twelfth century at the same time as the book was completed. Although in some places the text was revised to accord better with the second recension of the work, the majority of interventions were to emend copying errors. It is worth emphasising how thoroughgoing these corrections were. For example, fol. 19r (Plate 3) contains over fifteen alterations and erasures. Alongside a couple of examples of insertions of words for sense ('\a/ luce \se/ supernae cognitionis excludit'), there are also a large number of corrections of wrongly expanded abbreviations, for example *autem* over an erasure, *quam* altered from *qu(a)e*, *qu|i/a si* corrected from *quasi*, and *qui|a/* corrected from *que*. There are

³⁵ Clement ('King Alfred', 13 n. 22) notes that some continental manuscripts begin the chapter in another place entirely.

³⁶ Franzen, *Tremulous Hand*, 72.

³⁷ Franzen, *Tremulous Hand*, xix.

³⁸ On the pencil layer (designated P), see Franzen, *Tremulous Hand*, 10.

also a surprising number of what appear to be inconsequential spelling alterations, for example *intelligit* for *intellegit*, *apprehendit* for *adprehendit*, *luxuria* for *luxoria*, alongside one that potentially affects meaning: *uoluptas* from *uoluntas*.

The number of errors in the original text was noted by Ker, who observed that the text seems to have been copied from an exemplar in Welsh minuscule or (less probably, he thought) Irish minuscule.³⁹ He based this theory on the copyists' evident lack of familiarity with the abbreviation system of their model, noting '[t]hey commonly write *tunc* for *tamen*, *etin* for *etiam*, *sunt* for *sed*, or preserve abbreviations which they do not know how to expand'.⁴⁰ Examples of the type Ker adduces can be found throughout the first part of the manuscript. For example, fol. 82r (Fig. 2) displays the first two of these features alongside an interesting series of other mistakes. Here *tamen* is written above *tunc* by a correcting hand (l. 2), and *etiam* appears above a poorly erased *etin* (l. 5). On fol. 38v, in another hand, (Fig. 3) we see the abbreviation for *enim* retained, and the expansion added above the line, and again *tamen* rather clumsily emended from what was probably *tunc*. Although these errors appear frequently throughout this first part of the manuscript, it is the case that certain scribes seem to struggle more than others, and this is an aspect of this manuscript's production that would certainly repay further investigation.

Is it possible to identify the exemplar used for the original part of Hunter 431? Of the surviving manuscripts or manuscript fragments of the *Regula pastoralis* in Lapidge's list, there is one obvious candidate, a ninth-century fragment tentatively ascribed to Wales, but with Worcester provenance.⁴¹ This fragment now forms an endpaper to a medical miscellany of the late twelfth or early thirteenth century, now London, BL, Harley 5228 (Plate 4), fol. 140. All that survives is the bottom half of a single leaf written in two columns and a stub with the fragments of a few letters from across the gutter. The fragment of text corresponds to parts of chapters 10 and 11 of the *Regula pastoralis*. Present are abbreviations for the following words noted by Lindsay (as abstracted by Dumville, *Abbreviations*) as

³⁹ Ker, *English Manuscripts*, 52-53.

⁴⁰ Ker, *English Manuscripts*, 53.

⁴¹ Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Library*, 306.

being unique to Celtic manuscripts: *apud, ergo, homo, inter, proprio* (in the form *proprius*), *quando, quem, quippe, quomodo, sicut, unde*, and contractions of the following syllables: *ius, gre, gra, tra, uer, mus, and nus*.⁴² The fragment has been carefully read, with a plethora of syntax marks and explanatory or supplementary glosses, at times identifying the biblical quotations (e.g. ‘in euangelio lucae’; ‘in cantica canticorum’), clarifying the text ‘diuitiis et voluntatibus [presentis] vitae’, ‘oculi nigra [*id est sana*]’ or offering near synonyms to some of the words: e.g., ‘creditur [*id est putatur*]’, ‘cuncti [*id est omnes*]’, ‘adprehendit [*id est uidet*]’, ‘incuruatus [*id est adreccatum*]’.⁴³ There are also a few longer, commentary-type, additions.

The very existence of this fragment with a Worcester provenance and with Celtic abbreviations naturally leads one to assume that Hunter 431 was copied from the Harley 5228 fragment. In an attempt to establish whether or not this is the case, I collate the fragment with the text in Hunter 431 and with the edited text. In the table below, I present seven differences for discussion which are numbered in sequence. I have also compared the text of another *Regula pastoralis* manuscript chosen at random, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 361, produced in the eleventh century, in an attempt to gauge how widespread shared readings were.

TABLE: Major differences between Harley 5228 and Hunter 431

Note: The edition followed is that of Judic and Rommel, eds., *Règle pastorale*, and the translation is that by Demacopoulos, *Book of Pastoral Rule*.

| | Edition | Translation | Harley 5228 | Hunter 431 | Corpus 361 |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | Qua in re adhuc aliud est sollicitius formidandum 162 32-33 | In this regard, there is yet another concern | Qua in ré adhuc aliud sollicitus formidandum est | 16r Qua in ré est adhuc aliud sollicitius formidandum. | 8r Qua in re est adhuc aliud sollicitius formidandum. |

⁴² Dumville, *Abbreviations*, Table 4, 13-16.

⁴³ Assuming this is an adjective derived from *adriigo* ‘set upright’, the gloss appears to have the opposite meaning from that intended.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| 2 | Hinc enim Paulus dicit 166 23 | Wherefore, Paul says | hinc etenim paulus dicit | 17r etenim paulus dicit | 9r Hinc etenim paulus dicit |
| 3 | Quorum culpam quoque per semetipsam Veritas reprobans 168 53-54 | Their fault the Truth also reproached in person | Quorum culpam per semetipsam ueritas quoque reprobans | 18r quorum culpam quoque per semetipsum ueritas reprobans | 9v Quorum culpam per semetipsam ueritas reprobans |
| 4 | hi sunt qui audierunt uerbum, et a sollicitudinibus et diuitiis et uoluptatibus uitae euntes suffocantur 168 55-56 | are those who when they hear the Word go forth suffocated by the cares, riches, and pleasures of life | hii sunt qui uerbum audiunt et sollicitudinibus et diuitiis et voluntatibus uitae euntes suffocantur | 18r hi sunt qui audi\er/unt et \a/ sollicitudinibus & diuitiis & uoluptatibus uitae euntes [<i>over</i> <i>erasure</i>] suffocantur | 9v hi sunt qui audiunt. [corrected from likely audierunt] & a sollicitudini\bus/; [<i>corrected from</i> sollicitudinii] & diuitiis & uoluptatibus uite euntes |
| 5 | cum ad cognoscendam ueri luminis claritatem intellectus nostri aciem medicamine bonae operationis adiuuamus 168 69-71 | when we aid the eye of our understanding with the medicine of good works so as to comprehend the brightness of the true light | [...]intellectus nostri aciem medicamine bone operationis adhibemus | 18v cum ad cognoscendam ueri luminis claritatem intellectus nostri aciem medicamine bonae operationis adiuuamus | 10r cum ad cognoscendam ueri luminis claritatem intellectus nostri aciem medicamine bonae operationis adiuuamus |
| 6 | quia arrogantia sapientiae seu iustitiae caecatur 168 72-73 | because he is blinded by the arrogance of his wisdom or righteousness | quia arrogantia sapientiae seu iustitia excecatur | 18v Quia arrogantia sapientiae suae \seu/ iustitiae cecatur | 10r quia arrogantia sapientiae suae iustitiae cecatur |
| 7 | si stultum se | If a man knows | sí stultum <u>u</u> sé | 19r si stultum | 10r si stultum se |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| | peccatoremque intellegit 75-76 | himself to be foolish and a sinner | seu peccatorem intellegit | [<i>erasure</i>] sé peccatorem\que/ [<i>erasure</i>] intellegit. (<i>corrected from</i> intellegit) | peccatoremque intellegit |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|

The first variant concerns the positioning in a clause of the verb *est* which varies between the edition, Harley 5228 (henceforth Harley) and Hunter 431 (henceforth Hunter). Here Hunter and Corpus 361 agree, which implies that this reading is probably not accidentally achieved by Hunter, but was in its exemplar. The second difference I have highlighted is Hunter's *etenim* for the edition's *enim*. This reading is shared with Harley, but also found in Corpus 361, suggesting that this was a common variant. The third involves a minor difference in word order, where the reading in the Hunter manuscript follows the edition. In example [4], the reading in Hunter follows neither the edition nor Harley exactly, but has a present verb form and omission of the preposition *a* (both subsequently corrected) also found in Harley. The parallel passage in Corpus 361 has also been corrected (in a different way) which suggests some long-standing issue with this clause. Both Corpus 361 and Hunter omit *verbum*, the direct object of the phrase, found in both the Harley fragment and the edition, and Harley's *voluntatibus* for *voluptatibus* militates against its being the source of the reading in Hunter. So too does *adhibemus* for *adiuuamus* [5], although I notice that the glossing hand at this point in the Harley fragment provides '*id est adiuuamus*' above the verb which could conceivably have triggered the standard reading in Hunter, although no other gloss seems to have been similarly adopted. Another difference [6] is *excecatur* in the Harley fragment where the edition, Hunter, and Corpus 361 all agree on *cecatur*. In the final example, Hunter omits *-que* in the clause 'si stultum se peccatoremque intellegit' (subsequently corrected). Here Harley has 'si stultum seu peccatorem' instead. There are short erasures in Hunter before *stultum* and after *peccatorem*: although the original reading cannot be recovered, it was not in any case identical to Harley. In sum, the evidence suggests that the Harley fragment was not used as the

direct exemplar for Hunter. However, the abbreviation system was clearly very similar, and I note that the abbreviations for *quem* and *quae*, and *quia* and *quam* are extremely hard to distinguish in the Harley fragment. It seems probable to me that the fragment and Hunter 431 share a common exemplar.

There is a further difference. Hunter 431 lacks original chapter headings, obliging the twelfth-century scribe on fol. 16v (and elsewhere), as we have seen, to add one of his own devising. The heading for chapter 11 in those manuscripts that include it is 'qualis quisque ad regimen uenire non debeat', 'The type of man who ought not to come to rule', which immediately follows a chapter on the qualities of an ideal candidate. However, the heading is there in the Harley fragment where it appears to have been squeezed in by the same scribe at the bottom of the column. This implies that Harley's exemplar, like Hunter's, omitted chapter headings, which the scribe of the Harley fragment subsequently supplied from another source.

If, as it seems, the first part of the Hunter manuscript was not copied from the Harley fragment, it remains the case that an Irish or Welsh exemplar was indisputably its exemplar. One further feature links the Hunter manuscript to Wales. As has been noted above, the manuscript from fol. 102v has been copied from a single source from what appears to be a second-recension manuscript of the *Regula pastoralis*. This copy manifests no difficulties with understanding the abbreviation system of the exemplar so apparent in the first part of the manuscript. On fol. 136v (Fig. 4) appears a marginal Welsh gloss, *duglas*, keyed to *cerúlei* in the text. This is perhaps in the same hand as the main text, although less formally written, or may be contemporary with it.⁴⁴ How are we to explain the existence of this gloss alongside the evidence presented above that the manuscript was completed at Worcester? If we believe the gloss was copied by the Hunter scribe, it seems either that he himself was a Welshman, or that the manuscript was completed and corrected from a second-recension manuscript which was either also Welsh or which passed through the hands of a Welsh reader prior to being copied. If one does not believe that the Welsh gloss is in the same hand, Hunter must at the very least have passed through

⁴⁴ I am grateful to Dr Tessa Webber and Prof. Elaine Treharne for sharing their views on the hand with me.

the hands of a Welsh reader in the twelfth century. The Harley fragment could have arrived in Worcester at any time prior to the fourteenth century, but in any event constitutes further evidence of long-established links between Worcester and Wales.

Worcester, Cathedral Library, Add. 3

The fate of the Harley fragment, to end up as a binding leaf, is one shared by several insular manuscripts of the *Regula pastoralis*, including another one now at Worcester. This is Worcester, Cathedral Library, Add. 3, once deployed in a binding to a copy of Gilbert de la Porrée's 'Glossa Media' on the Psalter itself datable to the end of the twelfth century.⁴⁵ Three consecutive bifolia remain of the eighth-century manuscript, containing most of iii. 27 and the beginning of iii. 28 of the edited text of the *Regula pastoralis*. In his introduction to the catalogue of medieval manuscripts in Worcester Cathedral Library, Rodney Thomson notes what he terms a 'significant' number of bindings made from discarded manuscripts, a practice which appears to have started in the middle of the twelfth century.⁴⁶ He suggests that this is 'possibly because by that date almost a century of continuous book production (post-1066) had considerably reduced the need to keep old books'.⁴⁷ Add. 3 is of English provenance and copied in Phase II half-uncial.⁴⁸ However, Patrick Sims-Williams⁴⁹ casts doubt on Turner's assertion that it 'may well have been written at Worcester itself'.⁵⁰ Atkins and Ker also note that the manuscript into which it was bound cannot be traced in Worcester before 1675, before which it was 'in secular hands, perhaps in Wales, or on the border of Wales'.⁵¹ Collation of the variants in this manuscript noted by Turner as being significant demonstrates conclusively that it

⁴⁵ Thomson, *Descriptive Catalogue*, 110 (F. 163). There is a facsimile and transcription of the entire fragment in Turner, *Early Worcester MSS*, 15-26.

⁴⁶ Thomson, *Descriptive Catalogue*, xlvi.

⁴⁷ Thomson, *Descriptive Catalogue*, xlvi.

⁴⁸ Brown, 'Irish Element', 209.

⁴⁹ Sims-Williams, *Religion and Literature*, 136 n. 98.

⁵⁰ Turner, *Early Worcester MSS*, xviii.

⁵¹ Atkins and Ker, eds., *Catalogus*, 70.

was not used as the exemplar for Hunter. Given that it contains no specifically Celtic abbreviations, it would have been both an easier and a more obvious text to copy. This implies that it was not available to the Hunter scribes, and thereby indirectly supports the contention that Add. 3 was not copied at Worcester.

Worcester and Wales

Although the *Regula pastoralis* was one of the key texts for the Anglo-Saxons, rather few early copies survive.⁵² There are two reasons for this, one of which is general, and one which is text-specific. The first is the effect of the viking raids, and widespread loss of texts during the troubled ninth century.⁵³ The second is that the majority of the surviving Anglo-Saxon texts are based on the first recension of the *Regula pastoralis*; the preference for the second recension of the work following the Conquest meant that copies were eventually replaced and subsequently discarded.⁵⁴ Mercia, removed geographically from the brunt of viking raids, was one of the few areas where learning might be expected to continue unabated; the fact that no fewer than four men were summoned from the region to help support Alfred in his own literacy endeavours, including Bishop Wærferth of Worcester (*c.* 872 – *c.* 915) himself, appears to corroborate this.⁵⁵ There is also evidence of considerable latinity in charter production in Mercia, if not specifically at Worcester, during the ninth century; Susan Kelly notes the ‘unusual literary ambition’ evident in ninth-century Mercian diplomatic.⁵⁶ Ben Snook argues from a detailed analysis of the language and rhetorical style of the charters that Aldhelm’s work was unambiguously ‘read,

⁵² Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Library*, 306 lists a total of six manuscripts of the text datable to the ninth century or earlier. Of these half are fragments, and one was exported during the period to Fulda and safety.

⁵³ See Lapidge, ‘Latin Learning’ for interesting differences in type and format between early Anglo-Saxon manuscripts preserved on the Continent and those surviving *in situ*.

⁵⁴ Gameson (*Manuscripts of Early Norman England*, 36) notes that comparatively few manuscripts of the *Regula pastoralis* were seemingly produced in the seventy years or so after the Conquest. He attributes this to the ready availability of the work in English monasteries.

⁵⁵ Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, 92-93; 259 notes 163-66.

⁵⁶ Kelly, *Charters of Peterborough*, 212 and 368. See also Love, ‘Insular Latin Literature’, 155.

understood, paraphrased and even imitated there'.⁵⁷ Despite these encouraging signs, it nevertheless appears that a series of scribes from the church, called on to copy the *Regula pastoralis* in the eleventh century, had access only to an exemplar that was not easily readable. The resulting copy in what is now Hunter 431 is full of error, and seems to have lain incomplete until the twelfth century when the text was finished and painstakingly corrected against a second-recension copy of the text.⁵⁸ Both the early and later exemplars for Hunter 431 seem connected in some way to Wales, as does the fragmentary Harley text, which the evidence presented above has demonstrated is closely related (though not identical) to the manuscript that caused the eleventh-century scribes so many problems. Even if, then, Worcester possessed a copy of *Regula pastoralis* prior to the eleventh century, it seems to have been one which was at least challenging to read; one does wonder what readers made of it if those charged with actually copying the text struggled so conspicuously with making sense of it. Perhaps they did not trouble to engage with it at all: Helmut Gneuss⁵⁹ makes the important but overlooked point that Alfred clearly states that even when books were available prior to the raids, the majority of churchmen were not able to read them:

Ða ic þa eall gemunde ða gemunde ic eac hu ic geseah, ærðæmðe hit eall forhergod wære & forbærned, hu þa ciricean geond eall Angelcynn stodon maðma & boca gefyldæ & eac micel men[i]geo Godes ðiowa & ða swiðe lytle feorme ðara boca wiston, forðæmðe hie heora nan wuht óngiotan ne meahnton, forðæmðe hie næron ón hiora ægen geðiode awritene.⁶⁰

When I considered all this I remember also how I saw, before it had been all ravaged and burnt, how the churches throughout the whole of England stood

⁵⁷ Snook, *Anglo-Saxon Chancery*, 32-36 (35).

⁵⁸ Gameson (*Manuscripts of Early Norman England*, 4) has argued that such revision (rather than copying afresh) seems to have been standard procedure for the immediate post-Conquest period.

⁵⁹ Gneuss, 'King Alfred', 31.

⁶⁰ Sweet, ed., *West-Saxon Version*, i. 5 ll. 8-13, with translation.

filled with treasures and books, and there was also a great multitude of God's servants, but they had very little knowledge of the books, for they could not understand anything of them, because they were not written in their own language.

The absence from Worcester of a readily usable copy of the *Regula pastoralis* until the twelfth century, together with the presence of two Old English translations by (at the latest) the late eleventh, implies that the Alfredian translation programme was certainly welcomed.⁶¹ That Worcester looked westwards to fill the lacuna supports Julia Crick's recent observation that '[i]ntellectual traditions fared rather better [in Wales] in the ninth century, possibly better than in most of England'.⁶² This contention is one that has been made earlier, similarly tentatively, by Sims-Williams, 'both in Anglo-Saxon England and in Ireland one has the impression that it was writing Latin rather than the vernacular that presented problems in the ninth and tenth centuries. In Wales, Latin may have been rather stronger'.⁶³ Despite Worcester often being held up as a bastion of learning during those dark times, the evidence adduced in this article demonstrates that even here the foundation had to look elsewhere in order to acquire copies of key patristic texts in their original language, a deficit finally made good surprisingly late in the period.⁶⁴

⁶¹ The optimist might instead badge the effort to produce one in the eleventh century along with two copies of the Latin text of the *Dialogi* (for which see Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Library*, 304) as evidence that the educational reform had had its intended effect.

⁶² Crick, 'Art of Writing', 65.

⁶³ Sims-Williams, 'Uses of Writing', 28

⁶⁴ I am very grateful to Prof. Sarah Foot for her comments and suggestions on an earlier draft of this article.

List of Figures & Plates

Fig. 1: Glasgow, UL, Hunter 431, fol. 64v: initial **A** with roundel/bar motif

Fig. 2: Glasgow, UL, Hunter 431, fol. 82r: twelfth-century corrections to the text

Fig. 3: Glasgow, UL, Hunter 431, fol. 38v: further corrections to the text

Fig. 4: Glasgow, UL, Hunter 431, fol. 136v: Welsh gloss keyed to the text

Plate 1: Glasgow, UL, Hunter 431, fol. 133r: early twelfth-century continuation of the text

Plate 2: Glasgow, UL, Hunter 431, fol. 16v: twelfth- and thirteenth-century comments and corrections to the page

Plate 3: Glasgow, UL, Hunter 431, fol. 19r: twelfth-century emendations to the text, showing correction of wrongly expanded abbreviations

Plate 4: London, BL, Harley 5228, fo. 140r: ninth-century fragment of the *Regula pastoralis* (?Wales) with Worcester provenance

Bibliography

- Atkins, I., and N.R. Ker, eds., *Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum bibliothecae Wigornensis made in 1622-1623 by Patrick Young* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1944)
- Brown, T.J., 'The Irish Element in the Insular System of Scripts to c. AD 850', in J. Bately, M. Brown, and J. Roberts, eds., *A Palaeographer's View: Selected Writings of Julian Brown* (London: Harvey Miller, 1993), 201-20
- Clement, R.W., 'A Handlist of Manuscripts Containing Gregory's *Regula pastoralis*', *Manuscripta* 28 (1984): 33-44
- , 'King Alfred and the Latin Manuscripts of Gregory's *Regula pastoralis*', *Journal of the Rocky Mountains Medieval and Renaissance Association* 6 (1985): 1-13
- , 'Two Contemporary Gregorian Editions of Pope Gregory the Great's *Regula pastoralis* in Troyes MS 504', *Scriptorium* 39 (1985): 89-97
- Collier, W., 'The Tremulous Worcester Hand and Gregory's Pastoral Care', in M. Swan and E.M. Treharne, eds., *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 30 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 195-208
- Crick, J., 'The Art of Writing: Scripts and Scribal Production', in C.A. Lees, ed., *The Cambridge History of Early Medieval English Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 50-72
- Davies, W., 'The Church - Institutions and Authority', in her *Wales in the Early Middle Ages*, Studies in the Early History of Britain (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1982), 141-68
- Demacopoulos, G.E., trans., *St Gregory the Great: The Book of Pastoral Rule* (New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2007)
- Dumville, D.N., *Abbreviations Used in Insular Script before A.D. 850: Tabulation Based on the Work of W.M. Lindsay*, Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic Manuscript-Studies 2 (Cambridge: Department of Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic, 2004)

- , 'English Script in the Second Half of the Ninth Century', in K. O'Brien O'Keefe and A. Orchard, eds., *Latin Learning and English Lore: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Literature for Michael Lapidge*, 2 vols. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005), Vol. 1, 305-25
- Franzen, C., *The Tremulous Hand of Worcester: A Study of Old English in the Thirteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991)
- Gameson, R., 'Book Production and Decoration at Winchester in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries', in N. Brooks and C. Cubitt, eds., *St Oswald of Worcester: Life and Influence* (London: Leicester University Press, 1996), 194-243
- , *The Manuscripts of Early Norman England (c. 1066 - 1130)* (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 1999)
- Gneuss, H., 'King Alfred and the History of Anglo-Saxon Libraries', reprinted in his *Books and Libraries in Early England*, Collected Studies Series (Hampshire: Variorum, 1996), Vol. 3, 29-49
- , and M. Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A Bibliographical Handlist of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014)
- Godden, M., 'Did King Alfred Write Anything?', *Medium Ævum* 76 (2007): 1-23
- Graham, T., 'The Opening of King Alfred's Preface to the Old English Pastoral Care: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 20', *Old English Newsletter* 38 (2004): 43-50
- Gullick, M., 'The Origin and Date of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 163', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 11 (1996): 89-91
- Horgan, D.M., 'The Old English *Pastoral Care*: The Scribal Contribution', in P.E. Szarmach, ed., *Studies in Earlier Old English Prose* (Albany: State University of New York, 1986), 109-27
- Judic, B., and F. Rommel, eds., *Grégoire le Grand, Règle pastorale*, 2 vols. (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992)
- Kelly, S.E., ed., *Charters of Peterborough Abbey*, Anglo-Saxon Charters 14 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 2009)

- Keynes, S., and M. Lapidge, *Alfred the Great: Asser's Life of King Alfred and Other Contemporary Sources* (London: Penguin, 1983)
- Ker, N.R., *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1957)
- , *English Manuscripts in the Century after the Norman Conquest*, The Lyell Lectures Oxford 1952-3 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1960)
- , 'The Provenance of the Oldest Manuscript of the Rule of St Benedict', reprinted in his *Books, Collectors and Libraries: Studies in the Medieval Heritage*, ed. A.G. Watson (London: Hambledon Press, 1985), 131-32
- Lapidge, M., 'Surviving Booklists from Anglo-Saxon England', in M. Lapidge and H. Gneuss, eds., *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England: Studies Presented to Peter Clemoes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 33-89
- , 'Latin Learning in Dark Age Wales: Some Prolegomena', in D.E. Evans, J.G. Griffith, and E.M. Jope, eds., *Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Celtic Studies* (Oxford: Cranham, 1986), 91-107
- , 'Latin Learning in Ninth-Century England', in his *Anglo-Latin Literature 600 - 899* (London: Hambledon, 1996), 409-54
- , *The Anglo-Saxon Library* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)
- Lindsay, W.M., *Early Welsh Script* (Oxford: James Parker, 1912)
- Love, R., 'Insular Latin Literature to 900', in C.A. Lees, ed., *The Cambridge History of Early Medieval English Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 120-57
- McIntyre, E.A., 'Early-Twelfth-Century Worcester Cathedral Priory, with Special Reference to Some of the Manuscripts Written There', Unpublished D.Phil. Thesis (Oxford University, 1978)
- Morrish, J., 'King Alfred's Letter as a Source of Learning in England in the Ninth Century', in P.E. Szarmach, ed., *Studies in Earlier English Prose* (Albany: State University of New York, 1986), 87-107
- , 'Dated and Datable Manuscripts Copied in England During the Ninth Century: A Preliminary List', *Mediaeval Studies* 50 (1988): 512-38

- Schreiber, C., *King Alfred's Old English Translation of Pope Gregory the Great's Regula pastoralis and its Cultural Context*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Englischen Philologie 25 (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2002)
- Sims-Williams, P., 'The Uses of Writing in Early Medieval Wales', in H. Pryce, ed., *Literacy in Medieval Celtic Societies*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 33 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 15-38
- , *Religion and Literature in Western England 600-800*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990)
- Sisam, K., 'The Publication of Alfred's *Pastoral Care*', in his *Studies in the History of Old English Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953), 140-47
- , 'Addendum: The Verses Prefixed to *Gregory's Dialogues*', in his *Studies in the History of Old English Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953), 225-31
- Snook, B., *The Anglo-Saxon Chancery: The History, Language and Production of Anglo-Saxon Charters from Alfred to Edgar* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2015)
- Sweet, H., ed., *King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care*, Early English Text Society Original Series 45 and 50, 2 vols. (London: Early English Text Society, 1871)
- Thomson, R.M., *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval Manuscripts in Worcester Cathedral Library* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2001)
- Thorpe, D.E., and J.E. Alty, 'What Kind of Tremor did the Medieval "Tremulous Hand of Worcester" Have?', *Brain: A Journal of Neurology* 138 (2015): 3123-27
- Turner, C.H., ed., *Early Worcester MSS* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1916)
- 'Vulgate.Org: The Latin Vulgate Bible', available online at <www.vulgate.org/>, accessed December 2014

- Fig. 1 Glasgow, UL, Hunter 431, fol. 64v
Fig. 2 Glasgow, UL, Hunter 431, fol. 82r
Fig. 3 Glasgow, UL, Hunter 431, fol. 38v
Fig. 4 Glasgow, UL, Hunter 431, fol. 136v
- Plate 1 Glasgow, UL, Hunter 431, fol. 133r
Plate 2 Glasgow, UL, Hunter 431, fol. 16v
Plate 3 Glasgow, UL, Hunter 431, fol. 19r
Plate 4 London, British Library, Harley 5228